

# ATTACHMENT 1:

## General Plan 2040 Public Comments and Responses (12/10/20 through 04/01/20)

*Note: Comments have been paraphrased for presentation purposes*

Comment	Response
<b>On-Line Comment from Glenn Snyder- 12/10/20</b>	
Reconsider the proposal for shuttle service from Downtown San Rafael along 5 <sup>th</sup> Av to Sun Valley, as expressed in the Neighborhoods Element	Comment noted. This is expressed only as an aspirational idea per the Neighborhood Association's input and would require further discussion if pursued.
<b>Letter from Zander Gladish – 12/10/20</b>	
Commenter is one of the current owners of Canalways---believes the property is worthy of a bold and grand vision that should be shaped by the entire community. Owners wish to realize the full potential of the 85 acres to serve the community. Commenter disagrees with letter and testimony from Marin Audubon which implies that the owners' environmental consultant may produce inaccurate findings. Commenter observes that planning in Marin County historically emphasized protection of open space in rural areas, with the tradeoff that infill sites in the urbanized area could be developed. The natural resource values of Canalways have been altered by years of perimeter development (freeways, landfills, industry, big box retail, pumping, etc.). Site can be a vital potential source of revenue and jobs.	All comments noted. General Plan 2040 acknowledges the potential described here as well as the importance of resource conservation.
Marin Audubon has incorrectly characterized the pump station issues. Pump station is owned and maintained by City and is on City land. Rainwater has not been pumped from Canalways site, rather from the City site. City has not properly maintained pump station, resulting in more water on Canalways site.	All comments noted. Comment relates to another comment letter rather than text of General Plan.
Commenter disagrees with Audubon's objection to the Draft Plan's suggestion that development be "economically viable." Commenter further notes that economically viable is not the same as profitable. The community loses out if the plan is only viewed through the lens of interest groups. Owner has invested in maintaining the property.	Comments noted. The reference to "economically viable" is being deleted.
Commenter supports language as shown in the 2040 draft, noting "If anything, the language should be stronger when referencing the various benefits this property could bring to the community, if properly planned and developed."	Comments noted. Further consideration of the vision for this site will likely happen through PDA planning and shoreline resiliency planning.

Comment	Response
<b>Letter from Victoria DeWitt – 12/15/2020 comments on Staff’s edits responding to prior comments</b>	
<p><b>P 6-19: Program C-1.16C. Redwood tree preservation.</b> Modify the proposed wording to eliminate reference to “private property” as follows: <i>“Revise the City’s tree regulations to identify protected trees <del>on private property</del> and establish required procedures and permit requirements for tree removal and protection.”</i></p>	<p>This change will be incorporated.</p>
<p><b>P 8-7: Program S-2.1B: Geotechnical Review.</b> The word “feasibility” should be included here as it is a critical part of geotechnical review and is included elsewhere in the Safety element.</p>	<p>Program edited as follows: “Such studies should determine the extent of geotechnical hazards, optimum design for structures, and the suitability <u>and feasibility</u> of proposed development for its location...”</p>
<p><b>P 10-43: Policy M-6.1.</b> “Public stairways” should also be included.</p>	<p>Public stairways will be added.</p>
<p><b>P 10-47, Policy M-7.3: Parking Technology.</b> <i>“Where <u>feasible</u>, use technology to improve parking efficiency and reduce the land area required to meet parking needs.”</i></p>	<p>No change proposed. The use of technology to make parking more efficient intended as a broad, guiding policy for transportation planning.</p>
<p><b>P 10-47, Program M-7.3A: Downtown Parking and Wayfinding Study Recommendations.</b> <i>“Implement the technology recommendations of the 2017 Downtown Parking and Wayfinding Study and <u>consider</u> the application of these recommendations to other parts of San Rafael <u>by doing a similar study for residential areas.</u>”</i></p>	<p>Will be changed as follows: Implement the technology recommendations of the 2017 Downtown Parking and Wayfinding Study and <del>consider</del> <u>study</u> the application of these recommendations to other parts of San Rafael.</p>
<p><b>P 13-22, Program EV-3.8C: Pre-Submittal Process.</b> Delete “and speed” as follows: <i>“Improve the efficiency <del>and speed</del> of the development review process by <u>updating departmental procedures</u>, <del>revisiting</del> neighborhood notification and meeting procedures and <u>updating</u> the pre-submittal process to identify initial concerns and encourage higher quality applications.”</i></p>	<p>Will delete reference to “speed” per the comment</p>
<b>Letter from Victoria DeWitt- 12/15/2020 – Further New Comments</b>	
<p><b>P 3-29, Policy LU-2.6: Lot Consolidation.</b> Add new second sentence (underlined) as follows: <i>“Encourage the consolidation of small (&lt;6,000 SF) lots zoned for higher density residential, commercial, and mixed uses in order to create more viable development sites. <u>Encourage consolidation of hillside lots which are difficult to develop because of size or slope or have difficult fire and emergency access.</u> Lot consolidation can provide greater flexibility in site planning, make it easier to meet parking and access requirements, <u>hillside development standards</u> and enable building sizes and dimensions that are more economically viable.”</i></p>	<p>This policy is intended to make development in urbanized locations more viable, so this addition would not fit well here. However, policy CDP-1.3 on hillside development in the Community Design and Preservation Element is being expanded (see response to comment on Page 4-19). A new action program under policy CDP-1.3 will encourage the merger of small lots in hazardous, steep, and fire-prone areas.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>P 3-31: Program LU-2.12D. Accessory Dwelling Units.</b>  Add: <u>Adopt a policy to disallow ADUs and JADUs in areas where risks to the public health and safety exist due to extremely narrow streets, lack of sidewalks, and access difficulties for fire and emergency vehicles.</u></p>	<p>LU-2.12D is intended to encourage ADUs rather than limit them, so this addition would not be appropriate here. However, this issue will be addressed through the new program described above for CDP-1.3.</p>
<p><b>P 3-33: Policy LU-3.2: New Development in Residential Neighborhoods.</b> Add to bulleted list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Should not increase risks to public health and safety or contribute to access difficulties for fire and emergency vehicles.</u></li> </ul>	<p>Rather than adding a new bullet, the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet will be extended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Reduce exposure to hazards, including limited emergency vehicle access</u></li> </ul>
<p><b>P 4-18: West End Neighborhood Narrative</b> - Replace the narrative in the Draft Neighborhoods Element (describing the West End Village and its vision for the future) with narrative provided by the author.</p>	<p>Most of the text provided has been incorporated in a revised version of the narrative. Some of the text relates to West End Village (2<sup>nd</sup> Street sidewalk improvements etc.) and is covered in the Downtown section of the element. See also comment from Brian Walsh (later in this matrix).</p>
<p><b>P. 4-19: Add new Policy NH-2.5: Hillside Construction.</b> <i>“Ensure compliance with the Hillside Design Guidelines for all new construction and major remodels on hillside lots. The siting, height, and design of new or expanded structures should be carefully evaluated to ensure adequate emergency vehicle access, slope and foundation stability, adequate surface and sub-surface drainage, erosion control, and meet parking requirements. Buildings that are out of scale, damage the natural landscape, cause excessive tree loss or habitat destruction, or obstruct scenic vistas from public vantage points, should be discouraged.”</i></p>	<p>This is a citywide issue rather than one unique to the West End neighborhood. As such, the appropriate place for it is in the Land Use Element or the Community Design and Preservation (CDP) Element. Policy CDP-1.3 will be edited to add the following language after the initial sentence: <i>“Structures on hillside sites should be sited and designed to provide adequate emergency vehicle access, slope and foundation stability, surface and subsurface drainage, erosion control, and off-street parking. Buildings on such sites should be carefully designed to protect the natural landscape, avoid excessive tree loss, and preserve scenic vistas from public vantage points.”</i></p> <p>Policy C-1.10/ Program C-1.10A will be cross-referenced.</p>
<p><b>P. 6-19, Program C-1.17A. Tree replacement policy.</b>  Commenter requests that a new program be added to adopt a tree replacement policy based on energy cost savings, runoff absorption, wildlife value, hazard mitigation, and beauty.</p>	<p>Per responses to prior comments on this issue, Program C-1.16C is being amended to <i>“establish required procedures and permit requirements for tree removal and protection.”</i> The replacement policy itself would be determined through future analysis and public discussion. The metrics listed here (wildlife value, beauty, etc.) would be difficult to quantify.</p>
<p><b>P 8-1, Edit 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:</b> <i>“While it would be impossible to remove all risks entirely, there are steps the City can take to reduce <del>losses</del> risks and make more informed decisions about land use and development <u>near these hazards by implementing policies and programs to reduce losses to life and property.</u>”</i></p>	<p>Edited as follows: <i>“Risks can be reduced by considering natural hazards in land use and development decisions, and by implementing policies and programs to reduce losses to life and property.”</i></p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>P. 8-4, Program S-1.2B: Use of Hazard Maps in Development Review.</b> Edit as follows: <i>“Review slope stability, seismic hazard, flood hazard, sea level rise, wildfire, and other environmental hazard maps when development is proposed. Require appropriate studies and <del>actions</del> other reports necessary to identify <del>ensure</del> <del>that</del> hazards on or adjacent to the site <del>are identified</del> and implement effective mitigation measures. <del>mitigated.</del>—Per the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), “a successful mitigation program involves both the public and private sector”. Information regarding the investigation, identification, and proposed mitigation measures for local hazards discovered during review of a development proposal should be assessed and available for public review before the application is deemed complete and the City takes action to approve the development. Update the City Study and mapping to include potential landslide areas and other hazards identified during development review, per LHMP.”</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. The action is about the use of maps. Some of the proposed new text relates to implementation of the LHMP, which is covered under S-1.1A. Some of the edits have been made in an abridged manner, as follows: <i>“Review slope stability, seismic hazard, flood hazard, sea level rise, wildfire, and other environmental hazard maps when development is proposed. Update hazard maps to include data collected during development review and other studies. Measures to mitigate mapped hazards should be identified prior to project approval.”</i></p>
<p><b>P. 8-5, Add new first sentence to 2nd para. under Goal S-2 as follows:</b> <i>“Geologic and seismic hazards should be considered in planning the location, design, intensity, density and type of land uses in a given area. Long term costs to the City...”</i></p>	<p>Sentence will be added: <i>“Geologic and seismic hazards should be considered in determining the location, design, intensity, density and type of land uses in a given area. Long term costs to the City...”</i></p>
<p><b>P. 8-5, add new sentence to paragraph 2 under Goal S-2 as follows:</b> <i>“The City will only approve new development in areas of identified hazard if such hazard can be appropriately mitigated, per the City’s LHMP.”</i></p>	<p>This is covered by Policy S-1.2. The LHMP is also adopted by reference as part of the General Plan.</p>
<p><b>P 8-6, add to last paragraph on page as follows:</b> <i>“The City has also adopted a Hillside Development Overlay District and the Hillside Residential Guidelines Manual which applies to all lots with an average slope of 25 percent or greater and includes development requirements and procedures to identify and minimize hazards associated with development on steep or unstable slopes.”</i></p>	<p>Sentence will be edited to acknowledge the Guidelines: <i>“The City has also adopted a Hillside Development Overlay District and Hillside Residential Guidelines to identify and minimize hazards associated with development on steep or unstable slopes.”</i></p>
<p><b>P 8-7, edit as follows: Policy S-2.1: <u>Geologic and Seismic Safety of New Buildings.</u> Design <del>and construct</del> all new <u>construction</u> <del>buildings</del> to resist stresses produced by earthquakes.”</b></p>	<p>Comment noted. Recommend keeping the policy (which is being carried forward from GP 2020) as is. The proposed change could weaken its applicability to construction methods and limits its focus to design.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>P 8-7, edit Program S-2.1B as follows.  <i>Continue to require geotechnical studies and peer review for proposed development as set forth in the City's Geotechnical Review Matrix <u>to assess soil/geologic hazards and determine if these hazards can be adequately mitigated.</u> (See Appendix F and text box at right). Such studies should determine the extent of geotechnical hazards, optimum design for structures, <u>the feasibility and suitability of a proposed development for its location, the need for special structural requirements, and measures to mitigate any identified hazards. In some instances, an engineering solution may not be economically feasible, and avoidance of the hazard may be the best way to assure public health and safety, per LHMP. These findings shall be considered in conjunction with development review before project approval. Periodically review and update the Geotechnical Review Matrix to ensure that it supports and implements the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan by identifying potentially hazardous areas that may be experiencing geotechnical instability., <del>reflects current practices and is internally consistent, and potentially remove the procedures from the General Plan and instead adopt them as part of the Zoning Ordinance or through a separate resolution.</del></u></i></p> <p>Commenter further requests that Appendix F remain part of the General Plan, as removing it makes it less transparent and visible to the public.</p>	<p>Some of these changes have been incorporated. Some of the suggested narrative appears elsewhere (The proposed third sentence appears in the narrative on P 8-5 and the proposed fourth sentence was added to Program S-1.2B in response to an earlier comment). Deletion of the last part of the final sentence is not recommended. The text in the October 2020 Draft does not suggest eliminating the Geotechnical Matrix—it merely suggests that it be included in a separate ordinance or resolution rather than in the General Plan, which is intended to be a broad policy document. The Matrix can become more accessible this way (as is, it is hard to find on the City's website). Revised text follows:  <i>"Continue to require <u>soil and geologic hazard geotechnical</u> studies and peer review for proposed development as set forth in the City's Geotechnical Matrix (See Appendix F and text box at right). Such studies should determine the extent of geotechnical hazards, optimum design for structures, <u>the feasibility and suitability of a proposed development for its location, the need for special structural requirements, and measures to mitigate any identified hazard. Periodically review and update the Geotechnical Review Matrix to ensure that it supports and implements the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan by identifying potentially hazardous areas that may be experiencing geotechnical instability, <del>reflects current practices, and is internally consistent, and potentially remove</del> Consider removing the procedures from the General Plan and instead adopting them as part of the Zoning Ordinance or through a separate resolution"</u></i></p>
<p><b>P. 8-7, Policy S-2.2:</b> (1) Change "registered geologist or geotechnical engineer" to "Certified Engineering Geologist or Registered Geotechnical Engineer", (2) add LHMP, (3) add sentence suggesting design factor or 1.5 static conditions and 1.0 pseudo-static conditions. (4) Add reduction of secondary impacts.</p>	<p>Changes 1 and 2 will be included. Change 3 is not appropriate for the General Plan (this language was removed from General Plan 2020, per City Building Official, as these standards are more appropriately covered by geotechnical design manuals, and not in the General Plan). Reduction of secondary impacts would be part of mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Appendix F:</b> Add note to bottom of first page: <i>"For Hillside lots with an average slope greater than 25%, refer to the Hillside Residential Guidelines Manual, Appendix C for Geotechnical/ Hazardous soils review."</i></p>	<p>This change will be made.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Letter from Responsible Growth in Marin – December 12, 2020</b>	
RGM asks that conditional auxiliary verbs (should, encourage, etc.) be replaced with more committal language (shall, require, etc.) as follows:	See responses below
<p><b>P 3-4: Growth Management and Community Benefits:</b> Policies in this Element carry forward the prior General Plan’s emphasis on growth management, particularly the idea that development <b>should (shall)</b> be permitted only when adequate transportation, infrastructure, and public services are available, or <b>will be</b> in place when the project is built.</p>	“should” retained in first case, as this is narrative text rather than a policy. In the second case, “will be” to be added as suggested here.
<p><b>P 3-29: Program LU-2.3A: Neighborhood Centers.</b> Use the development review process to evaluate future proposals for existing neighborhood commercial centers, including the addition of new uses such as housing. Neighbors should be <b>(shall be invited to be)</b> involved early in the development review process.</p>	In this instance, “should” is the more appropriate auxiliary verb, as the intent is broad and general.
<p><b>P 4-54: Policy NH-4.1: North San Rafael:</b> Plans for North San Rafael should <b>(need to)</b> recognize that this is a distinct and unique part of San Rafael. Standards for density, design, traffic, and parking should <b>(shall)</b> be tailored to reflect local context. North San Rafael residents should <b>(will be invited to)</b> have a voice at the citywide level and be directly involved in shaping decisions about the future of their community.</p>	All of the suggested changes will be incorporated.
<p><b>P 4-56: Program NH-4.2A: North San Rafael Town Center Plan:</b> The plan should <b>(shall)</b> include a community-driven process that fully engages <b>(existing)</b> property owners, business owners, community residents, and government agencies.</p>	Per the comment, the “should” will be replaced with “shall.” Addition of the word “existing” is not recommended as prospective/ future owners, business, and residents could also be involved.
<p><b>P 4-56: Program NH-4.2B: Outdoor Gathering Places:</b> Design of retail spaces <b>should (shall)</b> be flexible enough to support these types of activities in the future.</p>	Recommend keeping “should” here as the intent of the policy is flexibility and the topic is subjective.
<p><b>P 4-56: Program NH-4.2C: Incentives:</b> Allow a height bonus of two stories (24 feet) for affordable housing. Percentage targets for housing affordability <b>should (shall)</b> be set during the Town Center planning process and <b>should (shall)</b> be the focus of a community discussion about new approaches to meeting the housing needs for persons of all incomes.</p>	Both of the suggested changes will be incorporated.

Comment	Response
<b>Letter from San Rafael Heritage – December 12, 2020</b>	
<p><b>Page 5-1</b>  Paragraph 1: "...positively reinforcing its visual character and relationship to its natural setting, <b>history</b> and cultural context."  Paragraph 2 "... its natural setting as well as <b>its historical and</b> cultural roots."</p>	Both edits will be made.
<p><b>Page 5-2</b>, Paragraph 2, last sentence  "...and Preservation Element as a foundation but should recognize that other factors <del>must</del> <b>might</b> be considered to reflect the context of each location."</p>	"must" changed to "may"
<p><b>Page 5-3</b>, Paragraph 2, Sentence 3  "The image of the city is largely defined by a particular combination of natural features, buildings, roads, <b>the railroad</b> and infrastructure."</p>	No change.
<p><b>Page 5-5</b>, Paragraph 2, 4<sup>th</sup> Sentence  "Third Street, Fourth Street <b>and Fifth Avenue</b> function as important <b>Station Area</b> gateways to the <b>Downtown</b>. <b>Freitas Parkway, Lucas Valley Road and North San Pedro Road</b> are also important gateways."</p>	These changes will be made
<p><b>Page 5-5</b>, Paragraph 2  Include the Civic Center SMART station, Downtown SMART station and Downtown Transportation Center as gateways and perhaps the North South Greenway as Gateways as they represent ways that people access our city other than automobiles.</p>	Add sentence to end of paragraph 2: <u>There are also opportunities for enhanced gateways at the SMART stations and Downtown Transit Center.</u>
<p><b>Page 5-5</b>, Paragraph 3  "The waterfront consists of <b>the shore reaches in the San Rafael Creek watersheds and Gallinas/Miller Creek watersheds as defined in the ABAG Adaptation Atlas Operational Landscape Units, including San Rafael Canal, beaches, marinas, parks, trails, wetlands and marshes.</b>"   "...such as <b>historic</b> China Camp State Park"</p>	<p>Edited:  The waterfront consists of beaches, marinas, parks, trails, wetlands, and marshes, <u>as well as the lower reaches of creeks flowing into the Bay.</u></p> <p>No change</p>
<p><b>Page 5-5</b>, Paragraph 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> Sentence  Affected areas: Add Santa Venetia and other low-lying areas along the forks of Gallinas Creek</p>	This change will be made
<p><b>Page 5-8</b>, Paragraph 2  <b>"In the Downtown this includes the Station Area and the Northwestern Pacific Depot. In North San Rafael, this includes the transformation of Northgate Mall...."</b></p>	Add last sentence to para. <u>"In Downtown San Rafael, this includes infill development and new public spaces in the SMART station and transit center areas."</u>
<p><b>Page 5-10</b>. Goal CDP-1 Recommend BOLD* type: <b>preserves its legacy of historic buildings, and values its diverse design qualities. San Rafael's distinct</b> *It appears there is an editing error- some boxes are partially in bold, and others not.</p>	Text is correctly formatted as shown. First sentence is bold because it is the goal. Subsequent italicized sentences provide narrative explaining the goal. Each CDP goal is formatted this way.
<p><b>Page 5-11</b>. Policy CDP-1.3: Hillside Protection  SRH supports leaving this policy in 2040 GP:  "Continue to implement hillside design guidelines through the design review process"</p>	The policy has been retained but has been categorized as an implementing action (i.e., Program CDP-1.3A) rather than a policy. Note that CDP-1.3 is being expanded per the response to an earlier commenter.

Comment	Response
<p><b>Page 5-12.</b> Goal CDP-2: “San Rafael is a collage of uniquely identifiable places—a walkable <b>historic downtown....the city’s identity and its iconic buildings while protecting qualities....</b>”</p>	<p>No change. Text for this goal was carefully word smithed with GP Steering Committee.</p>
<p><b>Page 5-12</b> [Recommend including a photo of the NWP Depot] ...a gateway is also a chance to express the identity of a community through art, landscape, and signage. It can also communicate a sense of pride, history, culture, and values, <b>including the impact the railroads had on the City’s history as represented by the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Depot. San Rafael’s gateways....</b></p>	<p>No change. Addition of this text would be out of context in this sentence. SMART stations and Transit Center are acknowledged as important gateways in the last sentence.</p>
<p><b>Page 5-15, Edit,</b> Evaluate each gateway shown on <b>Figure [Exhibit] 5-2....</b></p>	<p>Correction will be made.</p>
<p><b>Page 5-15,</b> Program CDP-2.6B: “Support landscaping, signage, and design improvements at neighborhood and district entry points, <b>such as The Station Area.</b>”</p>	<p>No change. This is a general statement about gateways across the city.</p>
<p><b>Page 5-15</b> text box proposed edit to first sentence: “San Rafael’s Corridors and Gateways San Rafael’s transportation corridors include regional freeways like US 101 and I-580, and local arterials like Freitas Parkway, Pt. San Pedro Road, <b>2nd/3rd Streets, the Station Area, Lincoln Avenue, Redwood Highway, Bellam Boulevard and 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> Street...</b></p> <p>The SMART railroad and North South Greenway should be included as transportation corridors.</p>	<p>2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> will be moved per the comment. Station area will not be added, since it is not a corridor. The following sentence will be added. “Corridors also include the SMART rail line and greenways or promenades that cross the city.”</p>
<p><b>Page 5-16</b> Goal CDP-3: narrative text, second sentence “Streets, parks, plazas, and civic buildings are designed and maintained to convey <b>historic identity and civic pride.</b>”</p>	<p>This change will be incorporated</p>
<p><b>Page 5-16,</b> 2<sup>nd</sup> para. below the goal “Public space provides common ground for community gatherings, recreation, <b>education,</b> art, performance, and civic events.”</p>	<p>This change will be incorporated</p>
<p><b>Page 5-19,</b> Program CDP-3.7A: Downtown Wayfinding ...<b>cultural and historic resources, public...</b></p>	<p>This change will be incorporated</p>
<p><b>Page 5-19,</b> Program CDP-3.7B: Interpretive Signage. Eliminate: “Encourage the use of” and replace with “<b>Use</b> interpretive signage....”</p>	<p>This change will be incorporated</p>
<p><b>Page 5-25,</b> Goal CDP-5 <b>The Protection of Cultural Heritage...</b>  Edit second sentence in goal to read: <b>“Historic and archeological P preservation can provide provides a strong sense of place”</b></p> <p>Edit first sentence in last paragraph on page to read: “In 1986 <b>the City completed an update of the 1978 San Rafael Historical/Architectural Survey...</b>”</p>	<p>Will change goal title to “Protection of Cultural Heritage”.</p> <p>Second sentence to read “Historic preservation provides a strong sense of place...”</p> <p>This change will be made</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Page 5-26.</b> First para, last sentence:  <i>“Within the city limits, high concentrations of older buildings exist in Downtown, Gerstle Park, Forbes Addition-Sun Valley, Montecito-Happy Valley, and Dominican.”</i></p> <p>Third para., third sentence: <i>“The Ordinance is implemented by the Design Review Board and Planning Commission.”</i></p>	<p>Both of the requested changes will be made</p>
<p><b>Page 5-27:</b> Figure 5-5. Map of Historic Resources  Recommend Adding McNear Brickyard and McNear Brickyard School (now a small church)</p>	<p>The map only shows resources that have been formally listed by the City of San Rafael (e.g., by Ordinance) or on the State/Federal registers. It does not include eligible historic resources. The Brickyard properties are eligible but not landmarked. The map would be amended if formal landmarking occurs.</p>
<p><b>Page 5-28,</b> Program CDP 5-1.B, edit second sentence:  <i>“...advise the the Planning Commission and Design Review Board on matters and policies related to preservation or the modification of historic structures. If an oversight body is created, it should represent diverse perspectives and interests specific expertise and interest in historic preservation or related fields.”</i></p>	<p>No change. A Committee could potentially advise the DRB as well.</p> <p>No change. The concept of a Committee representing diverse perspectives and interests was very important to the General Plan Steering Committee and should not be eliminated.</p>
<p><b>Page 5-28.</b> Policy CDP-5.2, break first sentence into two. Second sentence becomes <i>“Balance these criteria so as not to (do not) unreasonably constrain property rights.”</i></p>	<p>This change will be incorporated</p>
<p><b>Page 5-28.</b> Program CDP-5.2B: Inventory Update.  <i>“Regularly (Continue to) update...”</i></p>	<p>This change will be incorporated</p>
<p><b>Page 5-28, add a new Program CDP-5.2E:</b> <i>Establish a process for local landmark designation, including the application process, fee structure, approval process.</i></p>	<p>This will be worked into Program CDP-2D as a second sentence, since that program addresses additional landmark designations</p>
<p><b>Page 5-29,</b> Program CDP 5.23 Conservation Districts  Define the differences between a historic district and a conservation district and their applicabilities.</p>	<p>This is the purpose of the text box on Page 5-29. It is cross-referenced in Program CDP-5.3B</p>
<p><b>Page 5-29,</b> Program CDP-5.3C: Eichler Neighborhoods.  <i>“Recognize the Eichler subdivisions of North San Rafael as a defining part of San Rafael’s architectural heritage.”</i> Recommend this be an example rather than a “program” or does the City want to name other potential districts as specific programs?</p>	<p>Expanded to include “Eichler, Kenney, and Alliance subdivisions” per input from Terra Linda area organizations.</p>
<p><b>Page 5-29.</b> Policy CDP 5.4 Preservation Incentives  Recommend additional research on incentives:  National Trust for Historic Preservation and Urban Land Institute for examples</p>	<p>Sentence will be added to end of Program CDP-5.4C recommending additional research on incentives, including National Trust and ULI</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Page 5-29:</b> Add the following three programs to Policy CDP-5.4:</p> <p><b>“Program CDP 5.4D Preservation Mitigation Exactions.</b> Retain development exactions for historic preservation mitigations in an account to be specifically allocated for preservation projects such as but not limited to updating the historic resources inventory, placement of interpretive signage, plaques, and markers, restoration and/or repair of publicly held historic resources, funding a historic resource advisory committee.”</p> <p><b>“Program CDP 5.4E Development Rights Transfer Market Mechanism.</b> Determine the feasibility of establishing a market mechanism with the commercial brokerage community that banks development rights for sale and transfer to receiving sites not yet identified.”</p> <p><b>“Program CDP 5.4F Historic Preservation Trust</b> Determine the feasibility of formation of a non-profit trust whose function is to restore, maintain, manage and when appropriate lease publicly owned historic buildings and sites. (Falkirk and the Boyd Gatehouse are two examples.)”</p>	<p>A single program will be added that includes an abridged menu of options that may be considered in the future, including the three programs listed here.</p>
<p><b>Page 5-30.</b> Program CDP 5.6A Certificates of Appropriateness. Edit as follows:  “.....Criteria for COAs should be consistent with State and federal standards <u>including the Secretary of Interior’s Standards</u>”</p>	<p>This change will be made</p>
<p><b>Page 5-31.</b> Program CDP-5.10A: Walking Tours, Trails, and Historic Festivals. Edit as follows:  “Encourage walking tours, historic trails, mobile apps, and history fairs and programs that attract visitors. Partner with the <u>Marin History Museum, San Rafael Heritage,</u> Marin Convention and Visitors Bureau and other organizations to promote events celebrating San Rafael history.”</p>	<p>This change will be made</p>
<p><b>Page 5-32.</b> Recommend adding programs to Policy CDP-5.10 to promote the civic use of the Carnegie Library, and to preserve the NWP RR Depot as a visitor designation.</p>	<p>No changes made. Recommendations for individual buildings in Downtown would more appropriately be addressed in the Downtown Precise Plan. These structures are addressed there.</p>
<p>Page 5-33. Edit last sentence of Program CDP 5-12.A as follows: “Support educational curriculum that raises awareness of the City’s cultural heritage <del>and includes non-Eurocentric perspectives.</del>” Recommend dropping “Non-Eurocentric” because it would exclude Portuguese and Spanish cultural heritage.</p>	<p>No change. Including a non-Eurocentric perspective does not require that other perspectives are excluded.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Letter from Responsible Growth in Marin – December 15, 2020 (Financial Committee)</b>	
<p><b>General Comment on Economic Vitality Element:</b> Economic stability and direction of the city is not clear with the provided data and graphs. Omission of a full financial statement and details of revenue and expenses drivers need to be included to ground the reader in the current environment.</p>	<p>The Element is intended to create a positive environment for business investment, encourage workforce development, and enhance the character of business districts. Staff agrees that the analysis described in the comment is needed and should be done as part of a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy. This is identified as a top priority, to be completed after General Plan adoption.</p>
<p><b>General Comment on Economic Vitality Element:</b> COVID is mentioned throughout as a reason for the current economic situation. These are unprecedented times but there will be others in the future. Suggest removing all COVID references and refer to the current situation as an ‘economic downturn’ or ‘challenging economic times’.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Steering Committee felt it was important to directly acknowledge the impacts of COVID-19, since it has affected not only the economy, but the transportation network, urban design, equity, emergency preparedness, and other issues that may influence the city’s future.</p>
<p><b>Page 13-2:</b> Tables 13-1 and Table 13-2 show aggregated snapshot data comparing San Rafael to Marin. These metrics do not make sense unless historical data points are shown. Adding a 15-20 year trend graph will help show the direction the community is heading</p>	<p>We will look into adding historical data points (such as 2000 or 2010) to these tables.</p>
<p><b>Page 13-2:</b> Tables 13-1 and 13-2 numbers in columns do not sum to the totals at the bottom</p>	<p>The numbers are correct but on data rows 5 and 6, a period was used instead of a comma—this will be corrected.</p>
<p><b>Page 13-4: Program EV-1.1C: 2020 Pandemic Recovery.</b> This is a dangerous (program) because knee jerk decisions could be made. Prudent and economic viable decisions need to be considered.</p>	<p>Edit to read “...and develop prudent and economically viable measures to recover losses in City revenue”</p>
<p><b>Page 13-4: Program EV-1.2C: Marin County Economic Forum.</b> ‘Business success’ definition is vague. A City’s view should be to encourage business vitality and profitability.</p>	<p>“Business success” will be replaced with “business vitality and profitability.”</p>
<p><b>Page 13-5: Program EV-1.2F: Housing Production Partnerships.</b> Add retail and commercial property owners, to explore opportunities for converting surplus inventory into housing.</p>	<p>Commercial property owners will be added to this policy</p>
<p><b>Page 13-5: Program EV-1.3B: Development Opportunities.</b> Add to this program: <i>“Inventory parcels and tracts that qualify as “Opportunity Zones” or other designations that carry preferential tax treatment for owners/developers.”</i></p>	<p>Parcels and tracts that qualify as Opportunity Zones or other designations with preferential tax treatment will be added to this program.</p>
<p><b>Page 13-5: Program EV-1.3C: Permit and Technical Assistance.</b> How will this advocacy be balanced with community input and involvement?</p>	<p>Other policies in the General Plan ensure community input and involvement, both in this Element and in others.</p>
<p><b>Page 13-6: Policy EV-1.4: Business Attraction.</b> This effort should include community input/involvement. How about a series of workshops as was done for housing and development streamlining?</p>	<p>Comment noted. This is intended only as a broad policy encouraging investment in the City. Community engagement (workshops, etc.) is strongly supported by other policies and programs in this Element.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Page 13-6: Program EV-1.4A: Industry Clusters and Supply Chains.</b> Which department is responsible for establishing and maintaining a list of these potential businesses – Chamber of Commerce?	The City’s Department of Economic Development and Innovation would be responsible, in tandem with private and non-profit partners as well as other City departments. This will be in the Implementation table.
<b>Page 13-6: Policy EV-1.5: Monitoring.</b> This effort should include community input/involvement. How about a series of workshops as was done for housing and development streamlining?	Program EV-1.2D has been edited to add “community workshops”
<b>Page 13-8: Program EV-1.9C: CCAP Implementation.</b> Require solar powered energy systems to be installed for all new construction and remodels/modifications over a certain value.	Incentives for renewable energy are included in the Conservation and Climate Change Element of the Plan, and in the CCAP itself.
<b>Page 13-11, last 2 sentences on page.</b> Comparing San Rafael to San Francisco is not a direct comparison. The last two sentences should be omitted.	The last two sentences on the page will be deleted.
<b>Page 13-12</b> (narrative on the future of retail). (The description of) long-term challenges assume what has worked in the past will work in the future. This is a false assumption especially in the retail sector. <b>The economy has shifted to convenience and price comparison with the rise of internet commerce and a shift in consumer buying behaviors.</b> There needs to be a fundamental shift in the community’s assumption on this topic.	The sentence shown in bold will be incorporated into this paragraph. The text states that retail is rapidly evolving and that underperforming centers need to be reimagined. The changing paradigms described here are acknowledged.
<b>Page 13-13 bullet point.</b> * Delete reference to Northgate as an example of where effective placemaking and greater diversity of uses can improve the long-term viability of centers, and instead refer to “all retail centers”	Comment noted. Northgate is intentionally cited because there was a good deal of community input that effective placemaking should be a part of that site’s future planning.
<b>Page 13-13: Program EV-2.2D: Day and Evening Visitors.</b> Promoting local purchasing should emphasize shopping throughout and <b>every</b> day.	Will add “throughout the week” to end of policy
<b>Page 13-16: Six Ideas for Adapting Retail.</b> Do not agree with this statement (about micro-fulfillment centers) as it mixes retail and industrial commerce.	Comment noted. This is not City policy or intended to reflect City plans. It is merely citing an article from Forbes on the subject of retail’s future.
<b>Page 13-16, Sales Tax and the City Graph.</b> The comments in the graph do not match the results presented in the graph. The comment states that Non-Retail and Food Services have been flat or slightly declined between 2010-2019. The ratios indicate that Retail and Food services represented a greater increase during this period. Retail/Food accounted for 78% of dollar transactions in 2010 and increased to 80% by 2019. The Retail/food transaction increased 38% in 9 years compared to 20% for non-Retail/Food.	The chart is based on data from the City’s Annual Financial Report. We may replace the graph with a table that shows the actual numeric data and will review the comments in the text to ensure that the discussion is accurate.

Comment	Response
<p><b>Page 13-17: Program EV-2.4A: Responding to Workplace Trends.</b>            – Analysis of occupational and workplace trends would help identify upcoming sectors where the city should focus investments on and/or areas of concern.            - Encourage stakeholders to repurpose surplus real estate inventory for higher purposes uses, such as housing.</p>	<p>Both of the comments under this policy are consistent with the direction provided by the Economic Vitality Element. Part of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy would be to evaluate occupational and workplace trends, as well as plans for repurposing surplus commercial real estate for housing. This can be added to Program EV-1.3A.</p>
<p><b>Page 13-22: Program EV-3.6A: Business/Neighbor Collaboration.</b> Insinuates that everything is a conflict. The collaboration statement needs to say .... that parties will work together for a mutual vision beneficial to the community.</p>	<p>This change will be incorporated.</p>
<p><b>Page 13-22: Program EV-3.8C: Pre-Submittal Process.</b> Delete reference to “Speed,” as it assumes short-cut or skipped steps and leads to mistrust within the community. The process would naturally accelerate if the community is involved and has input in the planning stages - rather than objecting or reacting to what is proposed. Nobody likes surprises. Ensure environmental review is not short changed and that the community and neighborhood groups receive ample notice of plan reviews and discussions.</p>	<p>The reference to “speed” in this program will be eliminated.</p>
<p>Fix typos: extra spaces in EV-1.8 “advancement”, EV 2-2.C “vendors”, EV-2.4A (missing period at end)</p>	<p>These typos will be corrected</p>
<p><b>Marin Conservation League Land Use Element Comments (submitted on Admin Draft Policies, prior to the publication of the General Plan but after completion of this Element)</b></p>	
<p><b>Page 3-17:</b> Land Use Goal LU-1: Well-Managed Growth, add <u>“Protecting environmental quality will be an objective in land use planning.”</u></p>	<p>Will add “..., protects the environment, ...” to the goal statement.</p>
<p><b>Page 3-18:</b> Land Use Policy LU-1.1: Balancing Growth with Infrastructure, edit: <u>“Plan and fund local circulation and infrastructure systems...”</u> In addition, edit last sentence: <u>“The City’s plans and capital improvement budgets should prioritize...”</u></p>	<p>These changes will be incorporated.</p>
<p><b>Page 3-18:</b> Land Use Policy LU-1.2: Edit: <u>“Allow new development only when adequate infrastructure is available or a projected need for infrastructure and services is linked with the ability to pay for them”.</u></p>	<p>The projected need (and commitment to provide) infrastructure and services is covered in clauses (b) and (c) of this policy.</p>
<p><b>General.</b> Wherever the plan refers to infrastructure, such as “Sewer, water, and other infrastructure improvements” (Policy LU-1.2c) include “stormwater” with “sewer” and “water”. GP policies and programs should manage stormwater as a resource and move the city forward in obtaining its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit coverage for stormwater discharge.</p>	<p>Stormwater will be added to 1.2(c). Later elements of the General Plan note that stormwater is a resource and support moving the City forward in NPDES permitting and compliance.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Page 3-18:</b> Land Use Policy LU-1.3: Replace “Focus future housing and office development . . . around transit stations” to “Focus future housing and office development . . . around transit stations with <u>high frequency and high capacity transit</u>”.</p>	<p>Comment noted. “Transit stations” refers only to the Downtown and Civic Center SMART stations. High-frequency bus service is noted elsewhere in the policy.</p>
<p><b>Page 3-18:</b> Policy LU-1.3: Include hyperlinks to SR’s CCAP and the Mobility Element.</p>	<p>We will look into hyperlinking cross-references once the Plan is adopted and finalized.</p>
<p><b>Page 3-19:</b> Policy LU-1.5: Include hyperlink to a list of undeveloped areas outside Urban Service Area</p>	<p>There is not a list of these areas per se, but we will explore hyperlinking to a County Map of the Urban Service Area.</p>
<p><b>Page 3-19:</b> Under <i>Land Use Program LU-1.7A</i>: assign Community Development as the City’s department charged with working with “the County and other jurisdictions to review applications from areas of interest adjacent to City limits or within the Sphere of Influence.”</p>	<p>Community Development is listed as the responsible agency in the Implementation Matrix</p>
<p><b>Page 3-20:</b> <i>Land Use Policy 1.8: Density of Residential Development</i> and <i>Policy LU-1.10: Intensity of Non-Residential Development</i> raise several questions: (1) How will “the adequacy of infrastructure” be determined? Will there be objective standards for water, sewer, and stormwater? (2) Will Level of Service (LOS) or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) determine adequacy of road, pathway and transit options? c) How does the GP anticipate state-mandated development bonuses and incorporate strategies to retain some level of local planning control? Will Objective Design and Development Standards be a tool? 4) Are there limits to the number of accessory and/or junior accessory dwelling units on one site or allowable percent of parcel coverage by development? (5) Are there off-street parking requirements especially in transit-rich areas?</p>	<p>(1) Adequacy of infrastructure is determined through the development review process based on the standards in the General Plan and the standards adopted by individual service providers. (2) LOS and VMT standards in the General Plan are intended for vehicle operations; other metrics may be developed for paths and transit; (3) State-mandated bonuses are considered in the planning, development, and environmental review processes, and are codified in the Municipal Code. Objective design standards are currently being developed; (4) The total number of ADUs and JADUs allowed on a single site is limited to two, as required by state law; there are no specific ADU lot coverage standards; (5) Under State law, the City may not require parking for ADUs in transit-rich areas.</p>
<p><b>Page 3-20:</b> Add hyperlinks in Policy LU 1.8 and Program LU-1.8A to where various terms are defined.</p>	<p>Hyperlinks can be added after Plan adoption, if staff resources allow</p>
<p><b>Page 3-20:</b> Land Use Policy LU-1.9: Add to end of paragraph: “<i>Encourage wildlife corridors and habitat preservation in areas where adjacent properties share environmentally sensitive areas</i>”</p>	<p>Policy C-1.11 on wildlife corridors is being expanded to address this comment and a similar comment from another commenter.</p>
<p><b>Page 3-24:</b> Regarding the height bonus policy, it seems the City would want to limit height bonuses in General Plan 2040 and use other incentives or planning tools where additive city and state height bonuses would not allow an area to keep within character of existing structures or align with designated land uses since the State is creating its own mandated bonuses. Include language protecting views, privacy, and solar access of existing buildings and uses both here and in <i>Policy LU-3.2</i>.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with this comment. For this reason, the text explicitly states that state and local bonuses are not additive, and that only one bonus program may be used for a given development. The Downtown Precise Plan likewise includes explicit prohibitions against “double dipping.” The requested guidance for Policy LU-3.2 is included in the Community Design and Preservation Element (Policy CDP-1.5 and elsewhere) and throughout the Neighborhoods Element.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>Page 3-29: Policy LU-2.6 Lot consolidation. Make sure this policy does not disincentivize retaining unique individual buildings on small lots. San Rafael would benefit from a mix with opportunities for local builders and small developers to rehabilitate and redevelop buildings that add character to downtown and to neighborhoods.</p>	<p>This point will be added to Program LU-2.6A, which implements Policy LU-2.6</p>
<p>P 3-33: Add to Policy LU-1.8 and through new bullet in <i>Policy LU-3.2: New Development in Residential Neighborhoods</i>, add "Limit impacts to views, privacy and solar access of neighboring properties."</p>	<p>The last bullet in the sequence in Policy LU-3.2 states "Minimize reduction of views, privacy, and solar access"</p>
<p><b>Comments from Brian Walsh, WENA. Received January 5, 2021</b></p>	
<p>Please include the following text box in the West End Neighborhood Profile in Chapter 4 (Neighborhoods Element) of General Plan 2040:          "The West End Neighborhood Association (WENA) invited recommendations from the West End residents, input from the WENA board and collaboration with other San Rafael neighborhood associations. The following list incorporates these recommendations:          1. Family oriented stores located on the Miracle Mile and West End Village.          2. Maintain level and unobstructed sidewalks throughout the West End.          3. Limits to hillside homes, particularly South facing, to mitigate erosion, landslide prevention, native tree removal, and strict height limitations.          4. Maintaining unobstructed pedestrian access to fire roads and trails for residents to freely enjoy.          5. Completion of the trail connecting 5th Avenue and Tamal Vista Drive designated on city maps and in concert with recommendations from the Sun Valley circulation concept.          6. Monitor and discourage homeless encampments particularly on Forbes Hill reservoir.          7. Maintain and improve bicycle access along Greenfield Avenue as the East-West bicycle corridor.          8. Establish underground power lines and fiber optic internet.          9. Rebuild a non-sound reflective wall on the South side of the Miracle Mile.          10. Maintain a proactive neighborhood association."</p>	<p>A text box will be added to the West End neighborhood section listing these priorities, similar to what has been provided for Sun Valley.</p>
<p><b>Comments from Shirley Fischer and Kim Keith Brown on behalf of TLHOA Community Development Committee, Received January 5, 2021</b></p>	
<p>P 4-58, please add to the description of Terra Linda:  <i>"Joseph Eichler and his family company were also pioneers in opposing racial housing discrimination that was common in the mid-twentieth century. In addition to insisting on inclusionary practices in his own company, Eichler advocated at the state and national levels against redlining and racial discrimination in housing policy."</i></p>	<p>This content will be added to the Neighborhoods Element</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Element.</b> Please consider adding a text box to this chapter to emphasize the historic anti-discrimination role played by Joseph Eichler in the development of North San Rafael, including opposing redlining and advocating for State and federal fair housing laws (TLHOA provided the suggested content for a text box on this topic).</p>	<p>Staff followed up with TLHOA and will be placing this text box in the Housing Element, to be updated in 2021-2022. The Housing Element requires the City to demonstrate that it is “Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing” and this provides good context for that discussion.</p>
<p><b>Comments from Brian Walsh and Victoria DeWitt, WENA. Received February 10, 2021</b></p>	
<p>Brian Walsh, representing the West Neighborhood Association, submitted a statement of support for the revised narrative description of the West End Neighborhood prepared by Victoria DeWitt that had been submitted on December 15, 2020.</p>	<p>Most of the replacement narrative will be incorporated as provided. See response to earlier comments from Victoria DeWitt.</p>
<p><b>Letter from Kaiser Permanente. Received March 5, 2021</b></p>	
<p>Kaiser Permanente submitted a letter indicating their commitment to San Rafael. Their letter acknowledges the importance of continued investment in their San Rafael real estate and assets, and their intent to be mindful of General Plan goals and policies as their plans are developed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>