

Nancy McPeak

From: Cyndy Johnsen <cyndy@bikewalkalameda.org>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 4:55 PM
To: Xiomara Cisneros; Ronald Curtis; Hanson Hom; Diana Ariza; Teresa Ruiz; Alan Teague; Asheshh Saheba; Andrew Thomas
Cc: Nancy McPeak; BWA Board
Subject: [EXTERNAL] BWA Comment for Item 7E, 9/12/22 PB Meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

RE: Item 7E: Public Workshop to Review and Give Direction for the West Midway/RESHAP Project at Alameda Point

Dear Planning Board Members and Staff,

I wanted to offer a few quick comments on item 7E on behalf of Bike Walk Alameda.

First, on page 22 ("Street Sections"), standard bike lanes are proposed along Main Street. Per our [Draft Active Transportation map](#) these should be protected. In general, since the adoption of our Mobility Element, which calls for protected bike lanes over standard bike lanes unless infeasible (Actions B and G in ME-6, and ME14), we're expecting to rarely -- if ever -- see standard bike lanes appearing in plans. When they do, we hope they will be flagged for a closer look to make sure they are, in fact, the only option feasible.

Secondly, if this is the time to consider improving the intersection of Main Street and Willie Stargell with a modern roundabout, we hope you will give that direction, as it ranked highly in [the evaluation](#) earlier this year.

Finally, if it's possible to have sidewalks wider than 5' (as spec'd on pg 27, for example), that would make for more comfortable, social walking, and be consistent with many other sidewalks in Alameda.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Regards,

Cyndy Johnsen
Bike Walk Alameda Board Member

Nancy McPeak

From: Drew Dara-Abrams <dda@dara-abrams.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 10:42 AM
To: Nancy McPeak
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Development Plan for the West Midway/RESHAP Project

Ms. McPeak,

Would you add to the upcoming PB packet for Item 7-E and share with PB members and relevant staff?

Thank you,
Drew Dara-Abrams

--

Dear Planning board members and Planning staff,

I've previously shared some feedback about the number of townhouse-style units proposed at Site A. Based on my skim of the developer's latest submission, I believe these concerns are unfortunately still relevant for the proposed mix of units in the market-rate portion of the project. I would like to reiterate them for your consideration, as well as add some more feedback on other aspects of the proposed plans.

Too many townhouse-style units

It's unfortunate to see the developer proposing so many townhouse-style units at Site A, given that:

- Townhouses often dedicate their ground floor to individual parking garages. This increases the total number of on-site parking spots (often to 2.0 parking spots per dwelling unit), undermining the city's goals to make as efficient as possible the provision of off-street parking. This is true on a per-unit basis, even if the stacked flats elsewhere in the development may decrease the total average to 1.5 parking spots per unit.
- A ground floor of individual parking garages also necessitates poor design at the neighborhood scale. It's apparent even in the rough site plans that show many access roads dedicated solely to getting a handful of residents to and from their garages by car. These will not be "active" facades with stoops or sidewalks -- just driveways. It's also even more paved surface that needs to be drained of stormwater.
- Townhouses, usually of 3 stories, cannot be effectively designed to meet universal accessibility design standards, and so are not relevant to the many seniors looking to "down size" or "age in place" in Alameda. While it's great that the developer is making 49% of units meet universal design requirements and 80% of the units "visitable," I would be curious to learn more about what constraints or conflicting goals are preventing them from increasing these percentages further.

Please work with the developer to consider more advantageous design approaches such as:

- Replacing all in-unit parking with centralized structured parking (to allow different numbers of parking spots to be attached to each housing unit and/or to unbundle the sale of parking from dwelling, to let households decide as they each see fit)
- Replacing more or all townhouses with stacked flats (which have already been produced successfully at Site A and are proposed for the RESHAP portion of this site)

- Minimizing access roads, driveways, and curb-cuts throughout the entire site.

With strategies like this, Site A can better contribute toward the housing units needed in Alameda and can be designed for a great experience at ground level for many years to come.

Cycling facilities

The street sections on p. 22 show bike lanes on Main Street that are not protected from motorists. Main Street is a straight-away on which motorists can and do speed dangerously. It's also an important corridor for moving north/south by all modes. I'm not sure how responsibility for street improvements are shared between the developers and the city, but I urge all involved to plan for protected cycle tracks along Main Street and all other arterials at Alameda Point. Class II bike lanes that are only protected by paint are not sufficient today, let alone for the future of a denser and busier Alameda Point.

Modern roundabout

In May, city staff ranked the intersection at Main Street and Willie Stargell/Midway as the most important intersection in the city to be redesigned with a modern roundabout (tied with Atlantic/Main Street). City staff did not nominate to submit this intersection for county/state funding, perhaps with the intention to use the further development of Site A to cover the rebuilding of that intersection instead.

I do not see any mention of a modern roundabout for Main/Stargell/Midway when skimming these draft development plans. Will the developer contribute in some capacity to improving the safety of that intersection?

Thank you for your time,
Drew Dara-Abrams
Calhoun St