

From: [Tom Antholzner](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Zoning amendments
Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 3:20:30 PM

I Tom Antholzner;+ wife Nancy Manos; homeowners in Alameda for 27 years! Are totally OPPOSED !!! ; to ANY Changes in regards to the height or the Space ratios; in the new proposal! NO NEW ZONING AMENDMENTS. !! Most sincerely!!

Tom and Nancy

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Patsy Paul](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: May 3, 2022 City Council Agenda Item 6-B (Housing Element)
Date: Monday, May 2, 2022 11:28:54 PM

Dear Staff Member,

I am a home owner one block behind the Marketplace on Park Street, in a green house on the corner of Foley Street at 2426 Buena Vista Ave. In regard to building height limits and density bonuses consider we who live here in our historic homes.

The feeling we have living where we see buildings built many years ago with pleasing architectural details. We do not want to be overpowered by box-shaped, rectangular, six story apartment buildings with eyes through windows looking down upon us. Nor do we want to live where we are crowded, overrun with many people living too close for comfort.

Adjacent Dwelling Units behind our current homes will provide additional housing. Like the two built behind the house across the street from our home. And nearby 2615 Eagle Ave. will provide 40 to 50 affordable rental homes.

Please council members imagine yourself living here. Keep the existing 2000 ft. lot area density. Retain the existing height limits. Continue the public hearing until after May 9. Be careful what you allow now. We all don't want to suffer tomorrow for poor current decisions made today.

Thank you for your consideration.

Patricia M. Paul
2426 Buena Vista Ave.
Alameda 94501
(510) 523-4205

From: mcgavin_ted@comcast.net
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [John Knox White](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting of 05/03/2022 - Agenda Item 6-B (Housing Element Update)
Date: Monday, May 2, 2022 8:13:09 PM

Dear Mayor Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Vella, and Councilmembers Herrera Spencer, Daysog, and Knox White:

I am a longtime Alameda resident and voter.

I am commenting on the draft Housing Element of Alameda's General Plan released on 04/04/2022. I understand that the public is allowed to comment on the Element until 05/09/2022, the Historical Advisory Board will review the Element on 05/05/2022, and the Planning Board will consider the Element again on 05/09/2022.

Therefore, it seems to me that the City Council should continue the public hearing to a date after 05/09/2022, since that would allow ALL the public input to be considered (not just that through 05/03/2022), the inputs from the Historical Advisory Board (05/05/2022) to be considered, and the inputs from the Planning Board (05/09/2022) to be considered. The Housing Element will be an important part of Alameda's future, so it is only fair to make sure all voices are heard.

Turning to the draft Housing Element itself, I fully support the recommendations of the Alameda Architectural Preservation Society. Further, I think it is important to remember that Alameda's RHNA responsibility is 5,353 units, no more, no less. There has been some talk that Alameda should plan for way more than 5,353 units (possibly to curry favor with Sacramento?). This is short-sighted, in my opinion, because the actual Census numbers show California is LOSING population, for the first time. In fact, California has already lost enough people to LOSE a Congressional seat!

So exceeding the 5,353 limit is not a good idea, in my opinion. But the current draft Housing Element, however, allows for MANY more units. While developers and their friends would be delighted by all those extra units, many current Alameda residents would not be, since the infrastructure (the grid, water, sewers, and the roads) would be stressed by all the extra people and the architectural integrity of many neighborhoods would be disrupted, lowering property values.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ted McGavin

mcgavin_ted@comcast.net

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: RE: RHNA
Date: Monday, May 2, 2022 2:21:51 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Andrew Thomas <athomas@alamedaca.gov>
Date: May 2, 2022 6:46 AM
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RHNA
To: jane peal <janepeal@sonic.net>
Cc: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>, Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>, John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>, Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>, Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>, Allen Tai <ATai@alamedaca.gov>, Gerry Beaudin <gbeaudin@alamedaca.gov>

Dear Ms. Peal,

Thk you for your email regarding the RHNA.

Under Stte Housing Law, the City Council cannot approve a Housing Element, until it has sent it to HCD for their review, and the City Council will not know whether or not the zoning changes are adequae, until it sends it to HCD for review. You should also be aware tht the draft Housing Element tht stff is proposing to send to HCD for their review:

- Does not propose raising height limits in any residential neighborhoods.
- Does propose raising height limits on Webster street from 3 stories to 5 stories. Park Street already allows 5 stories on Park Street and 4 stories on the side streets. The draft Housing Element raises the height limit on the side streets next to Park Street to 5 stories.
- Does propose eliminaing Alameda regulaions tht the Stte has already stted in writing are inconsistent with Stte Fair Housing Law and unenforceable.

Stff thinks tht the draft Housing Element does a good job of addressing Stte Housing Law requirements and local Alameda priorities, but we will not know tht for sure, until we send it to HCD for their review. Once HCD reviews it, the Planning Board and the Historical Advisory Board

will have an opportunity to make recommendaions to the City Council before the Council makes a final decision.

Sincerely,

-Andrew Thomas, Planning Director

From: jane peal [mailto:janepeal@sonic.net]
Sent: Saurday, April 30, 2022 12:12 PM
To: Andrew Thomas <ahomas@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RHN

I am again writing to urge you to:

1. **Delete the massive, indiscriminae and unnecessary residential upzonings;**
2. **Limit the height in the historic parts of Park and Webster Streets to 40 feet; and**
3. **Continue the public hearing to a dae after May 9, so tht the Council can consider public comments received by the May 9 deadline as well as comments from the Historical Advisory Board's May 5 meeting and the Planning Board's May 9 meeting and approve the final draft Housing Element before it is submitted to HCD.**

Thk you for your attention, Jane Peal

Jane Peal, MF Integral Counseling for Individuals,
Couples, & Adult Adoptees
Alameda Office
<http://www.janepeal.com>

jane@janepeal.com

415.902.5761

Notice of Confidentiality: This email, and any attachments, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) and may contain privileged or confidential information. Any distribution, reading, copying or use of this communication and any attachments by anyone other than the addressee, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify me by email (by replying to this message), and permanently destroy or delete the original and any copies or printouts of this email and any attachments.

From: [Steve Gorman](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Cc: [Edie O'Hara](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please save our residential neighborhoods
Date: Saturday, April 30, 2022 12:48:56 PM

Dear City Clerk Weisiger,

I have been following this issue and have filled out the survey at cityofalameda.ca.abalancingact.com and made my preferences known there. Thank you for that survey. It appears to me and many others that there is enough space at existing sites in Alameda without upzoning and forever changing the residential neighborhoods that Alamedans treasure, and that this city is famous for. With all of the existing sites available, why change the character of Alameda's unique neighborhoods by cramming in all kinds of non-complementary and intrusive construction and even destroying historic homes in order to build multi-unit buildings? If this were to happen at all, it should be the absolute last resort, not something to be considered at this stage when there is so much fine land available for building. A couple of points:

1. THERE IS NO LEGAL OR POLICY JUSTIFICATION FOR THE UPZONING OF OUR R —2 THRU R-6 RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS. 2. Please APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT BEFORE IT IS SUBMITTED TO HCD.

Here is a list of available areas for building with no need to touch most of the residential areas:

#1 Alameda Point: Option 1: 1.5k housing units **#2** North Housing: Option 1: 586 housing units **#3** Harbor Bay Shopping Center: Option 2: 400 housing units **#4** College of Alameda: 200 housing units **#5** Harbor Bay Golf Course: 200 housing units **#6** Harbor Bay Business Park: Option 2: 400 housing units **#7** Alameda Landing Shopping Center: 200 housing units **#8** Neptune Park: 200 housing units **#9** Encinal Terminals: 589 housing units **#10** Alameda Marina: Option 2: 500 housing units **#11** Grand Street: 90 housing units **#12** AUSD Surplus Lands: 120 housing units **#13** 2199 Clement: Option 2: 200 housing units **#14** Boatworks: 182 housing units **#15** 2615 Eagle Street: Option 2: 50 housing units **#16** Alameda Wellness Campus: 100 housing units **#17** Admirals Cove: 190 housing units **#18** Habitat for Humanity: Option 2: 100 housing units **#19** Park Street: Option 2: 300 housing units **#20** Jean Sweeney Park: 200 housing units **#21** Webster Street: Option 2: 300 housing units

Thank you so much for your attention to this. Future generations will thank you for balancing growth with preserving what makes Alameda a wonderful place to live. A balanced approach is all I'm asking for.

-Steven Gorman

Alameda, CA

From: [jane.peal](#)
To: [Andrew.Thomas](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RHNA
Date: Saturday, April 30, 2022 12:11:59 PM

I am again writing to urge you to:

- 1. Delete the massive, indiscriminate and unnecessary residential upzonings;**
- 2. Limit the height in the historic parts of Park and Webster Streets to 40 feet; and**
- 3. Continue the public hearing to a date after May 9, so that the Council can consider public comments received by the May 9 deadline as well as comments from the Historical Advisory Board's May 5 meeting and the Planning Board's May 9 meeting and approve the final draft Housing Element before it is submitted to HCD.**

Thank you for your attention, Jane Peal

Jane Peal, MFT
Integral Counseling for Individuals,
Couples, & Adult Adoptees
Alameda Office
<http://www.janepeal.com>
jane@janepeal.com
415.902.5761

Notice of Confidentiality: This email, and any attachments, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) and may contain privileged or confidential information. Any distribution, reading, copying or use of this communication and any attachments by anyone other than the addressee, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify me by email (by replying to this message), and permanently destroy or delete the original and any copies or printouts of this email and any attachments.

From: [Trish Spencer](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Letter re. Alameda's 6th Cycle Housing Element
Date: Wednesday, April 27, 2022 11:09:24 PM
Attachments: [We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)
[Alameda Housing Element letter - YIMBY Law, Greenbelt Alliance.pdf](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Sidharth Kapur <sidharthkapur1@gmail.com>
Date: Apr 24, 2022 8:38 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Letter re. Alameda's 6th Cycle Housing Element
To: CityCouncil-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov,Rafa Sonnenfeld <rafa@yimbylaw.org>,Zoe Siegel <zsiegel@greenbelt.org>

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

Dear Alameda City Council:

Please see the attached letter from YIMBY Law and Greenbelt Alliance regarding Alameda's 6th cycle Housing Element.

The PDF should be correctly attached now.

Best,
Sid Kapur
sidharthkapur1@gmail.com
(469) 487-9648



April 21, 2022

Dear Alameda City Council:

We are writing on behalf of **YIMBY Law** and **Greenbelt Alliance** regarding Alameda's 6th Cycle Housing Element Update. **YIMBY Law** is a legal nonprofit working to make housing in California more accessible and affordable through enforcement of state law. **Greenbelt Alliance** is an environmental nonprofit working to ensure that the Bay Area's lands and communities are resilient to a changing climate.

We are writing to remind you of Alameda's obligation to include sufficient sites in your upcoming Housing Element to accommodate your Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of **5,353 units**.

In the Annual Progress Reports that Alameda submitted to HCD, we observe the following trend of housing units permitted in the last four years:

Year	Housing units permitted
2018	181
2019	681
2020	298
2021	605
Average, 2018-2021	441

To meet the 6th cycle RHNA target, the rate of new housing permits in Alameda would need to increase from **441 units per year** in 2018-2021 to **669 units per year** in the next 8 years. This is a 52% increase from recent years. **If the current pace were to continue, Alameda would meet only 66% of its new housing target.**

Based on these trends, it is unlikely that Alameda's existing realistic zoning capacity is sufficient to meet its 6th cycle RHNA target. According to HCD's Housing Element Site Inventory Guidebook, housing elements must analyze the realistic capacity of their sites, which may include considerations of "[l]ocal or regional track records", "past production trends", and "the rate at which similar parcels were developed during the previous planning period". A housing element that does not include a significant rezoning component is therefore unlikely to be compliant with state law.

We urge Alameda to include a major rezoning component in its Housing Element—a rezoning large enough to close the gap between recent housing production trends and the RHNA target. The rezoning should be within existing communities and should comply with the city's obligation to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing. We also urge Alameda to ease any other constraints, such as discretionary approval processes or impact fees, that may impede the rate of development on your city's housing sites.

Thank you,

Sid Kapur, East Bay YIMBY (sidharthkapur1@gmail.com)

Rafa Sonnenfeld, YIMBY Law (rafa@yimbylaw.org)

Zoe Siegel, Greenbelt Alliance (zsiegel@greenbelt.org)