

Item 7-B Public Comment D. Freeman

From: Dorothy Freeman <dfreeman@pacbell.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 26, 2017 7:14 PM
To: NANCY McPeak
Subject: Planning Board Agenda Item 7-B on March 27, 2017

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

March 26, 2017

Planning Board Members
City Of Alameda
Agenda Item 7-B on March 27, 2017

Dear Planning Board Members,

Some issues I believe need to be addressed for the Encinal Terminals project are:

1. Request for a 14 story building: Presently the height for buildings in Alameda is 5-6 stories. Approval of this request by Tim Lewis Communities will set a precedent for Alameda and will allow any future developer to be able to also build up to 14 stories. Once that genie is out of the bottle, it cannot be put back in. All building heights should be limited to what is existing within the City already.

2. Request for 589 units: The addition of 589 units in an area of Alameda that is experiencing rapid growth will overwhelm the city's local streets as well as the tube and all bridges. The addition of AC Transit bus 19 on Buena Vista actually adds to the traffic problem as a street with bus traffic actually slows down.

3. Traffic: Over 1000 additional units between Marina Shores, Del Monte and Encinal Terminals will add 2500 more in population to this immediate area. Most new tenants will use cars even with the plans for other means of transport.

3. Clement Ave is not yet approved at Pennzoil: The fact that the completion of Clement Ave through to Sherman Street is not yet approved limits the planned mitigations for traffic. The Clement Ave connection through Pennzoil would complete the bike path on planned on Clement. Without the cut through Pennzoil the bike path cannot be completed. The Pennzoil connection will also be necessary to remove trucks from Buena Vista between Sherman and Grand Street.

4. Three acre park: A three acre park is not enough for the added population even if Little John and Jean Sweeney Parks are nearby. Twenty five hundred more people without back yards need more outside public space to play in.

5. Moving the Tide Land Trust lands to surround the development is meaningless. BCDC requirements would provide for water front access without the need to move the Tide Lands. The 6 acres of Tide Lands should be used as a water front park and for water related businesses. It appears that by moving the Tide Lands, the developer

Item 7-B Public Comment D. Freeman

actually has to provide less open space than would be required otherwise.

Respectfully

Dorothy Freeman

From: [IRMA Glidden](#)
To: [NANCY McPeak](#); [ERIN GARCIA](#)
Subject: FW: Encinal Terminals development
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 11:52:52 AM

Hello,

Just forwarding this to you, I don't know if you were CC'd separately.

Thanks!

Irma

From: Josh Geyer [mailto:joshm.geyer@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 4:22 PM
To: Kristoffer Koster <KKoster@alamedaca.gov>; David Burton <DBurton@alamedaca.gov>; Ronald Curtis <rcurtis@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>; David Mitchell <DMitchell@alamedaca.gov>; Sandy Sullivan <SSullivan@alamedaca.gov>; Lorre Zuppan <LZuppan@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Encinal Terminals development

Alameda Planning Board,

Greetings. I am an Alameda resident and homeowner and I am writing today in support of the new proposed development at Encinal Terminals. This space is a huge untapped resource both for Alamedans and the East Bay at large. In combination with the upcoming the Brooklyn Basin development across the estuary, this new development would contribute to a much-needed densification in the well-located and transit-rich inner East Bay.

I will spare you going into the familiar and deplorable history of exclusionary zoning and development practices that Alameda shares with almost every other municipality in the country, but I will say that we--the fortunate ones who get to live in beautiful, friendly, walkable, bikeable Alameda--are in no way entitled to this bounty, and those who are excluded due to insufficient housing supply are similarly undeserving of that fate. Alameda has of late taken moral leadership by voting to impeach President Trump and declaring itself a sanctuary city. In my view, moving forward with this much-needed development--in light of sky-high housing-cost burdens and decades of anti-development, exclusionary sentiment here and elsewhere in the Bay Area--is itself a real and commendable act of moral leadership.

Please make every effort to approve this development as expeditiously as possible.

Thank you,
Josh Geyer

Alameda Traffic and Additional Building Proposals P Moris

From: debbie jennings <debbiejennings@att.net>
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2017 7:54 AM
To: NANCY McPeak
Subject: Alameda Traffic and Additional Building Proposals

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

How can the Planning board even "think" of entertaining a 14 story High Rise building in Alameda! Your decisions to build out the WEST end with housing has already created a nightmare getting into and out of Alameda.

Before any further building is considered, there needs to be a new bridge to get out of the city, not only at the WEST end but the EAST end as well. Have you driving in morning traffic or evening traffic, in and out of Alameda? If not, try it sometime, let me know how you feel when it takes you 25 to 30 minutes to go just a mile from the foot of Webster into Oakland. It is crazy that someone has to leave 1 hour or even more to get to a 20 minute location.

Lets talk about the first Sunday of the month, have you made the attempt anytime during late morning and all afternoon to get out of Alameda, actually this should be punishable by law, to create such a disastrous situation for the residents of Alameda. You cannot even get to the new shopping center the traffic is so bad.

Who authorizes the projects to move forward with little to no consideration of the current residents and traffic. I know, everyone down there thinks, add buses, not going to solve the problem.

STOP BUILDING, I know the greed is all there, everyone only thinks about MONEY, MONEY, at what point do you get beyond that, live within the means. The roads are a mess. I have complained about my street for several years. At the point, I plan to take pictures and send to Washington, federal dollars are not fixing my street. GRAND area, East end, etc, I think has priority.

Debbie

FW CA Public Record Request E. Thompson

From: LARA WEISIGER
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 11:28 AM
To: NANCY McPeak; ERIN GARCIA
Subject: FW: CA Public Record Request

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,
Can your department please respond to this request?
Thanks,
Lara

From: Eugenie [mailto:eugenie@islandalameda.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2017 2:48 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER <LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: CA Public Record Request

Hello Lara
Please provide for my inspection all the records associated with the Encinal Terminals Draft EIR's Traffic findings.

These records should include those traffic models etc and other public records associated with the Northern Waterfront GPA 's EIR upon which the Encinal Terminals DEIR is relying upon. It also appears, the traffic volume (forecast) data the Encinal Terminal DEIR is using comes from the Alameda Point EIR's Traffic Model and other records. These too i would like to review.

The records should include all correspondence also with Planning Board members etc.

I am unable to comment on the DEIR as the records are not complete. Very similar to the problems encountered with the Alameda Point EIR.

\
Thank you kindly,
if you have any questions, feel to contact me at 510 928 6980.
Eugenie

p.s. please use my new email eugenie@shasta-daisy.com

FW FOURTEEN STORY RESIDENTIAL TOWER E. Olson

From: LARA WEISIGER
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 11:31 AM
To: NANCY McPeak; ERIN GARCIA
Subject: FW: FOURTEEN STORY RESIDENTIAL TOWER

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Sorry, I was out of the office, so I am not sure if you ever got this email.

From: Emily Olson [mailto:ejwoollett@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 8:59 PM
To: LARA WEISIGER <LWEISIGER@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: FOURTEEN STORY RESIDENTIAL TOWER

To: L. Weisiger, City Clerk
City of Alameda

Please attach this email to the EIR for the Fourteen Story Residential Tower. Thank you!
Emily Olson

Subject: FOURTEEN STORY RESIDENTIAL TOWER

The Tim Lewis development proposed for the Encinal Terminal to have 589 units in a 14 story tower is absolutely unacceptable to those of us living in the area and will negatively impact all Alamedans. Adding over 1000 persons and possibly as many vehicles to the already congested streets, mainly Bueva Vista, Sherman, Atlantic, Independence, Marina Village Parkway, and Webster Street leading to and from the Webster and Posey Tubes and the bridges is unconscionable. Already it is daunting to wait up to 30 minutes to an hour in bumper to bumper traffic to leave the island for the 880 freeway. This project will choke our traffic and overwhelm our streets and parking along arterial streets even more than they are now. The theoretical and unproven TDM to resolve traffic issues in the draft EIR suggesting bus passes and a small transit ferry system is unrealistic in solving a traffic problem of this magnitude. Adding thousands more people along the Northern Waterfront will preclude leaving the island during a disaster or emergency and will cause property values to decrease dramatically not to mention the resulting increase in air pollution, sewer and water usage.

Local neighborhood streets will be impacted for parking as there is not enough parking included in the plan. The provision for one 3 acre park is insufficient given the size and economics of this project and the additional projects along the Northern waterfront. Calling narrow walkways/ bike lanes "parks" is also unrealistic. Approval of this project is unconscionable.

We are overwhelmingly opposed to this plan.

Emily and Charles Olson chasolson@aol.com ejwoollett@aol.com
3 Redondo Court
Alameda, CA 94501

FW FOURTEEN STORY RESIDENTIAL TOWER E. Olson

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

proposed 14 story building

From: PatrickM <thetipplingtoad@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 12:10 PM
To: NANCY McPeak
Subject: proposed 14 story building

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

Please list me as another Alameda opposed to the 14 story building proposed for the Encinal Terminal site. Once you let one building of this height in, others are going to follow, forever changing the community. In addition there are inadequate plans for the increased traffic. It can take me over a half an hour to leave the island during busy times. It's only one mile down Park St.

Before adding more residences to the city, address the issue of transportation.

Thank You,

Patrick Moris

Re 14 story high-rise at Encinal Terminals P. Paul

From: Patsy Paul <patsypaul@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 12:29 PM
To: NANCY McPeak
Subject: Re: 14 story high-rise at Encinal Terminals

Dearest Alameda Planning Board,

Do we really want 14 story buildings in our city?

Tim Lewis Communities is asking for approval of this development as well as 589 new housing units at Encinal Terminals in the north central portion of Alameda. Do we really think this plan will not impact traffic?

Are developer-density-bonus-high-rises the only way to provide money for very low and low housing and affordable and moderate housing mandated by the state? What are the state requirements and how close are we to meeting them?

This proposal is to provide only for 55 and older to have 25 very low income units and 20 low income units. It will also provide for 34 affordable to moderate income units. What are the cost and qualifications for very low, low, affordable and moderate housing? A combination of 510 units and houses will be market rate.

Is this proposed 14 story high-rise another example, unfortunately like so much of our country, of us verses them?

Please Planning Board we do not want 14 story high-rises rising, or bye to our Alameda as we know it and hello to Honolulu #2.

Sincerely,
Patsy Paul
2426 Buena Vista Ave.
(510) 523 - 4205