

To design & review board,

From Diane & Thomas mills on 1826

Bay street in Alameda

1. Since 2006 we have not been able to open our windows on the side 1822 Bay street. The reason being asbestos & fecal matter from rats & raccoons.
2. On 1822's deck was about 2-600 pounds of raccoon fecal matter. The right wall collapsed on to our property. Damaging our property. The mess was never cleaned up.
3. In between the two houses woods, pipes, asbestos laying. All the piping is on 1822's side. There's no drainage on 1822's side so when it rains it floods our property.
4. we never was able to paint in our backyard because 1822 never gave us permission to go on her property, plus they bushes stood in our way.

5. Because of 1822^s neglect, we were forced to pay for repairs, because of flooding.
6. we are forced to redo our back deck. Because the wall fell on our foundation and stairs.
7. If you allow 1822 to put in 4 units, our lives will become miserable. parking would also be too much challenge.

Thank You
Tom and Doreen Mills

P.S. Where are you going to house us during construction. I'm already disabled my wife has Asthma, we would have to be put up in a hotel of our choice

Linda Barrera

From: Sailing <baysailingjames@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 12:54 PM
To: Linda Barrera
Subject: Re: Update

Thanks for the update. FYI. The property owner has sent documents to all of us saying his intentions are to bring this home back to its original grandeur. As such, a nice wood exterior, ornate trim and a 1910 look should be in the design as that is what he promised the neighborhood.

Regards.

James.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 10, 2017, at 11:38 AM, Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

>

> Hi James,

>

> I am still working on the design review. I am working with the architect and property owner to refine the project. As such, the City has not sent out the public notice for this project yet because the design review has not been finalized.

>

> Best,

>

> Linda Barrera

> Planner I

> City of Alameda, Permit Center

> (510) 747-6870

> LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Sailing [mailto:baysailingjames@gmail.com]

> Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 9:31 AM

> To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>

> Subject: Update

>

> Hi.

>

> I met with you about 6 weeks ago concerning the property at 1822 Bay Street. You indicated that you would be sending out information to neighboring properties, but as of now, nothing has arrived.

>

> Could you update me please?

>

> Thanks.

>

> James.

>

> Sent from my iPhone

Linda Barrera

From: Linda Barrera
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 11:04 AM
To: 'Sailing'
Subject: RE: 1822 Bay

Hello James,

The applicant removed that bit of siding under a valid investigative interior demo permit per my direction. The applicant has been diligently working with the planning department to restore the home. At this point the architect is working on some additional revisions. When the project is deemed complete, the neighborhood around 100' of the property will receive a notice.

Best,

Linda Barrera
Planner I
City of Alameda, Permit Center
(510) 747-6870
LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Sailing [mailto:baysailingjames@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 09, 2017 4:00 PM
To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: 1822 Bay

Hi Linda.

Just noticed with the removal of shingles that there is nice architectural designs underneath. Hoping that the plan includes keeping the original wood facade and ornate woodwork.

How is the planning going as several neighbors have inquired?

Regards.

James.

Linda Barrera

From: Linda Barrera
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 5:34 PM
To: 'Denyse'
Cc: Jon Randell
Subject: RE: Neighbor feedback on PLN17-0274

Denyse,

The Parking Section of the Municipal Code below outlines when parking requirements come into play for a project. I did not work on your project so I am not familiar with the details. However, I can tell you that the design review at 1822 Bay does not trigger off-street parking requirements.

The appeal process requires that you file a formal appeal application in the Permit Center with the Planning Division with a statement indicating the reason or justification for the appeal. The fee for an appeal of a multi-family residential project is \$2,850 which is due at the time you file the application (this fee is established by your elected officials in the City Council). The appeal period ends on September 28, 2017. The appeal application can be found on the City's website.

- **30-7.2 - Accessory Parking Spaces Required.**

-

- Accessory off-street parking spaces (including access driveways) shall be provided in accordance with the schedule in subsection [30-7.6](#) and in conformance with other provisions of this article as a condition precedent to the occupancy of:

- a. New buildings;
- b. New dwelling units;
- c. Any expansion of existing nonresidential buildings, which in any ten-year period would either (i) be more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the existing gross floor area, (ii) require five (5) or more additional parking spaces as determined by the provisions of subsections [30-7.5](#), [30-7.6](#), or (iii) remove any existing on-site parking spaces required by this article.
- d. Any change in use requiring a conditional use permit. When making a finding for the approval of a use permit for a use in an existing building, the Planning Board may require that additional newly created parking be provided on- or off-site or that measures be imposed to reduce parking demand in accordance with subsection [30-7.13](#). Any additional parking proposed in the public right-of-way shall be subject to the review of the Public Works Director.
- e. When changes of use or building expansions require additional parking, the total amount of parking required for the site shall be reduced by the amount of parking required by subsections [30-7.5](#) and [30-7.6](#), but legally not previously provided, for the prior use.
- f. *Dwelling Unit Additions.* Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection 30-20.4a, when a dwelling unit is enlarged on a property that is not in compliance with the minimum required parking, an additional parking space shall be added for each seven hundred fifty (750) square feet of added floor area until compliance is achieved. An existing driveway may be considered as up to three (3) parking spaces in tandem serving a single dwelling unit or a primary dwelling and a second unit if the proposed space(s) conform to the requirements of subsections [30-7.8](#), and [30-7.9](#). Conformance with subsection 30-7.10a is not required.

Linda Barrera

Planner II
City of Alameda, Permit Center
(510) 747-6870
LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

From: Denyse [mailto:denyse@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 3:42 PM
To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Jon Randell <larryone@earthlink.net>
Subject: Re: Neighbor feedback on PLN17-0274

Hi Linda,

Thanks for the response. I'm confused about a few points though.

1) My renovation was not to ADD 1300 square feet. It was 1300 sq feet in total. I only added 60 sq' feet with my renovation, but still had to provide for 3 off-street parking spaces. I'm not sure why this property is exempt.

2) While the front of the building is not increasing in height, the back of the building, which is what I look at, is going from less 10 feet high to over 33 feet high! That is a tremendous reduction in the view from my house.

Please let me know what the appeal, or escallation process is if these plans are approved by the city.

Thanks,

Denyse Trepanier & Jonathan Randell
1216 Eagle Ave., Alameda CA 94501

215.740.2765

On Mon, Sep 18, 2017 at 12:42 PM, Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Denyse,

According to the City's permit history for this property, the property was converted from a one-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling on November 10, 1944. Subsequently, the property was converted to a three-family dwelling on April 24, 1952. Lastly, on July 23, 1953 the property was converted from a three-family dwelling to a four-family dwelling. The property has never obtained permits to reduce the number of units therefore it is allowed to maintain the existing legal for units. To clarify, the property is not being subdivided it is simply maintaining its existing legal nonconforming status.

Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) Section 30-7.2 (a-f), lists the triggers for requiring off-street parking. One of the triggers that requires parking to be added is "when a dwelling unit is enlarged on a property that is not in compliance with the minimum required parking, an additional parking space shall be added **for each seven hundred fifty (750) square feet of added floor area** until compliance is achieved." This is likely why you were required to add parking for your project if you were adding 1,300 sq. ft. of living space. The proposed project is not adding 750 sq. ft. or more and therefore, does not trigger off-street parking to be provided per AMC 30-7.2 (a-f). However, the applicant is aware that the neighborhood is concerned about parking and has agreed to convert a portion of the living space into a one-car garage in order to address the neighbor's concerns. The property has physical constraints that does not provide the opportunity to add more parking than what the applicant has agreed to provide, which again is not required per the Municipal Code.

Uncovered stairs are allowed to encroach into the required rear yard. The letter for your project specifies that the **porch** shall be setback from the property line 20 feet. This is the case for the project at 1822 Bay Street as well—the proposed porch is setback 20 feet and 4 inches from the rear property line.

According to the architect, the trees that are on the “Existing Site Plan” were there when the plans were originally submitted, one was a tree and the other a shrub. During the site remediation to clean up the property the shrub was removed and one tree remains. The applicant is proposing planting additional trees in the back yard.

The project is not proposing an increase in building height. The overall building height will remain the same and the roofline of the rear addition is actually 2 feet lower than the overall building height. Historically, the Planning Board has given staff direction indicating that the loss of blue sky views is not considered view blockage.

Regards,

Linda Barrera

Planner II

City of Alameda, Permit Center

[\(510\) 747-6870](tel:(510)747-6870)

LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

From: Denyse [mailto:denyse@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 11:10 AM

To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Jon Randell <larryone@earthlink.net>

Subject: Fwd: Neighbor feedback on PLN17-0274

Hello Linda,

I'm responding to the letter your department sent on 9/7/17 regarding planned renovations of 1822 Bay St. My property borders the rear of that parcel, and I would like to express my concerns regarding the proposed plan, which I viewed on-line via the aca/accela.com portal. Thank you for sending the link. Below is my feedback:

1. This neighborhood is zoned R-2, why is the city considering allowing a 4-unit building? In fact, when my requested approval for my renovations, your department forced me to file a deed *restriction* with the county stating I would not convert my single family into 2 units, even though that is allowable by the zoning (see attached word documents). Please explain how, if I could not sub-divide to 2 units, this 4-unit plan is being considered.
2. There was no parking plan included in the plans. I only see a single-car garage in the plan. However, with 8 total bedrooms for 4 units, the plan should accommodate parking for 8-16 cars. When I recently completed my renovation, I needed to show plans to accommodate off-street parking for 3 cars for 1300 sq ft of living space. I would expect to see the same in these plans.
3. This plan does not meet the required 20' setback from the rear property line to the back stairs. Again, my planner required that I meet all setback requirements to my *stairs*, not my building. I expect the same rules to apply to my neighbors. (See attached PLN15-0466 Incomplete Ltr REV1 1216 Eagle Av..., pt 1e)
4. Why is a garage being permitted to be added to the front of a Queen Anne style house? Clearly, that is not original, and will significantly detract from the original intent of the architecture.
5. The plan makes reference to existing trees in the rear yard which do not exist. There is one black acacia tree in the yard, but it is not referenced on the plans, and other trees that don't exist, are referenced on the plan. I'm not able to piece together what is intended.
6. My biggest concern however, is the loss of sky line due to the significant increase in building height in the rear of the building. As it currently stands, this building has already been raised beyond its original intent and is the tallest house on the block. This proposed increase in rear height will completely obliterate any sky line from my kitchen and eating area. I'm very opposed to this as it will significantly reduce my property's value as I will now only be able to see this rear of this giant, non-conforming house.

I apologize for not getting this feedback to you sooner, but I was out of the country until today. If you would like to discuss any of this further, please either email me back at this address, or call me at [215.740.2765](tel:215.740.2765).

Again, I am very grateful for the opportunity to provide feedback on these plans, and look forward to hearing how these concerns will be addressed.

Thank you,

Denyse Trepanier & Jonathan Randell

[1216 Eagle Ave](#)

Linda Barrera

From: Frank D'Amico <frankvdamico@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 2:53 PM
To: Linda Barrera
Subject: Re: Design Review Application for 1822 Bay Street

Hello Ms. Barrera,

Thank you for replying to my email.

Not to belabor a point, but when did the neighborhood where I live receive a R2 designation? Was it before or after 1954? It really was a mistake and not a subjective opinion if the city granted a permit for four units while the rest of the neighborhood is designated R2.

Sincerely,

Frank D'Amico
1821 Bay Street

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 18, 2017, at 12:04 PM, Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Hello Mr. D'Amico,

Legal nonconforming statuses in Alameda are explicitly based on recorded permits, not subjective opinion, and therefore were obtained according to the governing policies of the time. According to the City's permit records, the property obtained the required permits to convert the space into four units on July 23, 1953. Permits were never obtained to reduce the number of units. Thus, the property is allowed to maintain the legal four unit status.

Regarding the parking, the proposal does not trigger off-street parking to be provided per Alameda Municipal Code Section 30-7.2 (a-f). The applicant is aware that the neighborhood is concerned and has agreed to convert a portion of the living space into a one-car garage in order to address the neighbor concerns. The property has physical constraints that does not provide the opportunity to add more parking than what the applicant has agreed to provide, which again is not required per the Municipal Code.

Regarding the asbestos removal, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) manages the permits for asbestos removal. The applicant must apply for a "J Number" from BAAQMD prior to obtaining their building permits to ensure that asbestos is removed properly. However, the applicant is not required to have the J Number during the design review phase of the project. If you have any further questions regarding the J Number permit please contact the BAAQMD because I do not have any involvement in that permitting process.

Regards,

Linda Barrera
Planner II

City of Alameda, Permit Center
(510) 747-6870
LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

From: Frank Damico [<mailto:frankvdamico@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 3:57 PM
To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: Design Review Application for 1822 Bay Street

Dear Ms. Barrera,

The permits to change the house at 1822 Bay Street to a fourplex should never have been approved in the first place. I don't believe you should grandfather in a bad decision that was made in the past. The neighborhood is designated as R2. The house has not been used as anything other than a single family dwelling since I have lived here, for almost 18 years. Turning it into a fourplex will substantially change the complexion of our block. There will not be enough parking spaces to accommodate the amount of vehicle owners who now will be able to move into the future apartment building. The so called garage space that the planning department has had the new owners add to the plans is inadequate. And, it is highly unlikely that it will ever be used for parking.

I am also concerned about the asbestos siding that will be removed in the re-modeling process. I would like to be kept informed on how and when the asbestos removal will be done in a manner that protects our neighborhood from asbestos exposure.

Sincerely,
Frank D'Amico

Linda Barrera

From: Linda Barrera
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2017 8:30 AM
To: 'Michael Ignaszewski'
Cc: Barbra Cell
Subject: RE: 1822 Bay Street POLN17-0274

Michael,

Both the existing and proposed lot coverage are less than 45%.

Given that the privacy screening is not required per the Alameda Municipal Code, the porch meets the required setbacks, and is not adjacent to any of your habitable space, the applicant did not agree to provide the screening and the City cannot obligate him to do so.

The appeal period is 10 days from the decision date (appeal ends on September 28, 2017). The project is tentatively approved, meaning that the decision is not final until the appeal period is over.

Best,

Linda Barrera

Planner II
City of Alameda, Permit Center
(510) 747-6870
LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

From: Michael Ignaszewski [mailto:michael.ignaszewski@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 3:41 PM
To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Barbra Cell <loubarbra@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: 1822 Bay Street POLN17-0274

Dear Linda,

Thank you for your quick email and answers.

I have the follow up questions/comments:

- What is the current lot coverage of the main building according to the latest plans (is less or more than 45%) ?
- I agree that the back top porch meets the setback requirements but we are asking you, as part of AMC 30-5.7 c.3. , as a condition of Design Review approval to provide privacy screening barriers and landscaping of sufficient height deemed sufficient to provide adequate screening, to mitigate privacy impacts.

If I understand correctly, the decision is made today (7/18) but it will only be reported next Monday (7/25). The appeal period of 10 days starts when the decision is made or the decision is reported?

Can we know the decision before it is reported ?

Thanks and Regards,
Michael

On Sep 18, 2017, at 11:30 AM, Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Dear Michael and Barbara,

The electronic plans are uploaded as a courtesy to the public. The final version of the hard copies were available at the time the notice went out. You and the community have had the opportunity to come into the Permit Center to review the plans during business hours and as I have mentioned, I am happy to make myself available at your convenience.

Your input as well as the input from other interested parties are considered. However, I hope it is clear that property owners are permitted to improve their properties provided the project complies with the required development regulations. The letter that is currently uploaded on accela was received some time ago when the project began the design review process. Your emails as well as any other correspondences I have received will also be uploaded onto accela as a courtesy. However, I am not required to upload them as soon as I receive them. I compile the information and organize it prior to uploading it onto accela, which takes time.

This design review is a staff level decision. Staff level design reviews are reported to the Planning Board during "Staff Communications." This project will be reported to the Planning Board on September 25, 2017, it is a public meeting so all are welcomed. Please note, that there is an appeal period of 10 days after a decision is made on a design review.

Regarding the garage, a portion of the existing living space is being converted to provide a one-car garage. This does not increase the lot coverage or building footprint. But it does indeed increase off-street parking because the property had zero parking spaces and it is now proposing a one-car garage. Also, the existing driveway will remain.

The previous property owner did not obtain permits to remove any of the kitchens and therefore did not discontinue the use of the property as four units. As I explained in my previous email, the permit history for the property shows the property was converted into a fourplex under valid permits and may maintain its legal nonconforming status as such.

The rear porch meets the required setbacks and is not required to provide screening nor is the applicant required to provide landscaping along your shared property line again because the side yard exceeds the required setbacks.

Regards,

Linda Barrera

Planner II
City of Alameda, Permit Center
(510) 747-6870
LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

From: Michael Ignaszewski [<mailto:michael.ignaszewski@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 11:04 PM

To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>

Cc: Barbra Cell <loubarbra@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: 1822 Bay Street POLN17-0274

Dear Linda,

Thank you for your answer. One week to review the new plan is unfortunately not enough.

Thank you for having the latest version of the plan uploaded on accela. I have noticed that one letter from our neighbor is also available on accela. I have not seen any other communication or letters from other neighbors (or mine). It seems that many other neighbors have complained about this project?

Is our input considered ? If yes, why is there only one letter on the accela website ?

Is the design review decision public or closed ? What time will it happen on Monday and can we attend?

The garage was added so that the lot coverage can be 53% (instead of 45%, which would have needed a bigger redesign). It does not really increase off-street parking since there was already a driveway at the same place.

Because the building is nonconforming (There is not enough parking for an R4) and was not actively used as a fourplex for at least 12 years, we believe that it falls under AMC 30-20.1.c: It nows needs to be rebuilt as conforming, specifically regarding the number of off street parking spaces that have to be provided by a R4 residence. Barbara Kerr (the previous owner) was living alone in 1822 Bay Street since at least 2003. She has therefore voluntarily discontinued any non conforming use regarding parking.

Because it was not used as a R4 for a very long time, because the building is going to be modified, we believe that it should be done in a confirming way.

It is fine to expand a non conforming R4 and not provide any new parking spaces if it is already actively used as an R4 (with four families). But 1822 Bay was never used as a R4.

According to AMC 30-50.7 c.3 (Privacy Screening required for Decks), we require landscaping of sufficient height to mitigate the potential privacy impact of the open porch in the back of the house. We believe this is mandatory because of the open porch in the back of the structure and we would like the owner to extend the privacy landscaping on the side of my property.

Thanks and Regards,
Michael Ignaszewski and Barbra Walker
1820 Bay Street

On Sep 11, 2017, at 3:41 PM, Linda Barrera <lbarrera@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Dear Michael,

Thank you very much for bringing this to my attention. The latest version of the plan are uploaded on [accela](#). I have also attached the plans to this email for your convenience.

As you will see on Sheet A-2, the applicant has agreed to convert a portion of the living space on the ground floor into a parking garage due to the concerns the neighbors have raised. Although converting the living space to parking is not technically required under the current municipal code because the proposed project does not trigger off-street parking requirements per Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) Section 30-7.2 a-f, the applicant understands that the neighborhood is concerned with parking and has made a good-faith effort to address the concern.

According to the City's permit history for this property, the property was converted from a one-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling on November 10, 1944. Subsequently, the property was converted to a three-family dwelling on April 24, 1952. Lastly, on July 23, 1953 the property was converted from a three-family dwelling to a four-family dwelling. The property has never obtained permits to reduce the number of units therefore it is allowed to maintain the existing legal for units.

I am happy to ask the applicant if he would be willing to plant landscaping for privacy on the side yard adjacent to your property. There is a 6'-1" side yard setback from the subject property to the property line adjacent to your property, which is 1'-1" more than the required side yard setback of 5'. Therefore, the project more than complies with the side yard setback requirement and the applicant is not obligated to provide privacy landscaping but again, I am happy to talk with him about it.

Regarding the comments from my incomplete letter, the applicant worked with the Planning Department to address every point in the letter.

- The revised building footprint is in compliance with the development regulations of AMC 30-4.2 which allows up to 45% lot coverage.
- The applicant provided window details on Sheet A-8 including the Marvin brand wood window construction details and a window schedule with specifications on the various window types throughout the home.
- The front stair orientation was revised.
- The applicant is providing a parking space on the ground level as mentioned above.
- The applicant will be restoring the original redwood siding.

The applicant removed a portion of the siding per my direction and that of the Planning Division in an effort to conduct the restoration as part of this project. This applicant obtained an Investigative Exterior Demo Permit (permit number B17-0590) reviewed and approved by the Building Official to conduct the exploratory work.

Although the home is currently in poor condition, the applicant has been working with the Planning Department to ensure that the work conducted restores the architectural merit of the property.

A decision on the design review will not be made until Monday, September 18th, 2017. I am happy to make myself available to discuss this further if you have any additional questions or wish to review a hard copy of the plan set given that it's a bit easier to review full scale plans rather than looking at a PDF. If you are interested in meeting, please feel free to contact me so we can arrange a time to meet.

All the best,

Linda Barrera

Planner II
City of Alameda, Permit Center
(510) 747-6870
LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

From: Michael Ignaszewski [<mailto:michael.ignaszewski@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2017 9:31 AM
To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Barbra Cell <loubarbra@yahoo.com>
Subject: 1822 Bay Street POLN17-0274

Dear Linda Barrera, Dear Planning Director,

Thank you for sending the public notice for design review application.

We are the next door neighbors of 1822 Bay Street (our address is 1820 Bay Street).

We have been trying to access the latest revision on the plan set on accela.com and unfortunately only Rev1 is available (PLN17-0274_PLAN SET REV1.pdf)
Since this seems to be the latest available versions, we will base our comments/questions on this revision.

The design review notice mentions: "The project will reestablish the attached garage parking". We do not see any 'attached parking' on the project plan. We are very concerned about parking as a R4 with 9 bedrooms will bring many cars and the only parking option available seems to be street parking.

We have been living at 1820 Bay Street since 2003 and 1822 has never been used as a fourplex. Only one apartment was occupied and the 3 others were vacant. How can a four unit exists in a R-2 zone ?

The should side (facing our house) now includes 13 windows. We count 20 windows after the renovation. Can we suggest to have privacy trees planted on the south border to limit the impact on our privacy (as well as the privacy of the future neighbors since we will have full view from our house/garden). Please note that we only have one window on the north side of our house.

The addition in the back will block the view of Oakland hills from our second floor bedrooms (see attached pictures).

We also agree with all the points you have raised in your response to the application:

- The footprint is too big
- Window type and brochure. We do not see the window brochure online. Are the windows going to open to the outside or slide? As you can see from the pictures below, the windows represented on the plan are very different and do not match the current configuration.
- Front staircase orientation (as you indicated, it should be straight)
- Will the off-street parking spot be conserved ?

- Siding material should be wood.

It seems that parts of the siding has been removed without following the adequate regulation for Asbestos Demolition (specifically section 303.6 of <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/Rules%20and%20Regs/reg%2011/rg1102.ashx>)

This is a concern as we have a family with your children (aged 13, 10 and 6 year olds) and the planning should include the procedure used for demolition/renovation.

The building is not in a very good shape as you can see from the images below (from [Zillow.com](http://www.zillow.com)) and the integrity of it structure might not be there anymore.

Because the latest plans do not seem to be available online and the decision meeting is coming very soon, we are asking to reschedule the decision meeting to a later date so we can review the latest plans when available.

Thanks and Regards,
Michael Ignaszewski and Barbra Walker
1820 Bay Street,
Alameda, CA

<image001.png>

<image002.png>

<PLN17-0274_PLAN SET REV 3 - FINAL.pdf>

Linda Barrera

From: Linda Barrera
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 11:49 AM
To: 'James Morgan'
Subject: RE: PLN17-0274

Hello Mr. Morgan,

Regarding the asbestos removal, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) manages the permits for asbestos removal. An applicant must apply for a "J Number" from BAAQMD prior to obtaining their building permits to ensure that asbestos is removed properly. However, the applicant is not required to have the J Number during the design review phase of the project. If you have any further questions regarding the J Number permit please contact the BAAQMD because I do not have any involvement in that permitting process.

The California Building Code (CBC) has specific requirements for plumbing and drainage. The applicant is required to submit plumbing plans to obtain permits for the plumbing and a site plan that shows drainage on the site. Those plans are reviewed to ensure compliance with the CBC.

Best,

Linda Barrera

Planner II
City of Alameda, Permit Center
(510) 747-6870
LBarrera@alamedaca.gov

From: James Morgan [<mailto:baysailingjames@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 9:19 PM
To: Linda Barrera <LBarrera@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: PLN17-0274

Hi Linda-

Am interested in adding comments concerning the property at 1822 Bay Street.

- Mitigation plan for removal of asbestos shingles. Did not see it addressed.
- Redirection of exterior plumbing vent pipes back into the interior of the inside walls. Since the house is being re-done to such a large extent, it should be possible to remove these unsightly exterior cast iron plumbing vent pipes and have them re-directed back inside the structure which has been the norm for many years.
- Pipes on north side of house appear to extend over enough to not have the setback required. They are up higher, but they still intrude on setback distance.
- Drainage issues. From downspouts to general pooling and elevation differences with surrounding properties.

Regards,