

Item 7-A Public Comment

From: Courtney Shepler <c\_shepler@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Sunday, November 05, 2017 7:43 PM  
To: NANCY McPeak; David Burton; Ronald Curtis; John Knox White;  
Kristoffer Koster; David Mitchell; Sandy Sullivan; Alan Teague; DEBBIE  
POTTER; ANDREW THOMAS; Trish Spencer; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft;  
Malia Vella; Frank Matarrese; Jim Oddie  
Subject: Questions and concerns on the North Housing project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Flagged

Good evening,

Several of my neighbors here at Alameda Landing received notice of the planning board meeting on 11/13 regarding the North Housing project. It is quite odd that we didn't all receive the notice as I believe virtually every home in Alameda Landing is within 300 feet of the North Housing parcel. What were the criteria used for this communication? Where else in the area were notices posted?

After reading the proposal, I am very confused about what the city is trying to do, and I struggle more to see how anything proposed could possibly be in the interests of the residents of Alameda Landing. When we all purchased our homes we were told that the dilapidated area behind us was to be auctioned off and redeveloped with new homes. The City of Alameda had no information on their website about North Housing, and we were not given any disclosures about the planned use of that property. Only after moving in did we learn that in fact, a deal was cut many years ago to allow some of that land, and specifically the land abutting the \$1M+ homes in Alameda Landing, to be dedicated to 90 units for the "formerly homeless", as well as up to 30 units for Habitat for Humanity. While I know I will sound like a "NIMBY" saying this, there is truly a big difference between affordable housing and housing the formerly homeless, and having knowledge of this would certainly have impacted what people were willing to pay for their homes here and whether they chose to purchase homes here to raise their young families in. We have had these concerns even with the knowledge that the housing component for the "formerly homeless" would be 90 units. Based on my reading of the current proposal, the City is now proposing that the number of units dedicated to housing for the formerly homeless could now be in the hundreds (Direct quote: "Therefore the underlying zoning could allow for 430 units on the 14.32 acres owned collectively by the Housing Authority and Habitat for Humanity"). I do hope that I am simply confused.

1. There is a recommendation to remove the housing cap. (Direct quote: "For these reasons, staff is recommending that the G Combining District be removed from the North Housing site, without reinstating the 435 cap on the property). With all of the talk of limiting trips through the tube, and the hoops that Planning requires market rate developers to go through, how can you in good conscience remove a cap to allow hundreds or thousands more residents in that space? Is any consideration at all given to the quality of life of those nearby, and the good faith we should have been able to have in the City's plan when some made the single largest investment of their lives?

2. If the number of units dedicated to affordable housing were increased, would it all be allocated to the "formerly homeless" or is there an opportunity to revisit how the Housing Authority will leverage the site? As we all probably know from being well

Item 7-A Public Comment

informed citizens, the biggest crunch in housing is for the middle income earners who don't qualify for low income housing but can't afford "market rate" housing, especially with a family. Or as has tragically occurred too many times in Alameda, they can afford market rate housing until they are brutally evicted from their homes by greedy landlords. These are our teachers, local workers, and their families who are being forced out of Alameda because their wages simply cannot keep up with the price escalations. Personally, I will not support any increase in the affordable housing allocation unless a different mix of needs is considered.

3. The document also indicates that the housing authority and habitat site will still be vacant in 2021/2022. Why? What will be done with that property in the meantime? In our neighborhood it is called "zombieland". It is dilapidated, with broken windows. It smells horribly. Homeless encampments and drug users routinely take residence. How can the City ensure that our quality of life and what we have to look at doesn't stay this way for 5 more years?

I hope that someone can provide additional information to me between now and the meeting on 11/13. Unless I have absolutely mis-read and mis-understood everything in this document, I suspect you will have dozens of outraged homeowners in the meeting on 11/13. Please try to put yourselves in our shoes and consider what you think would be reasonable if you lived here at Alameda Landing.

Thanks,

Courtney Shepler  
510-393-0306

## NANCY McPeak

---

**From:** John Knox White  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 12, 2017 3:16 PM  
**To:** ERIN GARCIA; NANCY McPeak; ANDREW THOMAS  
**Subject:** FW: North Housing Zoning Amendment - 11/13/2017 Mtg Agenda Item

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

forwarding for the record

---

**From:** Melissa O'Connor <mel.a.oconnor@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 9, 2017 10:34 AM  
**To:** Ashley Zieba; David Burton; Ronald Curtis; John Knox White; Kristoffer Koster; David Mitchell; Sandy Sullivan; Alan Teague  
**Subject:** North Housing Zoning Amendment - 11/13/2017 Mtg Agenda Item

Dear Planning Committee and Transportation Commission of City of Alameda,

Regarding the agenda for the Planning Committee's Monday 11/13 meeting, I would like to express my concern that approval may be given for additional housing in the Alameda Point area, on top of already planned housing.

My main concern is traffic from additional vehicles. We have had a marked increase in traffic through the Webster tube over the last 10 years. Over time, travel on and off the island could make living here undesirable. It only takes one car breaking down in the tube to create hell for thousands of people. Taking public transportation doesn't necessarily solve the issue - many people have no choice but to travel by car. In any case, busses must travel through the tube also.

Unless cars are impossible to own in the planned new developments (**no parking provided?**), how do you plan to solve for additional traffic?

Is the Transportation Commission involved in your approvals for development, in order to solve for consequent added vehicles on streets?

Since members of the Transportation Commission:

Laura Palmer

Michele Bellows

Thomas Bertken

Christopher A. Miley

Samantha Soules

Jesus Vargas

Michael Hans

do not list their contact info on the City of Alameda website, I am including their "Administrative Technician", Ashley Zieba, here to forward my concerns and questions related to above.

Thank you,

Melissa A. O'Connor  
Alameda West Side Resident

From: John Knox White  
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 6:54 PM  
To: ANDREW THOMAS; ERIN GARCIA  
Subject: Fwd: Housing at Admirals Cove (North Housing)

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

From: Philip James <pjj@philipjohnjames.com>  
Date: Nov 13, 2017 4:13 PM  
Subject: Housing at Admirals Cove (North Housing)  
To: David Mitchell <DMitchell@alamedaca.gov>, Sandy Sullivan  
<SSullivan@alamedaca.gov>, Kristoffer Koster <KKoster@alamedaca.gov>, John Knox White  
<JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>, Ronald Curtis <rcurtis@alamedaca.gov>, Alan Teague  
<ateague@alamedaca.gov>  
Cc: ANDREW THOMAS <ATHOMAS@alamedaca.gov>

Planning Board Members:

Many of you know me, my name is Philip James and I've been a resident of Alameda for 23 years. I have a strong interest in remaining a resident of Alameda. I also have a strong interest in making sure that we are taking care of our community while inviting in new residents who will grow that community.

That is why I ask that you do everything in your power to remove the use restriction in the North Housing area. Part of a comprehensive housing plan for the future of Alameda, the city you and I hold so dear, is a mix of affordable and market rate, and making sure options are available to house the most disadvantaged among us.

It should be our responsibility as citizens to make sure that our land and our governing bodies are benefiting all residents, not just those who already own property.

Sadly I will not be able to attend tonight's meeting, but I do hope you will consider my words as you make your decision.

Sincerely,  
Philip James

PJJ  
<http://philipjohnjames.com>

From: John Knox White  
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 6:54 PM  
To: ANDREW THOMAS; ERIN GARCIA  
Subject: Fwd: North housing reuse

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

From: Alan Pryor <alanrpryor@gmail.com>  
Date: Nov 13, 2017 12:14 PM  
Subject: North housing reuse  
To: David Mitchell <DMitchell@alamedaca.gov>, Sandy Sullivan  
<SSullivan@alamedaca.gov>, Kristoffer Koster <KKoster@alamedaca.gov>, John Knox White  
<JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>, Ronald Curtis <rcurtis@alamedaca.gov>, Alan Teague  
<ateague@alamedaca.gov>  
Cc: ANDREW THOMAS <ATHOMAS@alamedaca.gov>

Hello planning board members, i am asking you to approve removing the "g overlay " from the north housing site so we can move forward building and in this case repurposing housing that is sorely needed.

I was hoping to be at the meeting tonight but have another commitment.

Thanks,

Alan Pryor  
510-684-7468

From: John Knox White  
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 6:53 PM  
To: ANDREW THOMAS; ERIN GARCIA  
Subject: Fwd: North Housing Site Zoning Change Approval

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

From: Gayle Thomas <blaze00031@aol.com>  
Date: Nov 13, 2017 8:49 AM  
Subject: North Housing Site Zoning Change Approval  
To: Ronald Curtis <rcurtis@alamedaca.gov>, John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>, Kristoffer Koster <KKoster@alamedaca.gov>, David Mitchell <DMitchell@alamedaca.gov>, Sandy Sullivan <SSullivan@alamedaca.gov>, Alan Teague <ateague@alamedaca.gov>  
Cc:

Dear Planning Board members,

I am writing you from the capacity of a Director of Building Futures for Women and Children and also a West-ender living on Haight Avenue. As both, I am extremely aware of the housing shortage occurring throughout our region, including our wonderful City of Alameda, as I'm sure you all are.

As active members of our community, we are all aware of the priority that housing, especially affordable housing currently has. Work is certainly being done to find ways to address the issue, including the item up for your Planning Board approval: removal of the 435 cap limit on the North Housing site, specifically for the non-profit organizations on this site.

Affordable housing is desperately needed in our City. When affordable rental housing becomes available, the applicant pool drastically outweighs the availability. This site has been identified within the City's Housing Element as an important location to have affordable housing. With the current cap, though, the impact for Alameda will be minimal. We have the opportunity to support our current and future citizens with much more with this cap removal...and also be in position to have these units contribute towards our RHNA obligation.

In every aspect of city government, we will always have the individuals who shy away from change, have fear of increased population, imagine associated negative impacts and are often quite verbal about their feelings. Please be aware that many, such as my family, welcome new contributing citizens of Alameda to our section of Alameda and are pleased to see this site finally used again.

Please support our community partners in removing the cap on the non-profit parcels who wish to provide affordable rental housing on the North Housing Site.

Thank you,  
Gayle Thomas