



July 11, 2021

City of Alameda Planning Board  
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 190  
Alameda, CA 94501

**Subject: Proposed revisions to Second Draft Alameda General Plan (Item 7-C on Planning Board's 7-12-21 agenda) - -AAPS comments**

Dear Planning Board members,

The Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS) is very pleased that the proposed revisions to the March 2021 draft General Plan reflect many of our previous comments. We would like to thank staff, the consultants and the Planning Board for your responsiveness. The deletion of the height limits and some of the previously proposed residential densities (apparently as part of the strategy to address those parameters as part of the Housing Element and related zoning amendments) is very helpful. This strategy is apparently intended, among other things, to avoid causing the general Plan's remaining intensity provisions to be used as a basis for density bonus projects, which is good.

The following comments mostly address remaining loose ends, clarifications and some of the new proposals in the proposed revisions.

**1. Retain the following text proposed for deletion in Section 1.3 (Looking Ahead: Alameda In 2040):**

*Alameda will continue to provide for its share of the growing regional housing need as required by State Housing Law and Alameda's regional housing needs allocation, which is projected to include the need for approximately 10,000 to 12,000 new housing units in Alameda over the next 20 years. The majority of the growth in Alameda will occur on the former Naval Air Station lands and along the Northern Waterfront of Alameda. Both areas are designated as priority development areas in the regional **Plan, Plan Bay Area**. Additional housing opportunities exist for accessory units and additional units on existing residential properties, and along the Park Street and Webster Street commercial corridors and the community's several shopping center sitess. ~~It is expected that Alameda's existing historic neighborhoods and commercial main streets will look very similar in 2040 as they do today and as they did in 2000 since much of the new housing in these areas will be limited to backyard accessory buildings and addition of units within existing buildings.~~*

The deleted text should be retained. It is an important part of the Plan's vision, especially the reference to historic neighborhoods.

2. **Avoid further density increases in existing residential areas.** The proposed revisions still provide significant density increases in the Medium Density Residential Areas (MDRAs), i.e. the R-2 through R-6 zoning districts. Since significant portions of these areas already have high densities, and much of the MDRAs consist of historic buildings, any density increases in the MDRAs should be limited to carefully targeted subareas and only: (i) where necessary to meet the RHNA and other General Plan objectives; (ii) if insufficient development capacity is available in the non-historic portions of the Neighborhood Mixed Use, Community Mixed Use and Mixed Use Areas (including Alameda Point, the estuary shopping centers and Encinal Terminals) to meet the RHNA and General Plan objectives; and (iii) in MDRA subareas where adverse impacts on historic buildings and on-street parking will be minimized.

**Unless mitigated, these density increases will encourage demolition and replacement of historic buildings with new and larger buildings that architecturally disrupt historic neighborhoods.** The increases could also encourage architecturally incompatible alterations and additions to historic buildings. **The General Plan density provisions should be deleted and determined as part of the Housing Element and zoning ordinance changes.**

In addition, the proposed residential densities for the Low Density Residential Area and MDRAs of “up to 21 units per acre” and “30-74 units per acre”, respectively, are a big increase from the March 2021 draft that provided up to 13 units per acre and 21-50 units per acre, respectively.

**What is the rationale for this change?** It is also inconsistent with the July 6 City Council Housing Element staff report Exhibit 2.

Here are some related concerns:

- a. **Retain the existing 5000 square-foot minimum lot size in the Low Density Residential Land-Use Area (i.e. the R-1 zoning district).** The March 2021 draft Land-Use Element proposed a residential density of 13 units per acre, but the proposed revisions increase this to “up to 21 units per acre” which is ca. 240% of the existing maximum allowed density of ca. 8.712 units per acre (based on the existing 5000 square-foot minimum lot size) and equals a minimum lot size per unit of ca. 2074 ft.<sup>2</sup> Reducing the minimum lot size will encourage lot splits and architecturally disrupt some of Alameda’s most significant historic neighborhoods.

LU-2f’s extension of multi-family and shared housing to R1 will further intensify R-1 and essentially eliminate what’s left of single-family zoning in Alameda, which has already been largely eliminated by state-mandated ADUs. The March 2021 draft Plan limited these facilities to just the MDRA and higher. **What is the strategy for accommodating multi-family and similar uses within R-1 including in combination with ADUs?** Will it just be based on the proposed residential density up to 21 units per acre and will this density be lower in some areas based on the zoning map?

- b. **What will be the architectural impacts of the multifamily and the other listed facilities if they involve new construction in residential neighborhoods?** AAPS requests that the Plan identify what, if any, architectural impacts could occur and how they might be mitigated.

- c. **Evaluate the impacts of the state affordable housing density bonus law on height limits, other development regulations and overall future density in the MDRAs and elsewhere.** For example, a density bonus project in an area zoned for a 40 foot height limit could end up with a 50 foot or greater height (one or more additional stories).

The proposed residential density increases will significantly increase the number of sites eligible for density bonus projects. Under Article 26's 2000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of lot area per unit rule, only lots of 10,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> or more are eligible for density bonus projects, since the state density bonus law limits these projects to those with five or more units. But the proposed density increases to a range of 30-74 units/acre would decrease the density bonus project threshold lot size to between 7260 ft.<sup>2</sup> (30 units/acre) and 2943 ft.<sup>2</sup> (74 units/acre). This will significantly increase the number of sites eligible for density bonus projects in the MDRAs. **The General Plan's Land Use and/or Housing Elements should include an estimate of how many additional density bonus project sites could result from the proposed intensity increases.**

- d. **Given the above, the General Plan, including the Housing Element and related zoning changes, needs to be very selective in proposing development intensity increases,** since it is much more difficult to downzone than to upzone, due in part to recent changes in state legislation and also resistance from investment-minded property owners.

- 3. **Add provisions to Policy CC-18 (building renovation and reuse) to encourage building relocation when complete demolition cannot be avoided.** This will promote both resource conservation and historic preservation. Here is suggested wording:

***CC-18. Building Renovation, ~~and~~ Reuse and Relocation.** To reduce construction waste and GHG emissions associated with construction material manufacture and transportation, encourage and facilitate renovation and rehabilitation of existing buildings instead of demolition and new construction and maximize retention of existing building materials rather than gut rehab. Where complete demolition of an existing building cannot be avoided, encourage relocation of the building to another site. (See also Policy LU-17)*

Add action statements to implement this policy. (AAPS can make specific recommendations if requested).

- 4. **Add provisions to LU-32 (Civic Center Design) concerning the historic gas station at the northeast corner of Oak Street and Santa Clara Avenue and the Veterans' Memorial Building.** Here is suggested wording:

***LU-32. Civic Center Design.** Create an identifiable Civic Center District that supports a wide variety of civic, institutional, cultural, office, commercial, retail, and residential uses and provides a transition between the Park Street commercial district to the east and the neighborhoods to the west on Santa Clara and Central Avenues.*

**Actions:**

- a. **Centerpieces.** *Preserve the City Hall, Carnegie Library, Veterans Memorial Building and Elks Club buildings as centerpieces of the Civic Center district.*

*b. **Opportunity Sites.** Support and encourage the redevelopment and reuse of the corners opposite City Hall and the Carnegie Building with mixed-use development. Either restore and incorporate the historic gas station at the northeast corner of Oak Street and Santa Clara Avenue or relocate it to a suitable site.*

5. **Provide additional transit enhancements as justifications for increased residential densities.** Expand Policy ME-16f and/or g and Policy CC-8 to call for a BART, Caltrain and other regional transit shuttles with frequent headways to Alameda. Also explain, (perhaps in the transit-rich spotlight on page 39) how mothers with small children will be able to utilize transit to meet basic needs such as grocery shopping and going to school or doctor's visits.

6. **Delete new Action a under LU-15** which read as follows:

***LU-15 Housing Needs.** Provide land appropriately zoned to accommodate local and regional affordable housing needs and support the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy to address climate change as well as housing needs. (See also Policies CC-3, HE-1 and HE-2).*

***Action:***

- a. ***Efficient Land Use.** Optimize the use of limited land in Alameda for residential purposes by maximizing the number of housing units constructed on each acre of residentially zoned land.*

Action LU-15a basically says that **all** residentially zoned land should be indiscriminately upzoned as high as possible. The statement appears off-the-wall, is inconsistent with other Plan provisions and hard to take seriously. **This new action statement should be deleted.** LU-15 in combination with other General Plan provisions is sufficient on its own to provide a robust housing strategy.

7. **Clarify new Action a under Policy CC-10**, which read as follows:

***CC-10 Climate-Friendly, Walkable and Transit-Oriented Development.** Reduce reliance on automobile use and reduce vehicle miles traveled by prioritizing walkable, transit-oriented, medium and high density mixed-use development in transit-oriented areas and commercial corridors. (See also Policies LU-33, LU-34 and ME-21).*

***Actions:***

- a. ***Density, FAR and Transit.** When zoning property or considering commercial, residential or residential mixed-use projects near transit stops, encourage higher densities and floor-area-ratios to make the most efficient use of land, support public transportation, and minimize vehicle miles traveled.*
- ~~a. ***When zoning property for commercial, residential or residential mixed use near transit stops, generally zone for more ensure higher densities and/or floor-area-ratios (FAR) on the parcels closest to the highest quality existing or Planned transit stops to encourage the most efficient use of land and public resources while minimizing vehicle miles traveled.***~~

As drafted, Action CC-10a is too open ended and subject to interpretation. What is meant by "near" (transit stops) and how high are "higher density and FAR", especially if existing densities



are already relatively high. We continue to question the wisdom of promoting permanent land-use changes based on ephemeral and easily changed transit facilities such as bus lines.

8. **Address the role of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards referred to in LU-25g (Alterations) as part of the revisions to the historic preservation ordinance included in Action LU-25i, rather than within the General Plan itself.** It is not clear why LU- 25g needs to be changed to refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The criteria provided in the existing Citywide Design Review Manual *when correctly applied* has generally resulted in good design outcomes for alterations to both historic and nonhistoric buildings. In addition, Alameda's historic preservation ordinance already requires changes to Historical Monuments to conform with the Secretary's Standards, which was added to the ordinance as a federal government requirement as part of the NAS conveyance to the City. Staff also requires conformity with the Standards for partial demolitions and related alterations to Historic Building Study List properties that require a certificate of approval from the Historical Advisory Board (although the historic preservation ordinance does not apply the Standards to Study List buildings).
9. **Retain important existing General Plan provisions.** The following existing General Plan provisions are not included or only partially included in the new Plan and should be retained with minimal modifications.

#### **Themes of the General Plan.**

***Respect for history:** The City's rich and diverse residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional architecture is continually gaining recognition as an irreplaceable asset. The Bay Area has no similar communities and none will be built. The General Plan emphasizes restoration and preservation as essential to Alameda's economic and cultural environment.*

Similar language, especially the last sentence, should be incorporated into the "character" theme on page 3 of the proposed revisions. (We would like to thank staff and the consultant for adding "diverse historic architectural styles" to this theme.)

#### **Implementing Policies: Architectural Resources**

*3.3.i Preserve all City-owned buildings and other facilities of architectural, historical or aesthetic merit. Prepare a list of these facilities and develop an Historic Facilities Management Plan that provides procedures for preserving their character-defining elements, including significant interior features and furnishings. Include in the Management Plan design guidelines or standards and a long-term program to restore significant character-defining elements which have been altered.*

The first sentence is retained in the draft Plan as Action LU-25a, but the remaining language should also be retained, since it provides strategies to implement the first sentence and is much more of a true action statement than the first sentence.

*3.3.j Encourage owners of poorly remodeled but potentially attractive older buildings to restore the exterior of these buildings to their original appearance. Provide lists of altered buildings which present special design opportunities and make the lists widely available. Develop financial and design assistance programs to promote such restoration.*

Although the last sentence is reflected in Action LU-25e's financial assistance and design assistance proposals, the rest of 3.3.j is more proactive and at least equally important.

- 10. Verify that all changes from the March 2021 draft are included.** It is very helpful that the revision text shows changes from the March 2021 draft through redlines. However, some of the changes have been missed, e.g. on Page 3 of the revisions some of the changes to the “character” theme are not shown (although AAPS-recommended changes are!) and on pages 22 and 23 some of the changes to Policy CC-14a (although, again, an AAPS-recommended change is shown). We did not try to thoroughly compare the revisions to the March 2021 draft so there may be other changes that are not reflected in the redlines. **Can staff and/or the consultants double check the changes and try to make sure that they are all reflected in the revision?**

See the attached marked up pages from the proposed revisions for additional comments.

Thank you for the ongoing opportunities to comment. Please contact me at (510) 523-0411 or [cbuckleyAICP@att.net](mailto:cbuckleyAICP@att.net) if you would like to discuss these comments.

Sincerely,

Christopher Buckley, Chair  
Preservation Action Committee  
Alameda Architectural Preservation Society

Attachment: Marked up pages from the proposed revisions to the March 2021 draft General Plan

cc: Mayor and City Councilmembers (by electronic transmission)  
Andrew Thomas and Allen Tai, Planning, Building and Transportation Department (by electronic transmission)  
AAPS Board and Preservation Action Committee (by electronic transmission)

Revisions to March 2021 Draft General Plan

Page 2

\*=PREVIOUSLY RECOMMENDED

**Global Revisions:**

1. Fix typos throughout. (Special thank you to Pat Potter for contributing her excellent editing skills to the General Plan editing process.)
2. Change name of "Alameda Point Wildlife Refuge" to "Alameda Point Nature Reserve" in all policies and on all maps.

**Revisions to Chapter 1 ORGANIZATION AND THEMES:**

1. 1.2 LOOKING BACK: A BRIEF HISTORY OF ALAMEDA. Revise three paragraphs in section

Prior to the arrival of the Spanish, Alameda was a peninsula of land covered by a dense forest of coastal live oak and inhabited by Coastal Miwoks who sustained themselves through hunting, fishing and gathering. Settlement of Alameda by Europeans ~~non-natives~~ began in 1820-1776, when Luis Peralta divided Rancho San Antonio among his four sons. Alameda derived its original name, "the Encinal," from the large stands of native oaks ("encino" means "oak" in Spanish) on the Main Island. The name "Alameda," meaning "grove of poplar trees," was given to the City as a poetic gesture upon popular vote in 1853.

In the decades between 1920 and 1970 the City witnessed cycles of boom and bust. Following an enlightened era of civic building during the 1920s, Alameda endured difficult years of political scandal and corruption through the 1930s. The entry of the United States into World War II focused the City's attention on the war effort. During World War II, shifts ran around the clock at the Alameda Naval Air Station (commissioned in 1940) and in the City's shipyards. The City's population reached an all-time high of 89,000, but also became more economically and racially segregated, with lower income households and people of color predominantly located on the west side of Alameda and higher income households predominantly located on the east end of Alameda.

WHY  
IS THE  
FAIR  
HOUSING  
ACT  
RELEVANT?

In 1973, soon after passage of the Fair Housing Act of 1968, 1973, the voters of Alameda approved a citizens initiative passed a measure to amend the City Charter to prohibit construction of all multifamily housing in Alameda. City Charter Section 26-1 states, "There shall be no multiple dwelling units built in the City of Alameda". In 1991, the voters approved a second initiative to add added Charter Section 26-3, which limits residential density to one unit for every 2,000 square feet. The two measures, collectively referred to as "Measure A", effectively stopped the development of any multifamily housing in Alameda from 1973 to 2013.

\* The City Council subsequently passed an ordinance clarifying that "multiple dwelling units" meant buildings with three or more units.



2. Revise the population growth and housing text in section 1.3 LOOKING AHEAD: ALAMEDA IN 2040 as follows:

Alameda will continue to provide for its share of the growing regional housing need as required by State Housing Law and Alameda's regional housing needs allocation, which is projected to include the need for approximately 10,000 to 12,000 new housing units in Alameda over the next 20 years. The majority of the growth in Alameda will occur on the former Naval Air Station lands and along the Northern Waterfront of Alameda. Both areas are designated as priority development areas in the regional plan, Plan Bay Area. Additional housing opportunities exist for accessory units and additional units on existing residential properties, and along the Park Street and Webster Street commercial corridors and the community's several shopping center sites. ~~It is expected that Alameda's existing historic neighborhoods and commercial main streets will look very similar in 2040 as they do today and as they did in 2000 since much of the new housing in these areas will be limited to backyard accessory buildings and addition of units within existing buildings.~~

3. Revise the "Character" them in Section 1.4 THEMES OF THE GENERAL PLAN as follows:

**Preserve and enhance Alameda's distinctive character.**

Alameda is distinguished by its island setting, diverse neighborhoods and main streets, diverse historic architectural styles, extensive tree canopy and overall walkability and livability. Equally important to Alameda's distinctive character is its diversity of family and household types, its wide range of household incomes, and the diverse ethnic and racial composition of its residents. These qualities, and others, contribute to the quality of life for residents while providing the framework for shaping development, providing for the diverse needs of a diverse community, conserving resources and maintaining a thriving economy. General Plan 2040 policies manage growth to address current challenges and responsibilities while retaining and building upon the physical qualities and characteristics that contribute to a high quality of life in Alameda.

4. Revise Section 1.5 Implementation and Priority Setting to include list of implementing plans:

The Alameda Municipal Code and issue specific and area specific plans adopted by the City Council also play an important role implementing the General Plan. All these plans must be consistent with the General Plan, and they provide specific, shorter term actions to achieve longer term General Plan policy objectives. Examples include:

- Municipal Code Development Regulations
- Design Guidelines and Objective Design Standards
- Climate Action and Resilience Plan
- Transportation Choices Plan



architecturally distinguished

## Revisions to Chapter 2 LAND USE + CITY DESIGN ELEMENT

### 1. Land Use Element Goal related to Character amended as follows:

Character: Maintain and enhance safe, healthy, sustainable, economically and culturally diverse, complete and connected neighborhoods, districts, and waterfronts that support a high quality of life and fair and equitable access to affordable housing, employment, education, recreation, transportation, services, and participation in public decision making.

### 2. Revise Alameda Character Spotlight as follows:

#### ALAMEDA'S NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:

##### WHAT ARE THE QUALITIES THAT GIVE ALAMEDA ITS DISTINCT ~~UNIQUE~~ CHARACTER?

General Plan policies embrace and support the desirable qualities and assets that give Alameda its distinct unique character. Understanding those qualities is important; in order that future community design decisions and investments continue to support, enhance and maintain Alameda's character. Examples include: ~~Th includes: e characteristics that give Alameda its special character are:~~

**WALKABILITY.** Alameda, like all great places, is walkable. Short blocks, generally two lane roads, a traditional street grid, street trees, and a network of public parks and open spaces, a pair of commercial "Main Streets", and human-scaled buildings, make walking in Alameda pleasant and comfortable.

**CITY OF NEIGHBORHOODS AND MAIN STREETS** Alameda is a city of diverse neighborhoods and main streets that has endured and evolved over time. Walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods and commercial main streets where people live and work, own homes and rent, with nearby parks serving families, seniors, and kids, and main streets living in Alameda feels more like living in a small town than living in a metropolitan city of 80,000. General Plan policies preserve and build on this neighborhood fabric to accommodate inclusive residential and commercial growth while maintaining its charm.

**LEAFY STREETS** The mature deciduous and evergreen trees along Alameda's city streets and in its parks are critical to Alameda's neighborhood character. Systematic planting and maintenance of a variety of younger specimen trees in the future is essential to maintaining and expanding Alameda's urban forest for future generations.

**~~CONNECTIONED~~ TO NATURE** Memorable towns and cities are often surrounded by natural areas or defined by natural features, such as a river or a lake. Alameda's island setting contributes to its distinctive feeling of being connected to nature. Alameda's often tree-lined street grid provides multiple ways to explore the outdoors and easily connect to the water's edge. Maintaining Alameda's network of public open spaces and parks and promoting improvements to retain and enhance access to the water for all Alamedans will be essential to maximizing and preserving Alameda's unique natural assets.

**HUMAN SCALE** Alameda is "human scale". Tall trees, narrower streets with slower moving traffic, and buildings generally one to four stories in height fronting onto the sidewalk creates an environment that is best appreciated by the human senses and at eye level. Maintaining a human scale in all changes to landscapes, streets, and buildings is maintaining Alameda's character.



QUALITY ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN Although Alameda buildings represent a wide range of Bay Area regional architecture styles dating back to the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Many have architectural significance and most, they are well-crafted, comfortable, and rich with personality and color. Continuing to promote historic preservation and architectural design excellence through ~~by ensuring that~~ City development regulations ~~express clear outcomes~~ is essential.

Good!

### 3. Amend the following Land Use Element Policy as follows:

**LU-1 Inclusive and Equitable Land Use and City Design.** Promote inclusive and equitable land use plans, policies, zoning regulations, and planning processes. (See also Policies CC-1, CC-2, ME-1, ME-2, ME-3, HE-9 and HE-13).

#### Actions:

\*  
GIVE  
EXAMPLES  
OF THESE  
POLICIES

- a. **Equitable Plans.** Ensure that citywide and neighborhood plans are inclusive, non-discriminatory, and culturally responsive. Plans should reduce disparities, promote equitable access, minimize the impacts of income disparity, minimize displacement and promote fair access to affordable housing.
- b. **Exclusionary and Discriminatory Policies.** Rescind existing policies, programs, or development standards that are exclusionary or discriminatory.
- c. **Equitable Distribution.** Ensure that the uses, facilities, and services that are needed for a high quality of life are distributed equitably throughout the city.
- d. **Inclusive Processes.** Ensure robust community involvement in all city planning, public investment, and development review decision making by actively engaging all segments of the community, especially those that have historically been less engaged in city decision-making such as lower-income families, people of color, and youth.
- e. **Equal Representation.** ~~Appoint~~ Encourage a broad cross section of the community ~~in the appointments for commissions and other boards and advisory committees.~~

**LU-2 Complete Neighborhoods.** Maintain complete, safe, healthy, and connected neighborhoods that support a mix of uses and meet the needs of residents of all ages, physical abilities, cultural backgrounds and incomes. (See also Policies HE-2, HE-3, HE-4 and HE-15).

#### Actions:

- a. **Healthy Neighborhoods.** Provide equitable and safe access to housing, parks and recreation facilities, community services, public health services, schools, child care facilities, and neighborhood amenities in all neighborhoods.
- b. **Parks and Open Space.** Provide a comprehensive and integrated system of parks, trails, open space, and commercial recreation facilities within a safe and comfortable 1/4 mile walk from all neighborhoods. (See also Figure 6.2).
- c. **Water Access.** Provide convenient and safe bicycle and walking access to the waterfront from all residential neighborhoods.



DELETE, OR REVISE WITH MORE TARGETED LANGUAGE. JISIE CIVIL LETTER.

- b. **Green Business Practices.** Encourage Alameda businesses and industries to become more sustainable and continue to make positive contributions to the community by, for example, hiring locally, supporting telecommuting, utilizing solar power and prioritizing active transportation, transit, and electric vehicles. This includes providing electric vehicle and e-bike charging stations, long-term bike parking options, and a variety of transit options.
- c. **Housing and Transportation.** To reduce greenhouse gas emissions generated by employee commute trips, support housing at all affordability levels in proximity to employment areas; ~~improve~~ bus, ferry, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in proximity to employment areas, and allow child care facilities in business areas.

**LU-15 Housing Needs.** Provide land appropriately zoned to accommodate local and regional affordable housing needs and support the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy to address climate change as well as housing needs. (See also Policies CC-3, HE-1 and HE-2).

**Action:**

- a. **Efficient Land Use.** Optimize the use of limited land in Alameda for residential purposes by maximizing the number of housing units constructed on each acre of residentially zoned land.

**LU-16 Climate-Friendly, Transit-Oriented Mixed-Use Development.** Permit higher-density, multi-family and mixed-use development on sites within walking distance of commercial and ~~high-quality transit-rich areas~~ services to reduce automobile dependence, automobile congestion, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy use; provide for affordable housing; make efficient use of land; and support climate friendly modes of transportation, such as walking, bicycling, and transit use. (See also Policies LU-16, LU-33, LU-34, CC-3, CC-10, ME-6, ME-17, ME-18, ME-21, HE-5, HE-10 and HE-11).

**Actions:**

- a. **Transit-Oriented Zoning.** To support additional ferry service, bus services, and future rail service in Alameda, amend the zoning code to allow for higher-density, mixed-use, multi-family housing in transit-rich locations. (See Where are the Transit Rich Locations in Alameda Spotlight)
- b. **Mixed-Use Shopping Centers.** Amend the zoning code to facilitate the redevelopment and reinvestment in Alameda's single-use retail shopping centers and large open parking lots with higher density mixed-use development with ground floor commercial, service, and office uses, and ~~upper floor~~ multi-family housing.
- c. **Incentives.** Utilize strategic infrastructure investments, public lands, ~~and public/private partnerships, and density bonuses and waivers~~ to incentivize and support mixed-use, transit-oriented development in transit rich locations.



d. **Transportation Demand Management Programs.** Require new developments to include transportation services and facilities, and such as bicycle parking facilities, to support the City's mode shift goals.

e. **Parking Requirements.** Amend the Municipal Code to replace minimum car parking requirements with maximum parking requirements to disincentivize automobile ownership and reduce construction and land costs to help make housing more affordable.

**LU-17 Adaptive Reuse and Restoration.** Support and encourage rehabilitation, restoration, and reuse of existing structures to retain the structure's embodied energy and reduce the generation of waste. (See also Policies LU-25, CC-17 and CC-18).

**Action:**

a. **Intensification and Reinvestment in Existing Buildings.** Promote reinvestment and reuse in existing buildings with façade improvement grant programs and permissive zoning provisions, including facade improvements, accessibility improvements and additional story height to increase the range of uses and richness of the urban fabric while building on the historic character and form.

b. **Innovative Design Solutions.** Encourage and support innovative design solutions for the restoration and reuse of older buildings for new uses, and avoid design solutions that mimic a prior design style.

b. **Existing Materials.** Discourage the removal of existing materials to the extent feasible to promote resource conservation and preservation of existing architectural details and materials. Promote the use of the California Historical Building Code to encourage retention of existing materials.

**LU-18 Alameda Point Waterfront and Town Center Mixed-Use District.** Consistent with the Waterfront and Town Center Specific Plan, create a compact, transit-oriented mixed-use urban core with an iconic main street and vibrant waterfront experience that leverages the unique character and existing assets of the area to catalyze a transformation of the larger Alameda Point area. (See also Policies LU-10 and HE-10).

**Actions:**

a. **Mixed-Use.** Create a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit supportive mixed-use urban waterfront environment designed to provide for a mix of uses that include waterfront and visitor-serving uses, retail, service, entertainment, lodging, recreational, and medium to high-density residential.

b. **Seaplane Lagoon.** Permit uses that promote pedestrian vitality and are oriented to the Seaplane Lagoon, such as a ferry terminal, marinas, viewing platforms, fishing piers, and areas reserved for kayaks and other non-motorized boats. Include "short-duration stop" facilities that support stopping, gathering and viewing with places to sit, interpretive kiosks, integrated water features, public art, and access to the water.

SEE DEFINITIONS IN SECRETARY OF THE INTERIM STANDARDS.

Supportive

\* exterior and interior

"WHILE REGULATION OF OLDER BLDGS. IS PREFERABLE WHEN POSSIBLE, IT MAY NOT BE CONSISTENT WITH INNOVATIVE DESIGN SOLUTIONS."

STRET

rehabilitation



- c. **De-Pave Park.** On the western shore of the Lagoon, support development of "De-Pave Park" consistent with the Public Trust and sensitive to the neighboring Alameda Point Nature Wildlife Reserve Refuge.
- d. **Conservation.** Educate users and enforce restrictions to Breakwater Island and install signs about the sensitivity of the protected bird and mammal species.

**LU-25 Historic Preservation.** Promote the preservation, protection and restoration of historic sites, districts, buildings of architectural significance, and archaeological resources, and properties and public works. (See also Policy HE-7).

**Actions:**

- a. **City-Owned Buildings.** Preserve, maintain and invest in all City-owned buildings and facilities of architectural, historical or aesthetic merit.
- b. **Partnerships.** Work in partnership with property owners, Alameda Unified School District, and non-profit organizations, such as the Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS) to ensure that the city's memorable-historic buildings and landscapes are preserved.
- c. **Property Owner Awareness.** Continue to work to increase owners' and buyers' awareness of the importance of preservation in protecting community character and identity.
- d. **Historic Districts and Monuments.** Designate additional Historic Districts and Monuments to recognize areas or sites with significant historic architectural design character or cultural history.
- e. **Financial and Design Assistance.** Develop financial and design assistance programs to encourage the restoration or preservation of buildings, structures, and sites with architectural, historic or aesthetic merit, such as a Mills Act Program or the Facade Grant Program.
- f. **Demolition Controls.** Maintain demolition controls for historic properties.
- g. **Alterations.** Require that exterior changes to existing-historic buildings be compatible consistent with the building's existing or original architectural design and consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards whenever feasible.
- h. **Archaeological Resources.** Preserve important archaeological resources from loss or destruction and require development to include appropriate mitigation to protect the quality and integrity of these resources.
- i. **Study and Prioritize.** Continue to evaluate and categorize Alameda's architectural and cultural resources to create an up-to-date inventory of historic resources to guide decision making and the creation of improved historic preservation regulations.
- h-j. **California Historic Building Code.** Continue to utilize the California Historic Building Code to facilitate rehabilitation of historic buildings.

INCLUDE  
ADDITIONAL  
3.3.i  
TEXT FROM  
EXISTING  
GENERAL PLAN.  
SEE 7/11/21  
AAPS  
COVER LETTER.

INCLUDE ADDITIONAL 3.3.i TEXT FROM  
EXISTING GENERAL PLAN. SEE 7/11/21 AAPS  
COVER LETTER.

or  
architecturally  
significant

Continue  
to

ADDRESSES  
SECRETARY OF  
THE INTERIOR'S  
STANDARDS  
AS PART  
OF  
HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION  
ORDINANCE  
REVISIONS.

Cultural  
(Historic)  
Resources  
Inventory  
and  
Historic  
Preservation  
Ordinance  
Revisions.

pre-1942 \*



a variety of materials, architectural styles, - ground floor detailing

**e. Gathering Places.** Provide public, open air, gathering places, such as small parks, plazas, outdoor dining opportunities, or other publicly accessible areas to support a mix of residential, commerce, employment, and cultural uses.

**f. Architecture.** Require ~~building offsets and~~ window and door recesses, and variations in building heights to create a rich and visually interesting pedestrian level experience. *See also street front provisions in the Citywide Design Review Manual.*

**LU-31 Gateway Design.** Enhance the design of the gateways into the city.

**Actions:**

**a. Posey-Webster Tubes.** Improve the entry into Alameda and Webster Street by reducing visual clutter from Caltrans signs and signs on adjacent private property and increasing tree planting in the area.

**b. Park Street Bridge.** Improve the Park Street entry into Alameda by upgrading the street lighting, street tree canopy, and sidewalk and bike and pedestrian connections on the Park Street side of the bridge. Work with the Downtown Alameda Business Association on its plan for an iconic entry arch near the Park Street Bridge.

**b.c. High Street Bridge.** Improve landscape treatments at this entrance in conjunction with needed improvements to the High Street/Fernside Boulevard intersection.

**c.d. Miller-Sweeney Bridge and Fruitvale Rail Bridge.** Improve the Fruitvale Avenue entry into Alameda by redesigning Tilden Way to include sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and consistent street tree plantings from Broadway to the Bridge approach. Remove or seismically reinforce the abandoned Fruitvale Rail Bridge, to prevent the risk of collapse on the Miller-Sweeney Bridge in the event of a large earthquake. (See also Abandoned Fruitvale Bridge spotlight in Health & Safety Element).

**d.e. Bay Farm Island Bridge.** Ensure that the design for Bridgeview Park enhances the Bay Farm Island Bridge entry onto the Main Island. Maintain and enhance the wooden bike/ped bridge.

**LU-34 Parking Design.** To maintain the historic character of Alameda and reduce the impact of automobile parking and trips on the environment and character of Alameda, design parking facilities in a manner that decreases their visibility in the urban environment. (See also Policies CC-9 and ME-21).

**Actions:**

**a. Size.** Minimize the size and amount of land dedicated to off-street parking.

**b. Design.** Design parking lots for shared and multiple uses, active parking management, and electric vehicle charging. Parking areas should be well landscaped with shade trees to reduce heat island effects from expansive asphalt surfaces and to screen cars from view. Ensure impacts on Alameda's stormwater system are minimized.

**c. Location.** Place parking inside, below, or behind buildings. Avoid placing parking between the building and the public right of way or the waterfront wherever possible.



c.d. Special Needs. Ensure adequate space and facilities for special needs parking, including parking for seniors, the physically impaired and people with limited mobility options.

**4. Revise and simplify the Land Use Classifications to read as follows.**

**LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS AND DIAGRAM**

The land use diagram and classifications depict and describe the existing and intended location, distribution, intensity, and physical character and form of the development and use of land across the city in support of General Plan policies and State of California Government Code requirements. The Alameda Municipal Code and the Zoning Map determine the appropriate use and intensity and density of development that may be allowed on a specific parcel of land. Zoning district residential density limits or floor area ratio (FAR) limits within the range provided by the General Plan classification shall be considered consistent with the General Plan. State mandated affordable housing density bonuses shall be calculated based upon the permissible zoning density. The General Plan land use classifications, include:

*Existing residential densities are typically 5-13 units per acre.*  
**Low-Density Residential:** The Low-Density Residential areas support neighborhoods of predominantly single family detached homes with some multi-family residential buildings, accessory dwelling units, child care, shared living, assisted living facilities, residential care facilities, a hospital, schools, religious institutions, and home-based businesses. In support of General Plan affordable and fair housing policy goals, the Low Density Residential areas permit a wide variety of housing types, including multifamily housing, a limited range of neighborhood serving uses and residential densities of up to 21 units per acre.

**Medium-Density Residential:** The Medium-Density Residential areas support neighborhoods characterized by a wide variety of housing types, including single family detached homes, attached courtyard homes, multifamily rental buildings, multifamily condominium buildings, shared living, assisted living and residential care facilities. These neighborhoods also include a variety of non-residential uses, including child care, schools, religious institutions, home-based businesses, medical offices and clinics, office buildings, and personal service businesses. The residential density of buildings in these areas varies from 10 to over 100 units per acre. In support of State and General Plan affordable housing, climate change, and transportation policy goals, the Medium Density Residential areas permit a wide variety of housing types, including multifamily housing, a wide variety of complementary commercial and neighborhood serving uses and residential densities of between 30 and 74 units per acre depending on sub area zoning designations and regional housing needs allocation requirements.

**Neighborhood Mixed-Use:** These areas, which were originally developed to serve neighborhood stations for the Alameda commuter rail system, are small, compact, pedestrian-oriented "corner store" neighborhood mixed-use districts with commercial and retail uses on the ground floor and multi-family residential and office uses on upper floors. The ratio of floor area to parcel size (FAR) in these areas is typically 0.5 to 2.0. Mixed-use buildings with residential units above ground floor retail in these areas vary from 30 and 90 units per acre. In support of General Plan affordable housing, climate action, and transportation policy goals, the Neighborhood Mixed Use areas permit multifamily housing above ground floor commercial and service uses with a maximum FAR of 2.0.



- f. **Ferries.** Encourage WETA to replace diesel ferries with low or zero emission ferries.*
- g. **EV Action Plan.** Prepare and adopt an Electric Vehicle Adoption Plan that provides a path forward for increased EV adoption in Alameda, including:*
  - o Bolstering charging infrastructure availability,*
  - o Driving community awareness,*
  - o Facilitating EV adoption, and*
  - o Supporting EV services and innovation.*

**CC-8 Transit Use.** Reduce automobile pollution and greenhouse gas emissions by increasing transit use. (See also Policy ME-16).

**Actions:**

- a. **Partnerships.** Collaborate and partner with AC Transit, Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA), BART, community groups, and employers to provide expanded and more convenient transit services throughout the community as well as to downtown Oakland, San Francisco, and the BART system.*
- b. **Convenience and Frequency.** Work with AC Transit to provide convenient and frequent bus service within a quarter mile of every Alameda residence and business during normal commute hours.*
- c. **Alameda Easy Pass and/or Free Fare Zone.** Work with AC Transit and WETA to develop and fund an "Alameda EasyPass" program that would provide every Alameda resident with a pass for use on any bus or ferry and/or explore a "Free Fare" Zone that allows for free rides within areas of Alameda.*
- d. **Transit Connections.** Improve connections between bus transit and water transit facilities and services, such as a cross-town bus service connecting east and west Alameda to the Ferry Terminal services at Alameda Point.*
- e. **Oakland Connections.** Establish water shuttle service to connect commuters, pedestrians and bicyclists to Oakland and reduce the need to use automobiles to cross the estuary.*
- f. **Transit Priority.** Evaluate the creation of signal priority lanes, transit-only lanes, and queue jump lanes to make transit corridors more efficient and effective.*
- g. **First and Last Mile Connections.** Improve safety and access for shared and active transportation around major transportation nodes.*
- h. **Alameda BART.** Continue to work with BART to include an Alameda BART station in the design of BART's plan for a second San Francisco Bay crossing connecting Oakland and San Francisco.*

**CC-10 Climate-Friendly, Walkable and Transit-Oriented Development.** Reduce reliance on automobile use and reduce vehicle miles traveled by prioritizing walkable, transit-oriented, medium and high density mixed-use development in transit-oriented areas and commercial corridors. (See also Policies LU-33, LU-34 and ME-21).

**Actions:**

- a. **Density, FAR and Transit.** When zoning property or considering commercial, residential or residential mixed-use projects near transit stops, encourage higher densities and floor-area-ratios to make the most efficient use of land, support public transportation, and minimize vehicle miles traveled.*



- ~~a. When zoning property for commercial, residential or residential mixed use near transit stops, generally zone for more ensure higher densities and/or floor area ratios (FAR) on the parcels closest to the highest quality existing or planned transit stops to encourage the most efficient use of land and public resources while minimizing vehicle miles traveled.~~
- b. Parking Requirements.** Revise off-street parking requirements by replacing minimum requirements with maximum requirements to limit the amount of onsite parking allowed with each development in order to reduce reliance on the automobile and automobile ownership.
- c. Transportation Demand Management Ordinance.** Prepare and adopt a Transportation Demand Management Ordinance requiring new development to actively address the mobility of new residents and employees, including but not limited to contributing to annual operations and capital improvements for supplemental transit, water shuttle, land based shuttle services and improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian network.
- d. Pedestrian Only Areas.** Create pedestrian-only areas and create periodic pedestrian-only programs, such as the San Francisco Sunday Streets program to support economic activity in and around transit oriented new development.

**CC-13 Alameda's Building Stock.** Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from natural gas combustion and natural gas leaks.

**Actions:**

- ~~a. **Construction Regulations Existing Buildings.** Prepare and adopt citywide regulations limiting use of natural gas and encouraging and requiring owners of existing buildings to convert natural gas uses to the use of clean energy electricity.~~
- b. New Construction Reach Codes.** Adopt reach codes that eliminate the use of fossil-fuels in all new buildings constructed in Alameda.
- ~~c. **Renovation to Clean Energy.** Develop regulations and incentives to facilitate the conversion of existing buildings with natural gas infrastructure to clean energy alternatives.~~
- ~~d. **Development on City Land.** Limit the use and expansion of natural gas infrastructure on city land to the extent feasible and practicable.~~
- e.c. Rebate Programs.** Support programs that encourage homeowners/commercial building owners to implement electrification retrofits, with an emphasis on Alameda's most vulnerable residents.
- f.d. Partners.** Partner with PG&E and other utility companies to plan for the safe transition from natural gas to clean energy alternatives, including removal of infrastructure that pose hazards when not in use.

REALLY? (HS-30a STILL SAYS "ENCOURAGE")

**CC-14 Energy Efficiency and Conservation.** Promote efficient use of energy and conservation of available resources in the design, construction, maintenance and operation of public and private facilities, infrastructure and equipment.

**Actions:**

- a. Weatherization and Energy Efficient Building Renovations.** Promote investments in building energy efficiency through programs and the streamlining of permitting



moisture-retentive

and other

landscapes that include healthy, drought tolerant soils, diverse native plant species, non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants, and high-efficiency irrigation systems. e.

**b.a. Bay-Friendly Landscapes** Require new developments to comply with landscape ordinances that include healthy, drought tolerant soils, diverse native plant species, and non-invasive drought tolerant/low water use plants in landscaping, and high-efficiency irrigation systems.

**c.b. Water-Efficient Buildings.** Require low-flow fixtures, such as low-flow toilets and faucets in new construction.

—**Recycled and Reclaimed Water.** Promote/Coordinate the production and usage of recycled and reclaimed water (sometimes called “grey water”) for potable and non-potable uses.

**c. Pesticides, Herbicides, and Fertilizers.** Limit the use of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers throughout the city by fostering healthy soil practices, which include organic carbon amendments (e.g. compost and mulch) on all non-turf planting areas.

**d. Soil Health.** Encourage soil health by promoting and educating the public about the benefits of organic carbon soil amendments that improve water retention in local landscapes.

**CC-17 Zero Waste Culture.** Create a zero waste culture by implementing the City of Alameda's 2018 Zero Waste Implementation Plan (ZWIP). (See also Policy HS-36).

**Actions:**

- a. Zero Waste Awareness.** Promote a zero waste culture by developing programs and campaigns that recognize the shared responsibility for each individual to reduce and divert waste from landfill disposal.
- b. Single-Use Plastics.** Work toward eliminating single-use plastic products. Promote and require compostable, recyclable and/or reusable products.
- c. Technical Assistance.** Provide targeted technical assistance for commercial and multi-family waste generators, which have the greatest opportunity to reduce waste sent to landfill.
- d. Green Waste and Food Recovery.** Work with waste management partners to create green waste and food recovery programs and enhance organics management to reduce organic material disposal in landfills and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- e. Salvageable Materials.** Update the City's construction and demolition debris recycling ordinance to include specific incentives or requirements for deconstruction (rather than demolition) of existing buildings to salvage usable building components (lumber, doors, fireplaces, brick) on homes of a certain age.
- f. CAL Green.** Implement CAL Green building code requirements to divert and recycle construction and demolition waste and to use locally-sourced building materials and recycled content building materials, including mulch/compost.
- g. Franchise Agreements.** Expand the high diversion franchise agreement with waste management partner(s) related to recycling, organics, and construction and demolition waste to further support Alameda in reaching its zero waste goal.
- h. Recycling/Reuse.** Support organizations or facilities that help Alameda to recycle or reuse materials.

APPROX ACTION (e) TO ALL BLDGS.

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Reyla Graber <reylagraber@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 11:29 AM  
**To:** Nancy McPeak; Andrew Thomas; Asheshh Saheba; Alan Teague; Hanson Hom; jcavenaugh@alamedaca.gov; Ronald Curtis; Rona Rothenberg; Teresa Ruiz  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] July 7th Revised General Plan

Dear Planning Board :

I would like to call your attention to wording in the draft General Plan that should be reconsidered for change or removal:

**Pg. 2.** It currently reads"... In 1973, soon after the Fair Housing Act in 1968, the voters of Alameda approved a citizens initiative to amend the City Charter ...( re Article 26/measure A).

The phrase "soon after the Fair Housing act in 1968" should be removed. It is obviously but indirectly implying prejudices of Alameda voters 40 years ago which are certainly not proven by the fact that A26 was passed 5 years after the Voting Act.

This phrase should definitely be removed and there are thousands and thousands of current Alameda residents and voters who would agree with my conclusion that the phrasing is not true, not proven, is rude and not necessary and should be removed.

**Pg. 3.** The GP currently says that among the distinctive characteristics of Alameda is its "island setting"

That is true enough but it is not descriptive and is too vague.

I would suggest that additional wording be included such as:

" Alameda is the only island city in SF Bay." or "Alameda is an island city in San Francisco Bay.

This wording is more descriptive and makes it clear where Alameda is located.

**Pg 9 Efficient Land Use:** Currently says "maximize the number of housing units on each acre of residentially zoned lane" . What does that mean? Does that mean that in Fernside for instance if the City maps out an acre of single family homes, the City can tell Fernside that they can now build however many units they want to on that " acre"?I don't understand the current wording and what it means and how it is applied.

**Pg 22:** Converting gas to electricity throughout the City:

To encourage the use of gas may be appropriate but to require it should be carefully considered and given a great deal of thought.

Firstly, we are having electrical power shortages throughout California --correct? Given that, if Alameda should convert to all electrical does that not present potential problems for residents and businesses alike.

And why should the City be so eager to jump on the current bandwagon of "Lets convert to electrical". I know for a fact that in Los Angeles, electrical usage is so expensive that working class people cannot afford it. Therefore, stoves and washing machines etc are always gas powered because the cost of electrical is astronomical.

Given the above it would seem better that the GP to encourages conversion to electrical, but not require it.

And then the City can really study this issue in greater depth.

Thank you,

Reyla Graber

45 years Alameda resident.





July 12, 2021

To: Alameda General Plan 2040 Comments via [alameda2040@alamedaca.gov](mailto:alameda2040@alamedaca.gov)

Andrew Thomas via [athomas@alamedaca.gov](mailto:athomas@alamedaca.gov)

Lara Weisiger via [clerk@alamedaca.gov](mailto:clerk@alamedaca.gov)

RE: Agenda Item 7-C Public Hearing on the Alameda General Plan Update

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Golden Gate Audubon Society (GGAS) and its Alameda Conservation Committee, Friends of the Alameda Wildlife Reserve (FAWR) have two comments about proposed Global Change number 2: "2. Change name of "Alameda Point Wildlife Refuge" to "Alameda Point Nature Reserve" in all policies and on all maps."

- First, we appreciate that the city proposes to standardize the name of the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA's) wildlife reserve on city documents and use the word "reserve" rather than "refuge," as requested by US Fish and Wildlife Service. It will greatly reduce confusion to have a single reference name for the VA's wildlife reserve site.
- Second, however, it would please us very much if the VA's wildlife reserve property could keep the name "Alameda Wildlife Reserve." AWR in particular has been recognized by so many people over the last 27 years. The location was called the Alameda Wildlife Refuge in the beginning (1994), but the name was changed to Alameda Wildlife Reserve at the request of USFWS as they did not want it confused with official National Wildlife Refuges. This happened when the VA took ownership. Friends of the Alameda Wildlife Refuge or FAWR was established in 1994 and has a long history of supporting the endangered Least Terns and other species at the site. FAWR has produced high quality brochures that share history and resources at the reserve. The brochures refer to the site as the Alameda Wildlife Reserve. We've a few hundred left to use. The USFWS and VA have had opportunities to review FAWR's brochures (2 editions) before printing and have accepted the Alameda Wildlife Reserve tag. Creating the name using "nature" instead of "wildlife" would change our acronym to FAPNR and our brochures would become obsolete. As suggested earlier, if the city wants to specify location, Alameda Point Wildlife Reserve might work, but this will become a whole city magnificent resource. Changing the term "wildlife" to "nature" at this time does not support the investment citizens have made to the property over so many years. In addition, the change to "nature" is inconsistent with the reason

for the Reserve, to protect the specific wildlife that nests there, rather than to protect nature in general. Thank you for any thought and consideration for our concerns.

FAWR continues to question the value of a bridge from south shore to Bay Farm Island, given the effect of a bridge on the scenic value of the view from Shore Line Drive toward Bay Farm Island, although we recognize that it would reduce some traffic on the Bay Farm Island bridge.

Very truly yours,

GOLDEN GATE AUDUBON SOCIETY

FRIENDS OF THE ALAMEDA WILDLIFE RESERVE



Glenn Phillips  
Executive Director  
gphillips@goldengateaudubon.org  
510-221-4102



Leora Feeney  
FAWR Co-chair  
[leoraalameda@att.net](mailto:leoraalameda@att.net)  
510-522-0601

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Lesa Ross <lesarross@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 2:00 PM  
**To:** Nancy McPeak; Andrew Thomas; Trish Spencer; Tony Daysog; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; John Knox White  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Revised Plan left out Pools and Recreational land

Dear Planning Board,

Please Keep HBC as a recreational space. Don't rezone HBS as residential, in particular the pool. Consider keeping the HBC pool as one of the few pools still available to lap swimmers, USMS masters swimmers, water aerobics for many seniors, swim lessons for kids, and activity time for summer camps and family swim. Pools are so important to an island community, Alamedans, and people who work here are struggling to find places to swim.

We currently have two pools at the Alameda Pool Association and two public pools at the high schools. Both pairs have limited lap swim, no aqua aerobics, and no or limited lessons. There's a private pool at the Encinal Yaught Club, but it's very difficult to become a member - I've tried! Also Mariner Square has an indoor pool, but it's all the way across the island and they're struggling as well to survive.

Please consider saving most of HBC as recreational for the community at large and people like me in HOA's with no recreational space but still paying for CHBIOA and all of the services it provides to HBC. I believe that's part of why that space is recreational/commercial.

Limit how much of the space can be redeveloped. Don't make it so easy for HBC owners and developers to take away a valuable asset to our community. I urge you to save the club, buildings, greenbelt, and pool for exercisers, swimmers, childcare, lessons, senior memberships, and family memberships. Don't rezone all of it! Maybe a few of the underutilized tennis courts can provide enough housing and help fund the recreational facilities that are so desperately needed by families and the community at large. This is not just Harbor Bay people. We are people from all over the island, the business park, and nearby Oakland and San Leandro.

Lesla Ross

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Patricia Gannon <pg3187@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 2:18 PM  
**To:** Hanson Hom; Rona Rothenberg; Nancy McPeak; Andrew Thomas; asaheba@alameda.gov; Alan Teague; jcavanaugh@alamedaca.gov; Ronald Curtis; rtuiz@alamedaca.gov  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] latest revisions to General Plan

Dear Planning Board"

I respectfully request the following changes to the latest revisions to the General Plan:

The words "soon after the Fair Housing Act" should be removed. Article 26 was added 5 years after the Fair Housing Act.

Alameda is the ONLY city in San Francisco Bay. That fact needs to be emphasized.

Clarify the phrase "maximize the number of housing units on each acre of residentially zoned land What does that actually mean or how it will be applied.

The city needs to be cautious all gas appliances to electricity considering the number of blackouts currently being experienced. Conversion should b implemented very cautiously.

Thank you.

Patricia M. Gannon  
1019 Tobago Lane  
Alameda, 94502  
[pg3187@gmail.com](mailto:pg3187@gmail.com)

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Lesa Ross <lesarross@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 3:19 PM  
**To:** City Clerk; Andrew Thomas; Nancy McPeak  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Attention Planning Board: No to the RE-ZONE At Harbor Bay Isle Resolution 2021

<https://www.harborbay.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/NO-to-the-RE-ZONE-at-Harbor-Bay-Isle-Resolution-2021.pdf>

SKM C65821051317570

Title: SKM\_C65821051317570 Created Date: 5/13/2021 5:57:43 PM

[www.harborbay.org](http://www.harborbay.org)

Above is the resolution from CHBIOA.

Below is a document with the history of the agreement with the city, landowner, and developer.

<https://harborbayneighbors.wordpress.com/timeline-of-harbor-bay-club/>

### Timeline of Harbor Bay Club | Harbor Bay Neighbors

On September 25, 2013, over 80 Harbor Bay homeowners listened to Harbor Bay Neighbors spokesman Tim Coffey present this timeline to the CHBIOA Master Board of Directors, accompanied by a press release. The historical documents reveal Cowan was allowed to build additional homes on Harbor Bay acreage originally designated as recreation space. The City of Alameda...

[harborbayneighbors.wordpress.com](http://harborbayneighbors.wordpress.com)

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** ps4man@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 4:03 PM  
**To:** Xiomara Cisneros; Rona Rothenberg; Teresa Ruiz; Ronald Curtis; Asheshh Saheba; Alan Teague; Hanson Hom; Nancy McPeak  
**Cc:** Andrew Thomas; Eric Levitt; Yibin Shen; Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; Malia Vella; John Knox White; Trish Spencer; Tony Daysog; Lara Weisiger  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 7-C July 12 Planning Board Agenda-Public Hearing on the Alameda General Plan Update

Dear President Teague and Board Members Cisneros, Curtis, Hom, Rothenberg, Ruiz and Saheba:

I am very concerned about those parts of the Land Use chapter of the proposed General Plan Update that provide for increased residential density to a minimum of 30 units per acre in all residential and mixed use parcels other than in the R-1 zoning district. If implemented, this would violate Article 26 of the Charter and also be inconsistent with our current zoning ordinances.

The reason for my concern is that under the California Housing Accountability Act (Govt. Code. Sec. 65589.5) a city cannot require lower density than provided in objective standards contained in the general plan and zoning ordinances, except where there are specific health and safety issues that cannot be mitigated. The law goes on provide at subsection (j)(4) that if there is an inconsistency between the general plan and the zoning ordinance the density provided in the general plan prevails.

***"For purposes of this section, a proposed housing development project is not inconsistent with the applicable zoning standards and criteria, and shall not require a rezoning, if the housing development project is consistent with the objective general plan standards and criteria but the zoning for the project site is inconsistent with the general plan."***

Language in the introductory paragraph of Section 4 of the proposed Land Use Chapter (p. 14) may indicate the intent of the drafter to avoid these conflicts by stating that the zoning ordinances and zoning map determine the density of any particular development, but that statement is contrary to the Housing Accountability Act quoted above. Therefore adopting the proposed density increases in the general plan allows a minimum density of 30 units per acre for every residential/mixed use parcel in the city other than those situate in a R-1 district. This increased density would violate Article 26 of the Charter and is beyond the authority of the Planning Board or the Council to accomplish in either the General Plan or zoning ordinances.

The only provision for densities above 21 units per acre should be in confined to the Housing Element chapter of the general plan where Article 26 is pre-empted by state law to the extent necessary to meet our RHNA obligation.

The specific parts of the Land Use chapter that would violate the Charter, if adopted are, Section 3 at subsections LU-2 (f), LU-15 (a), LU-16, and all of Section 4 (Land Use Classifications). I urge you to delete all of the offending language from the General Plan Update.

Paul S Foreman

## Nancy McPeak

---

**From:** Carole Robie <crobie32@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 9:14 PM  
**To:** Nancy McPeak; Andrew Thomas; Asheshh Saheba; Alan Teague; Hanson Hom; jcavenaugh@alamedaca.gov; Ronald Curtis; Rona Rothenberg; Teresa Ruiz  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Revised General Plan  
  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

To: Members of the Planning Board:

I have concerns about some of the wording in the draft General Plan that should be changed:

**Pg. 2.** Reads"... In 1973, soon after the Fair Housing Act in 1968, the voters of Alameda approved a citizens initiative to amend the City Charter ...( re Article 26/measure A).

The phrase "soon after the Fair Housing act in 1968" should be removed. because it implies bias and prejudice of Alameda voters, neither of which are proven and it is an unnecessary prejudicial statement.

**Pg. 3.** The General Plan currently says that among the distinctive characteristics of Alameda is its "island setting".

.I suggest a clearer statement such as "Alameda is an island city in San Francisco Bay.

**Pg 9** Efficient Land Use: Currently says "maximize the number of housing units on each acre of residentially zoned lane" . What does that mean and how would it be applied?

**Pg 22:** Converting gas to electricity throughout the City:

To encourage the use of electricity may be appropriate, but to require it should be carefully studied, and a specific plan should be outlined..

Keep in mind that we are having electrical power shortages throughout California. Does California have the capacity for the State to be 100% electric? What would be the backup plan when the State power grids go down? Are you advocating that all housing goes solar?

I appreciate the work you do in keeping our community a wonderful place to live for the last 82 years.

Carole Robie