

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, MAY 23, 2016

1. CONVENE

President Knox White called meeting to order at 7:01pm.

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Mitchell led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: President Knox White, Board Members Burton, Mitchell, Sullivan. Board Member Zuppan arrived at 7:09pm. Board Member Henneberry arrived at 8:00pm.
Absent: Board Member Köster.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

President Knox White moved item 7-C to the beginning of the regular agenda to maintain quorum and in anticipation of Board Member Burton recusing himself for items 7-A and 7-B.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Rachel Campos gave an update on Phase Zero activities at Site A at Alameda Point.

Anonymous Painter raised concerns about the condition and negative effects of the former Christmas tree lot on Webster St.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6-A 2016-2927

Approve a Resolution Finding that the Harbor Bay Entities have Demonstrated Good Faith Compliance with the Terms and Conditions of Development Agreement, DA-89-1, through April 4, 2016, Based on the Findings Contained in the Draft Resolution. This Compliance Review is not a project under CEQA

Board Member Burton made a motion to approve the consent calendar. Board Member Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

7. REGULAR

AGENDA

ITEMS

Item 7-A was moved back to its original position on the agenda because the applicant for 7-C was not yet present and Board Member Zuppan arrived, establishing a quorum. Board Member Burton recused himself for item 7-A.

7-A 2016-2928

Public Hearing on the Scope of the Encinal Terminals Focused
Supplemental Environmental Impact Report.

Staff Member Thomas introduced the item and gave the staff report. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2722798&GUID=7337A724-1EF6-4984-B097-5FEFBAD2C0CA&FullText=1>

President Knox White explained that the board would not be addressing the project itself, only on the scope of the EIR.

Board Member Mitchell asked what number of housing units the 2008 EIR assumed.

Staff Member Thomas said it studied approximately 260 housing units and a large amount of commercial square feet. The new proposal has 580 housing units and much less commercial space.

President Knox White opened the public hearing.

Dorothy Freeman said people attending the community meetings did not want high rise buildings as a consequence of requesting more open space. She said allowing high rise buildings would be a bad precedent for Alameda. She suggested housing units be priced for median income residents.

Paul Foreman spoke about the jobs/housing imbalance in Alameda and how it impacts city finances. He said reducing the amount of available land for commercial use will preclude us from being able to address this issue in the future.

Elizabeth Tuckwell said impacts of shade cast by buildings should be considered, as well as views. She also said water pollution from increased units needs to be considered.

President Knox White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Mitchell suggested population & housing (p. 76) should be looked at due to the increase in units. He asked why we should not look at school impacts.

Staff Member Thomas said that state law is very specific on the issue and says that since the school district collects impact fees, the outcome of the EIR on the school issues will be the same.

Board Member Mitchell said that information would be helpful for the public to evaluate the issues more clearly. He said the drought has become much more severe since the previous EIR and that we might want a fresh look at water supply impacts.

Board Member Sullivan said she would like to see an updated look at the schools issue. She questioned the information about Wood School's enrollment.

Board Member Zuppan asked why geology and soil impacts would not need to be studied due to the potential for much taller buildings.

Staff Member Thomas explained how the 2008 report required proper geotechnical studies and mitigation for whatever size buildings are proposed.

Board Member Zuppan explained that approving the study is not the same as approving the project.

Staff Member Thomas said CEQA is basically a disclosure law and approving an EIR does not equate to approving the project.

President Knox White confirmed that we would be using the updated thresholds of significance and transit corridor travel time.

Staff Member Thomas said they would be looking at vehicle miles traveled and transit times. He said they would provide information on level of service at intersections.

Board Member Zuppan confirmed the traffic impacts would include comparisons to a "do nothing" alternative.

Staff Member Thomas summarized the feedback and said they would be adding sections on: population and housing, utilities, and public services. He also said they can look at the shade and view corridors in response to the public comment.

7-B 2016-2929

Planning Board Workshop: Provide Direction on Alameda Point Site A: (1) Blocks 6 and 7 Architectural Design, (2) Blocks 6 and 7 Parking Design, (3) West Atlantic Gateway Design and (4) Street Names for Side Streets.

Staff Member Thomas introduced the item. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2722801&GUID=522F8B64-EA88-4043-8F0B-87EBBCF41B2D&FullText=1>

Jessica Music, KTGy architect for Block 6, gave a presentation on the architecture of Block 6.

Peter Hesse, architect for Block 7, gave a presentation on Block 7.

Mr. Dorfman, applicant, spoke to the question of bundling the parking with the townhomes and why it is needed for these units.

Board Member Sullivan confirmed that all the units in Blocks 6 and 7 will be for sale. She confirmed that there were no private courtyards or backyard spaces. She asked what type of customer they envisioned.

Mr. Dorfman said they believed young families would be their primary customer.

Board Member Sullivan said she does not understand how that would work given the lack of private, secure space for small children and questioned the applicant's research. She asked what the price range would be.

Mr. Dorfman said the type of product was common and consistent in Alameda and throughout the Bay Area and very popular. He said they would be comparable to other units currently being sold in Alameda (possibly \$800k-\$1M).

President Knox White opened the public hearing.

Jerry Serventi said that Block 6 should really start looking like the housing across the street in the rest of Alameda. He liked that there were units fronting onto Main St. He said he preferred option 3 for the corner that does not have a large element announcing entry to the base. He suggested maintaining street names instead of having them change.

Vicky Sedlack said she looks forward to the different types of housing units coming to the base. She liked how the designs tied into the base. She said she supports tying the parking to the units to support the infrastructure investment required.

Karen Bey said Site A is the best project going in Alameda right now. She said she looked forward to seeing this type of product coming to Alameda. She said she preferred option 3 for the corner on Block 6. She said the developer should have the right to select the names of the streets.

Elizabeth Tuckwell said she did not see a lot of attention paid to bicycle lanes. She said that would be more important than unbundled parking.

President Knox White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Mitchell said he liked the clean design of Block 7. He said Block 6 is a great looking project. He said he wants the transition to just be another part of Alameda and not have signage announcing entry to Alameda Point. He said he would hate to see the quality of the project downgraded due to a 2% change in traffic and, therefore, is comfortable offering the bundled parking. He said young families without private outdoor space tend to get out more.

Board Member Sullivan said she did not like the row of orange doors on Block 7. She said the project had a flat feel in parts. She said she would like to see more diversity with the front doors.

Board Member Zuppan said she liked the dark mullions and wood features of Block 7. She liked the ability to add solar to the tilted roofs, the roof patio and stairs, and accessible units. She said there is a lack of rhythm to the frontage of W. Atlantic. She said Block 6 is very attractive. She liked the previous imagery with the transit stop in the middle of the gateway.

Staff Member Thomas said the bus lanes were moved to the outside lanes in consultation with AC Transit.

Board Member Zuppan liked options one and two for the gateway because it was more inviting to the public. She felt option three sends the message that this space is not for you. She said she was concerned with the location of the mailboxes and hoped that they would be large enough to accommodate packages. She wants to make sure the benches are in places where there is a reason to linger there. She said she wondered if there was a more attractive option than checker block paving. She said she wanted the CC&Rs to allow dogs. She said trees are to shade pedestrians and if they are in the street they will be targets for car bumpers. She suggested some reference to the history of the base if there is an open plaza at the gateway. She said the parking arrangement meets the requirements and does not have a problem with it being bundled. She said the garages could be used for storage as well.

Board Member Henneberry said the renderings look good. He said he agreed with Board Member Zuppan on the parking question and has no problem with the plan. He said he liked the wing in option two for the gateway. He said Yorktown would make more sense than York for a street name. He said some of the street names do not tie into the Navy theme.

President Knox White said that the list of available street names has many options that would pay proper respect to the base's history and the people who worked there. He said he would favor keeping the Appezzato name on Alameda Point instead of changing names. He said he has concerns about the durability of the wood grain siding. He said he liked option three for the gateway. He said the Master Plan said to try and integrate the neighborhood seamlessly. He said he does not believe the parking plan is consistent with the transportation plan for the project. He said it would be more transparent to address this issue as a variance instead of pretending like it is in compliance because the buildings are not connected.

Board Member Mitchell said he agreed with President Knox White that changing from Appezzato to Atlantic would be confusing and that perhaps we could dig a little deeper for more appropriate names on some of the other streets.

Board Member Henneberry said he prefers West Atlantic to continuing Appezzato. He said he is more concerned with some of the other names, like Buckthorn, which is an invasive species.

Board Member Sullivan said she likes the phrase “When the Atlantic meets the Pacific” and that it should stay Atlantic on the base because Appezzato had nothing to do with the base.

Board Member Zuppan said she can see both sides of the street name question.

Staff Member Thomas asked the board to discuss the question of placing trees in the street a little more.

Board Member Sullivan said trees in the street will not shade sidewalk users and become damaged by cars.

Board Member Zuppan said she prefers them on the sidewalk to shade pedestrians.

Board Member Henneberry said he had not given it much thought, but that he would not want to back into a tree.

President Knox White said this design is used in many places and he would be more concerned if people could not miss a tree.

7-C 2016-2930

Planning Board Study Session: Alameda Landing Waterfront Park Design and Land Use Program Revision

Staff Member Thomas introduced the item. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2722802&GUID=645CC4C1-364F-44AC-A0AA-42FD3A17D0C1&FullText=1>

Sean Whiskeman, from Catellus, gave a presentation on their proposal for the site.

Board Member Henneberry asked what the percentage of affordable housing would be for the site.

Staff Member Thomas said the minimum would be 15%, but the developer is currently proposing 16% of the base project be affordable and would seek a density bonus.

Board Member Zuppan asked if she was correct in understanding that the developer had already gotten approval in the past to change the approved plan to add more housing to pay for the investment needed in the site. She asked what the fiscal impact was to the changes.

Staff Member Thomas confirmed that they had changed the plan in 2006 to add housing at Alameda Landing. He explained the assessments on the properties would make the project fiscally neutral.

Board Member Zuppan confirmed that the sales tax from the retail at Alameda Landing would be applied towards the fiscal neutrality of the entire project.

Board Member Sullivan said she would like to see the expected revenue stream from commercial vs. residential for the project.

Board Member Mitchell asked about the longevity of the current wharf and how pressing the issue is for the current commercial tenants on site.

Staff Member Thomas said it is a big strong structure that had railroad cars on it. He said the big concern is that in an earthquake it will move laterally and topple into the estuary.

President Knox White asked to confirm that the large amount of rot and work needed was the reason Clif Bar chose not to relocate to the site and no other project has moved forward.

Staff Member Thomas and the applicant explained the combination of reasons Clif Bar did not follow through.

The applicant explained that the soil on land behind the wharf is what really threatens the wharf in the long term and that is what really changed the calculations since the 2006 redesign.

Board Member Burton asked why there was a greenway along Mitchell Ave. He asked why the hotel was sited where it was.

The applicant explained that there were easements that prevented building there, namely the high voltage power lines. He said the hotel was placed where it is because of parking availability, prominence, and adjacency to the retail component.

Board Member Burton asked if and when Mitchell Ave would connect to Main St.

Staff Member Thomas said that the third phase of Alameda Landing would extend Mitchell to the Bay Ship & Yacht property line. He said Bay Ship & Yacht has seven acres of vacant land they want to redevelop and Mitchell is part of that conversation.

President Knox White opened the public hearing.

Mike Kraft said the traffic getting through the tube into Alameda is much worse since Alameda Landing opened. He said getting jobs on the island that could afford the housing being built is important. He said the dirt generated by Catellus' work is having severe impacts on the motoryacht he lives on. He is asking that these impacts be accounted for if phase three goes forward.

Courtney Shepler said she is a resident of Alameda Landing and supports the plan. She said a business park would not be the best use of the waterfront and would leave the waterfront empty on the weekends.

Daniel Alhadeff, representing Starlight Marine, explained the high environmental standards their business meets. He said the working waterfront needs to be protected as plans move forward. He said he supports the Catellus plan.

President Knox White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Burton said he can be supportive of the change in use but that there would be a lot of work to do to convince the community about why it is necessary. He said he would like to push the restaurants out towards the water. He said having large, open, passive spaces between the two active ends of the waterfront park would be a good use. He suggested looking into more maker, supportive marine, or light industrial uses within the sight to provide jobs even if the office space market is not there.

Board Member Sullivan said the housing crisis is not for million dollar homes but for homes for young families starting out. She said she feels the park is hostage to adding new homes and asks where the jobs for these people would be.

Board Member Henneberry said affordability is important and would like to see those numbers go up. He said, however, the amount of affordable housing is zero if nothing gets done. He said if we want to move forward, this project can be done the right way to achieve our goals.

Board Member Mitchell said he understands the property needs a lot of work, but agrees with Board Member Burton that there is work to be done with the public before it moves forward.

Board Member Zuppan said there needs to be a balance with commercial at this site. She said the housing at the first two phases was supposed to contribute funds to get this site done. She said she could maybe be supportive of some housing but it has to have a significant jobs component.

President Knox White said he was a little disappointed that this was almost 100% housing. He said it is clear that the project has turned out to be more difficult since previous plans were approved. He said he wants to see more commercial spaces of some type on the

site. He said we do still have large areas available for commercial development in the city. He said he would like to see universally designed buildings and not more townhomes. He said he would like to see smaller homes built at this site. He said the only way to address housing costs is to build more housing. He said we will not be able to subsidize enough housing to address the supply problem. He said we need more commercial with good jobs for this site.

Board Member Burton made a motion to continue the meeting past 11:00 pm if necessary. Board Member Sullivan seconded the motion. The motion failed.

8. MINUTES

None

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2016-2931

Zoning Administrator and Design Review Recent Actions and Decisions

No action taken

9-B 2016-2932

Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Community Development Department Projects

Staff Member Thomas said a special meeting has been added for June 22nd, a Wednesday. He said he would not be present for June 13th. He outlined what projects are coming in the June meetings.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

None

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Knox White adjourned the meeting at 10:55pm.