

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2016

1. CONVENE

President Knox White called the meeting to order at 7:03pm.

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Henneberry led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: President Knox White, Board Members Burton, Henneberry, Köster, Sullivan, Zuppan. Board Member Mitchell arrived during the staff presentation for item 7-A (approx. 7:30pm).

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

President Knox White moved one Board Communications item to the beginning of the meeting.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

*****Board Communications*****

President Knox White read a proclamation honoring Board Member Henneberry's service to the Planning Board.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

None

7. REGULAR

AGENDA

ITEMS

7-A 2016-3055

Discuss the Existing Conditions and Goals/Objectives of the Citywide Transit and Transportation Demand Management Plan and a Potential Expanded Transportation Management Association

Staff Member Ott gave the staff presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2764543&GUID=FF248D2A-7E04-4877-89DC-83ECC7CD81BC&FullText=1>

The consultants from CDM Smith gave a presentation on current conditions in the city.

Board Member Burton asked about an “obsolete ordinance” in the staff report. He asked that the O Club parking be added to the available inventory in the report on current conditions. He asked that the South SF Ferry numbers be included as well.

Staff Member Ott explained the narrow, employer based focus of the ordinance in question.

Board Member Burton asked if there was a reason the BART ridership numbers seemed to have declined.

Staff Member Ott said that perhaps people that tried the ferry during the BART strike did not switch back.

Board Member Sullivan asked how the goal of no net new drive alone trips is possible given the 2200 new housing units that would be coming on line. She asked if Alameda can control bus frequency and reliability. She asked how parking concerns of the business community would be addressed in the parking management plan. She asked if the costs of managing these plans would be transparent.

Staff Member Ott said that the goal is to shift more people to high occupancy vehicles, increase ferry ridership and add jobs to Alameda to reduce drive alone trips off the island. She said they wanted to be aggressive in setting their goals. She explained the ways they can influence AC Transit to meet the goals of the City with bus service. She said that the City would continue to meet with the business associations to account for their concerns with respect to parking and not create too much of a disincentive for certain businesses to locate in Alameda because of the parking issues. She said any capital or operating costs would be laid out for policymakers to weigh in on.

Board Member Köster explained some of the costs associated with different transbay transit options which might contribute to the BART drop off and how people decide which mode to take.

Board Member Henneberry asked how long the City has been at capacity at the tubes.

The consultant said they do not have that data. He said the backup has worsened in large part due to the inability of 880 to handle its increased volumes.

Board Member Zuppan asked what the criteria is for the claim that the island is “well served by transit.” She said the frequency of transit service is down since she moved to the island. She asked what the incentives were that they referred to when talking about drive alone trips.

The consultant said there is not any standard data but that Alameda has more transit service than most cities of its size. He said things like free parking at their destination or lower costs are incentives for drive alone trips.

Board Member Mitchell asked about the bike and pedestrian safety plan. He said incorporating a safety plan for bikes and pedestrians would be an important part of any strategy.

The consultant said that safety is a very important feature of providing successful transportation alternatives. He said that for this project they would focus on making good connections to the transit options.

President Knox White asked how we were defining “optimum supply of parking.” He asked how replacing a drive alone trip with an Uber or Lyft is meeting our goals.

The consultant said it was about “right-sizing” the parking amounts for the developments. He said the ridesharing services can help people for middle of the day trips when transit service might not be as robust.

President Knox White opened the public hearing.

Tyler Savage asked about current versus expected levels of awareness for transit options and how that would affect ridership. He said he did not see another bus line to BART having a significant impact. He asked if we are requiring developers to help fund transit and whether the trip reduction goals are based on current or projected numbers.

President Knox White closed the public hearing.

Staff Member Thomas explained the requirements on developers to fund transit. He said the 10-30% goals are for new developments’ projected trips generated.

Board Member Zuppan said she would like to see ways to get employees into Alameda workplaces as a focus of the plan, not just how to get residents off the island. She said the data does not account for people that change modes fluidly. She said developing the baseline and the target is important. She said she does not think we are well served by transit. She said we need to get more service from transit agencies because we have demonstrated our willingness to use it. She said putting the free shuttle as a tradeoff with AC Transit service is the wrong framing and that it could be complimentary. She said we need to account for residential parking for how people really use it and not just rely on the theoretical. She said there are no transportation options to the South Bay.

Board Member Henneberry agreed that there were no good options for people heading south. He said hopefully we will be able to improve our jobs-housing imbalance as the base gets built out.

Board Member Mitchell said he wants to make sure we integrate a bike and pedestrian safety plan now and not pass it off for later. He said an intra-island shuttle could be a good thing for other transit agencies and not just in competition.

Board Member Köster said a ferry to ferry bus service could be an effective tool for getting people to transit nodes. He said realtors and rental properties should provide a guide to transit alternatives to new residents. He said he liked the idea of giving transit priority and the signal it sends to people stuck in their cars.

Board Member Sullivan said having a baseline to measure success against is important. She said a shuttle to the ferries is critical.

Board Member Burton said that commute hour backup is issue 1 through 100. He said we should focus on those issues like a laser. He echoed the desire to set the baseline and benchmarks that success would be judged against. He said many of the objectives laid out are vague and distract from the primary goals. He said the goal of increasing multi-modal mobility within Alameda ignores biking, which should be the number one way to get people out of their cars within Alameda by completing our bike infrastructure. He said we should be blunt about the parking objective and it should be to provide the least amount of necessary to make a project work.

President Knox White said he also thought biking and walking are overlooked in the plan. He said he is concerned that the multi-modal aspects of the TDM plan is becoming subservient to the transit plan aspect of the process. He said it would be good to add the crossing volumes to the report. He said we have a lot more young families with two working parents now compared to houses with senior citizens that are not commuting. He said normalizing the metrics is important. He said he wants to make sure we evaluate whether an intra-island shuttle would help us meet our actual goals. He said the City is making it more difficult for pedestrians in our business districts, in conflict with our General Plan. He said the City's projects need to be consistent with these policies and not just holding developers to these standards. He said we need to prioritize safety not just emphasize it. He said we are one of the few cities that could potentially implement a peak hour road charge.

Board Member Zuppan said a free Alameda shuttle would serve BART and the ferries and change behavior patterns.

No action was taken.

7-B 2016-3056

Hold a Public Hearing to Consider: Block 7 Design Review, Block 6 Design Review, Block 10 Design Review and Use Permit, and Site A Phase 1 Tentative Map.

Board Member Burton recused himself from item 7-B.

Staff Member Thomas introduced the item. The staff report and attachments can be found at <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2764544&GUID=2B3D5109-7088-49EF-8BD6-909A26DF166D&FullText=1>

Jessica Music, KTG Y, gave a presentation on the design of Block 6 at Alameda Point.

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

Dennis O'Kelly, BCV architects, and April Phillips, landscape architect, gave a presentation on the design of Block 10.

Board Member Sullivan asked about only having two trees in the middle of a large hardscape of Block 10.

Ms. Phillips explained what their vision is for the open space and why a lot of trees might not work with their flexible goals for the space.

Board Member Köster asked if the silos on the building at Block 10 would be functional or decorative.

Mr. O'Kelly said that depending on what tenant they end up with will dictate what uses they go with for the silos.

Board Member Köster asked about visit ability of all the units which have steps up to the entrance.

Staff Member Thomas said it is an issue they are grappling with all over the city and trying to address in the Universal Design ordinance.

Board Member Köster asked how package delivery would work and whether the decision was made that the community building at the corner of Block 6 was deemed not necessary.

Ms. Music said parcels would likely be placed on the porch like they would for a single family home. She said the community building was going to be confusing if it was for private use and increase HOA fees to maintain it, and that it why it was removed.

Board Member Zuppan asked where the utility boxes would end up. She raised concern over where residents can take their dogs out to meet their needs.

Mr. Hesse pointed out the locations they are considering for clustering the utilities.

Board Member Zuppan asked how the bocce courts would be maintained and supplied.

Ms. Phillips said it would be part of their facilities management and taken care of as part of the retail operations.

Board Member Mitchell asked for further details of the landscape water management and usage, and whether there was any grey water usage.

The landscape architect for Block 6 explained the high percolation soil and plants they would use. He said they would not have grey water systems but would have purple pipe installed with the project.

President Knox White asked why some of the smaller streets have trees on only one side.

Staff Member Thomas said that the street plan has been separated from the buildings and would be coming back for its own review and approval.

President Knox White opened the public hearing.

Karen Bey thanked the developer and team for a great project. She said she encourages approval of the designs for Blocks 6,7, & 10.

President Knox White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Sullivan said she was concerned with the California pepper trees and how they would be handled. She said the wooden panels on Block 7 did not look integrated and would not age well.

Board Member Mitchell said he likes the changes to Block 6. He said Block 7 has a good design and is okay with the wood paneling. He said he has some concerns with how the utility boxes are ultimately handled. He said he liked the flexibility of the spaces in Block 10. He said he wanted to make sure there was drinking fountain access. He said he is ready to see all three move forward.

Board Member Köster thanked the teams for all the work they have put into these buildings. He said he liked the design of Block 6. He said as you turn the corner there could be some more differentiation between units on Block 6. He said he liked how Block

7 related to the rest of Alameda Point. He said he liked the adaptability of Block 10. He liked the idea of collecting rainwater in the silos for use on the site.

Board Member Henneberry said the developer did a good job. He said he liked the previous design w/ the relief of the pegasus wing at the corner of Block 6. He liked the sawtooth design of Block 7.

Board Member Zuppan said she wants to make sure there are walk in showers in the universally designed units. She said she was concerned that the Monterey Pines and Blue Agave would not work well next to each other. She echoed Board Member Köster's comment about breaking up the long, uniform walls, suggesting differentiated colors. She said she liked the wood paneling. She said we need to have a place for packages to be delivered instead of leaving them on the front steps in such a high traffic, transit oriented development. She said she would like more than the minimum to be visitable to people with mobility issues. She said she is excited about Block 10 and hopes it takes off. She said she liked the idea of more color in Block 10, but maybe not that shade of yellow. She said she is concerned about the logs in the center of the site but is willing to give it a try. She said the utility boxes were the main concern of the tentative map.

President Knox White said he will not be supporting Blocks 6 & 7. He said they are not consistent with the commitments made to reduce traffic with this development. He said that he would hope that these specific materials are used and not allowed to use approximations of these materials. He said he would like to see language limiting the roles of the HOAs. He said he is wondering why there is a 20 foot wide one way road past Block 10. He said it will result in many cars going right through what was planned as a pedestrian plaza. He said we should require that the new building maintain see through visibility from Atlantic to the interior of Block 10.

Staff Member Thomas listed potential conditions for approval of Block 6: bring back the tentative map providing information for phasing of improvements along Main St., street trees along the two side streets, the bike lane on C St., and the right hand turn lane exiting Alameda Point; modify the conditions to include a reference to the displayed color and material board (or higher quality); making sure the landscape plans address the needs of pets; adding the standard window condition for the 2 inch recess; securing roof decks from allowing materials that could fly off; a condition of approval for staff to see the location and screening of utility boxes before building permits are issued; clarifying the showers v. tubs in the universal design units; addressing package delivery; and, limiting the HOA's scope to maintaining public facilities.

Board Member Mitchell made a motion to approve Block 6 with the conditions laid out by Staff Member Thomas, except the condition regarding the HOA. Board Member Köster seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-1 (Knox White).

Staff Member Thomas listed potential conditions for approval of Block 7: addressing the universal design question; utility location and screening; landscape design accounting for pet needs; window design requirements; conformance with the color and materials board.

Board Member Mitchell made a motion to approve Block 7 with the conditions listed by Staff Member Thomas. Board Member Köster seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-2 (Sullivan & Knox White).

Staff Member Thomas listed potential conditions for approval of Block 10: presence and location of drinking fountains; utility location and screening; a condition about seeing through the new building fronting Atlantic.

Board Member Köster made a motion to approve Block 10 with the conditions listed by Staff Member Thomas. Board Member Sullivan seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-1 (Knox White).

Board Member Mitchell made a motion to continue the tentative map to July 11th, 2016. Board Member Sullivan seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

The resolutions can be found at: https://alamedaca.gov/sites/default/files/document-files/department-files/Planning/2016_planning_board_resos_june-july_2016_reduced_2.pdf

8. MINUTES

****None****

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2016-3057

Zoning Administrator and Design Review Recent Actions and Decisions

No items were called for review.

9-B 2016-3058

Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Community Development Department Projects

None

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board Member Zuppan made a motion to continue the meeting to 11:05pm. Board Member Henneberry seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

Board Member Zuppan spoke about the Governor's May budget revision which included requirements to allow a lower affordable housing requirements than Alameda has and prevents ministerial reviews like design review. She asked for an update from staff and to make sure that we oppose it.

Staff Member Thomas said that there were some delays on that legislation and that they were planning to bring it to Council to possibly take a position. He said the implementation would be very tricky and aspects of the proposal are unclear at this time.

Board Member Henneberry thanked the board, staff & public for their assistance and support while on the board. He highlighted what he felt were the highlights of his term including significant progress on rebuilding the NAS, Del Monte phase one, beginning to look at the Bachelor Officers Quarters (AUSD) and the Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (City of Alameda) as workforce housing and the unique architecture in the triangle area of Alameda landing.

He voiced significant displeasure, though, with political discourse that has evidenced itself in the city since the 2014 election. Specifically, he objected to a narrative around town and in city hall that says city staff is not valued and constantly suspect of devious and nefarious motives even when items as simple as bike lanes and as straight forward as traffic were concerned. He specifically objected to board member Dania Alvarez not being reappointed to the board because the Mayor couldn't tell the difference between a dedicated citizen volunteer and a political adversary. He stated he was not surprised by the Mayor not reappointing him but urged members of the city council to object to positions taken by the mayor that they considered wrong and were deleterious to the city. Henneberry wrapped up his comments by saying he was hopeful for reappointment in 2018 or earlier if the political winds change.

11-A 2016-3059

Report from the Boatworks - Ad-Hoc Sub-Committee

None

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Knox White adjourned the meeting at 11:06pm.