

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2017

1. CONVENE

President Köster convened the meeting at 7:00pm

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Knox White led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: President Köster, Board Members Burton, Curtis, Knox White, Sullivan. Board Member Zuppan arrived at 7:30pm. Board Members Mitchell arrived at 9:52pm.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

None

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Arnold Brillinger, from Commission on Disability Issues, said Alameda should make every new home visitable to those with disabilities.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6-A 2017-3805

PLN15-0198 - 1926 Park Street - Applicant: Bridgett Shank on behalf of Park Esquina, LLC. Public Hearing to consider approval of a landscape plan for a previously approved development project. The Planning Board approved a Design Review and Conditional Use Permit for a two-building mixed use development with a condition of approval that required final landscape plan approval by the Planning Board. This project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15304 - Minor Alterations to Land

Board Member Sullivan said she would like the plantings along the Blanding elevation should have more green.

Bridgett Shank, project architect, pointed out that the maiden grass they plan is green and that the rendering did not represent it accurately.

Board Member Sullivan made a motion to approve the plan. Board Member Knox White seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2017-3803

PLN15-0232 - 1208 St. Charles Street - Applicant: Paula Mathis and Tom Ellerbe. The Planning Board will hold a Public Hearing to consider Design Review for a project consisting of the demolition of a two car garage and the construction of an accessory structure that will have a three car garage and an artist studio. The proposed accessory structure is approximately 880 square feet which is less than 40% of the required rear yard allowed for accessory structures per Alameda Municipal Code (AMC) Section 30-4.1(d).7. This project is categorically exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15303 - New Construction of Small Structures. (Continued from January 9, 2017)

Staff Member Sablan gave the staff presentation.

Tom Ellebie and Paula Mathis, applicants, spoke about their plans and goals for their project. They said they worked hard to find common ground with their neighbors and resolve concerns about the project's potential impact on the nearby oak trees.

Italo Calpestri, project architect, gave a summary of the process and revisions to the plans have gone through.

Board Member Sullivan asked how far the new structure is from the property line.

Mr. Calpestri said it was almost three feet from the property line, but the existing fence was about 1.5 feet onto the applicant's property.

President Köster opened the public hearing.

Judy Thomas, applicant's arborist, said the garage should be constructed using pier and grade beam construction to avoid damaging tree roots. She said she will be present whenever work is done near the tree roots.

Antonia Nicosia said that they are asking for changes to the design to protect the oak trees. She said that pier and grade construction can still cause damage to tree health. She said they have had trees fall recently in the neighborhood. She said we should not jeopardize the tree's health for a recreational structure. She suggested scaling back the design and/or moving it to a different site on the property.

[Board Member Zuppan arrived at 7:30pm]

Scott Dawson, neighbor, said the project is too big and will compromise tree health. He said the arborist report he submitted shows that they should not build behind tree number 1.

Vincent Wu, applicant's structural engineer, said that they can design the structure to limit the forces put on the root structure of the trees.

Dee Keltner, neighbor, said they are stewards of the trees and the oak trees' health needs to be considered. She said the City should not rubberstamp these plans because it affects everybody. She said our tree regulations should be updated immediately.

Rob Doud, neighbor, said he supports his neighbors' project. He said he appreciates the efforts they made to reach out to the neighborhood.

Rena Rickles, applicant's attorney, said the applicants have done everything asked of them by staff to address concerns. She said the applicants hired her to respond to the CEQA challenge made on the project. She said there is no merit to a CEQA challenge.

President Köster closed the public hearing.

Board Member Burton said he visited the site. He said the health of the trees was his primary concern. He said it appeared they could do pier and grade beam construction without disturbing the major roots. He said it was not a very tall structure and should not disturb major lateral branches of the tree. He said he would support an additional condition mandating that no major lateral branches be disturbed. He said that with proper care, he can support the project.

Board Member Sullivan said the applicants have gone the extra mile to comply with the City's requirements. She said the owners have certain property rights and she supports the project.

Board Member Knox White said everyone shares the goal of preserving the trees. He said he asked staff to have the City's arborist to evaluate the reports and that he reported back that the plan is satisfactory. He said he would be supporting the project.

Board Member Curtis said that this process caused a lot of expense and time spent for the applicant and that staff had already reached this conclusion at the previous meeting. He said we placed an undue burden on the property owners. He said he will vote yes on the project.

Board Member Zuppan said she met with the applicant and the neighbors. She said that she is convinced that the project can be done as approved and conditioned without harming the trees. She said she supports the proposal as structured with the additional

condition regarding lateral branches. She said she agrees with the neighborhood that we need to clarify what the standards are around oak trees.

President Köster said he hopes to see some language before council addressing the treatment of live oaks. He said he visited the applicant and neighbor's house and believes due diligence has been done.

Board Member Burton made a motion to approve the application with a change to condition of approval 6.e.: (i)The foundation shall be a combination of slabs on grade, grade beams and piers. Slabs on grade, grade beams, and piers shall not disturb tree roots greater than 3". (iv) None of the major lateral limbs shall be removed or subjected to major trimming to accommodate the new structure.

Board Member Curtis asked how you would define a major limb.

The project arborist said that a major limb on these trees would be anything greater than 6".

Board Member Burton said that "six inches or greater in diameter." would be the standard for a major lateral limb. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

7-B 2017-3804

Hold a Public Hearing to Consider Site A Neighborhood Park Final Details for Design Review Application

Board Member Burton said his firm is involved in designing projects in Site A adjacent to the Neighborhood Park and would be recusing himself for this item.

Staff Member Thomas introduced the item and gave the staff presentation.

Board Member Sullivan asked for assurance that the decomposed granite would have a life of 20-25 years, because there does not seem to be a plan for maintenance.

James Winstead, landscape architect, said it would need ongoing maintenance. He said they worked with the Parks department on the plan and that it would have a stabilizer compound in it.

President Köster asked if all the green was lawn and if any of the areas were meant for stormwater retention.

Mr. Winstead explained which areas were lawn and which were other plantings. He said there is a retention area all along the sidewalk which would receive stormwater from the street and park runoff.

President Köster asked if there were any education or demonstration space in this park.

Mr. Winstead said it did not, but that there is community gathering space that could possibly serve that function.

President Köster asked why the basketball was only a half court.

Staff Member Thomas said that it was a recommendation from the Parks Dept. He said a full court bring a different kind of game with more adults. He said they have moved to using half courts in areas in close proximity to housing.

President Köster asked if there are standard fixtures for bike racks, BBQs, and drinking fountains, or if they were meant to be unique.

Staff Member Thomas said they do not have a specific policy. He said the Waterfront Park had some unique features.

President Köster opened the public hearing.

Susan Ramos said she visited the site and there are over-wintering monarch butterflies using the site. She said she hopes the design would include habitat and not just another playground.

Casey Sparks said Site A fits in with the progress of the city. He said there was a lot of hope when the plan was passed and looks forward to the park breaking ground soon. He said increases in rent and cost of living in the East Bay, this project will be a step in the right direction.

President Köster closed the public hearing.

Board Member Zuppan said she was concerned that we did not know about the butterflies ahead of time.

Staff Member Thomas explained that it is relatively new information to them as well. He said they are present in the Main Street neighborhood, but this park site is a parking lot right now, with no eucalyptus trees.

Board Member Zuppan said she was concerned about bicycle traffic. She said the street should be naturally pretty slow. She said she is comfortable with the sharrows and supports placing bike racks where the activity is, specifically mentioning the basketball court. She said she supports the plan.

Board Member Knox White said we need some bike racks at B Street. He said the park is under parked for bikes. He said we should build the bike racks for peak use. He said he liked the idea from Bike Walk Alameda for striping the travel lanes at 10' with a one way bike lane.

Board Member Sullivan said the plan looks nice and looks forward to seeing how the cork oaks grow.

President Köster said he supports doing anything we can to support species like the butterflies as we plan at Alameda Point.

Board Member Sullivan made a motion to approve the plan and take into consideration increasing the number of bicycle racks and evaluating their placement. Board Member Knox White seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

7-C 2017-3806

A Public Hearing to Consider a Resolution Recommending City Council Approval of the Alameda Point Bladium Tentative Parcel Map Application: PLN16-0544

Staff Member Thomas introduced the item.

Board Member Knox White asked if staff is comfortable with the language the Bladium attorney is proposing.

Staff Member Thomas said they are basically comfortable clarifying what changes to the building would trigger which conditions. He said he is somewhat concerned with trying to get that language right on the fly.

Board Member Knox White stated that we are only approving a tentative map at this point. He said the City would still own the parcel and could still clarify conditions if and when the property is sold.

Board Member Curtis said that picking and choosing conditions at the tentative map stage was not advisable. He said a potential buyer could add any conditions they desire during the purchase phase.

Brad Scheck, owner of Bladium, said they are seeking clarity about what events would trigger requirements from the City.

Staff Attorney Brown said the conditions are for disclosure purposes and included in other tentative maps they have done. She said she is reluctant to have the board insert modifications. She suggested using staff's recommendation or continuing the item to come up with the correct language.

Board Member Curtis made a motion to continue the item. Board Member Knox White seconded the motion.

Board Member Knox White asked that, if the item is continued, could it have direction to staff to clarify significant or non-minor building permits and come back on consent.

Board Member Burton said items 7,8, and 9 do not include the language referring to exterior changes or vertical construction.

Board Member Curtis said the language should be consistent from map to map. He said creating wiggle room will lead to future debate over the definition of terms like material or major.

President Köster said he supports continuing the item and bringing it back on the consent calendar.

Board Member Knox White said item 13 is the only one that he needs to be clarified before he is prepared to support the item.

Board Member Burton said he supports the continuance. He said there are interior changes that could lead to intensification of use that should trigger the conditions.

Board Member Zuppan asked if there is room to change the conditions during the sale negotiations.

Staff Attorney Brown said there are two things happening. That the tenant is trying to execute their purchase agreement, but in order for the conveyance to happen there needs to be a legal parcel created.

Board Member Zuppan asked if the concerns of the tenant could be resolved separately from the tentative map.

Staff Member Thomas said he believes they are resolvable. He said another option is that they could approve the item as is and work it out before it goes to City Council.

Board Member Knox White rescinded his second of Board Member Curtis' motion.

President Köster opened the public hearing.

Tony Daysog thanked the tenant for sticking with Alameda Point for all these years. He said they have earned the board's support. He says the global issues of the tentative map should be able to move forward tonight.

President Köster closed the public hearing.

Board Member Zuppan said she thinks the tentative map needs to move forward. She said she is ready to make that motion after hearing other board member comments.

Board Member Knox White said he would like the motion to direct staff to work out these issues before bringing the item to City Council.

Board Member Curtis said he is comfortable moving forward, but wants to make sure that the City Attorney's office approves of what moves forward.

Staff Attorney Brown summarized what she heard from the board: supporting staff's recommendation to move the map forward with some minor tweaks. She said she thinks that will be fine.

Board Member Zuppan made a motion to approve the tentative map with guidance to staff to make minor modifications to make the intent clear as discussed. Board Member Knox White seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

7-D 2017-3807

Recommend City Council Approval of the Main Street Neighborhood Specific Plan at Alameda Point. The Planning Board will hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council on the specific plan for the area generally located around Main Street, Pan Am Way, and West Tower Avenue

Staff Member Giles gave the staff presentation.

Board Member Sullivan asked how staff arrived at only 10% workforce housing. She said that is where our young families will end up and they are very important to this city and the numbers seem low.

Staff Member Giles said that 10% is a floor and it was based on what is economically feasible.

Staff Member Thomas said they do not have a template for this standard.

Board Member Sullivan said staff should look at how our existing neighborhoods are being used and is concerned with the type of housing we are building.

Board Member Knox White said we need to be upfront with what areas would have protections from sea level rise at what intervals. He said he was hoping to see how much money would be generated from different sizes of market rate housing products.

Staff Member Thomas said their financial expert is present and can begin to address those questions.

James Edison, financial consultant for Alameda Point, said every acre developed at Alameda Point has to carry \$1Million of infrastructure. He said affordable housing does not carry their infrastructure costs and that burden gets shifted to the remaining units. He said they assumed that the workforce housing would be affordable by design, by making them smaller units. He said the cost of homes is a function of square feet. He said a larger unit is more profitable than a smaller unit. He said there is no land cap here, but there is a unit cap. He said they came up with the 10% number for workforce housing by trying to balance all the different factors that will burden any development at the site.

Board Member Sullivan said it would be nice to understand the anatomy of the costs to build different units.

Board Member Knox White asked if there had been an analysis of what the dollar tradeoffs are for different levels of additional square feet per unit.

Mr. Edison said they could come up with a marginal extra value analysis. He said that the Master Infrastructure Plan is dominated by big ticket items like the levee. He said this means that the savings by building the units in a smaller area are marginal because of things like the levee have to be built the same way in either case.

Board Member Curtis asked if the infrastructure costs are priced per unit or allocated based on the square footage of each unit.

Mr. Edison said the MIP is based on the acreage. He said a lot of the work has to be done sitewide. He said the last piece is a residual value analysis which gives you a per unit value. He said the main constraint for Main Street is the unit count.

Board Member Curtis said the high costs of infrastructure construction is why these units have such a high price.

Board Member Sullivan said perhaps we should build some \$2-3 Million homes to help support the starter units.

Board Member Zuppan asked what the cost is per unit for going beyond the 1425 unit cap.

Mr. Edison said that it was \$50,000 per unit.

Board Member Zuppan asked if that number was negotiable.

Staff Member Thomas said that they would also need to amend the General Plan to exceed the cap. He said an easy way to pay for more workforce housing is to build more units.

Mr. Edison said that the \$1 Million per acre infrastructure costs comes out to \$50,000/unit if you are building at 20 units/acre.

President Köster asked how many units are envisioned for Main St.

Staff Member Thomas said there are 260 units already in the area and there is room for approximately 200 units for Main St. depending on how many are allocated to the adaptive reuse area.

Board Member Burton asked to clarify whether the requirement to use different architects for each block applied to the “super blocks” or the ultimately smaller blocks within as plans move forward.

Staff Member Thomas said they had not clarified that yet and would need to specify it further.

Board Member Burton pointed out areas that would not be elevated for sea level rise as marked in the plan due to their historic preservation.

Board Member Zuppan asked if we are certain that there is adequate protection from potential lead paint contamination.

Staff Member Giles said that current environmental protections are in place.

[Board Member Mitchell arrived at 9:52pm.]

President Köster asked how the needs for civic spaces would be addressed.

Staff Member Thomas said they envisioned the central area of the base, near the parade grounds, City Hall West, and theater, serving as the location for civic spaces.

Board Member Mitchell asked what the plans included for solar and water conservation at the site.

Board Member Burton said that the state’s next building code may require all new residential construction to be zero net energy by 2020.

Board Member Mitchell said that he would support including it in our plans now to build in that redundancy. He said he would like to see more than just wiring for solar.

President Köster opened the public hearing.

Tony Daysog said the financial report is an excellent report that lays out paths for achieving the social ends desired for the neighborhood. He said the board should push the envelope in getting higher workforce housing numbers.

Mike Ruddy said his company is interested in building in this neighborhood.

Doug Biggs said the process is very important for the Collaborating Partners. He said it is time to move forward with the plan. He said the conditions at the site are inhumane and would not be allowed anywhere else. He said the cap means that they need to focus on delivering on the promise to build this housing for their formerly homeless residents.

President Köster closed the public hearing.

Board Member Knox White said that the sea level rise issue is addressed. He said that we need to look at other options for cost savings besides waiving the workforce housing requirements if necessary. He said he would like the NACTO guidelines for street widths to be included in the plan. He said he would be supportive of adding zero net energy requirements to the plan.

Board Member Curtis said the plan was good.

Board Member Zuppan said she would like the new information regarding butterflies to be included in the plan. She said she would like to promote visitability in the plan. She said she would like to support wider sidewalks to make sure there is extra room for widening the streets if necessary. She said we need to be consistent in protecting our working waterfront and preventing privatization of the waterfront. She asked to please not use the unattractive street markings. She suggested adding lighting guidelines for the streetlights.

Board Member Mitchell said making the workforce housing affordable by design was a good compromise. He said he would like to see solar included in the plan. He said he would like to emphasize preserving existing trees as much as possible.

Board Member Burton said that the impending Universal Design ordinance would address the visitability issue. He offered several text edit suggestions for the plan.

Staff Member Thomas said he is hearing that most of the board supports waiting for the state building requirements to take effect in 2020 requiring all residential construction meet net zero energy requirements. He said he likes that rule because it does not dictate how it happens.

Board Member Knox White said he would support putting net zero in the plan now.

Board Member Burton said he would support net zero as well. He said he would like to keep the method flexible, rather than relying on solar.

Board Member Mitchell said he would hate to see the project rely on far away energy production to meet net zero.

Board Member Curtis asked why we would want to put the burden on the developer before it is necessary. He said if we wait for the state, the builder might move quickly to avoid the cost.

Board Member Burton said he was glad we are using the same parking maximums as Site A and the unbundled parking. He said that unbundled parking would not work for single family homes. He suggested requiring “adjacent” blocks to use different architects.

Board Member Sullivan said she would like to keep the code requirements as simple as possible to keep the project as affordable as possible. She said she would like the single family homes come with parking spaces. She said we should support the monarch butterflies.

President Köster said we should consider the idea of using some “super-lots” to help pay for some of the infrastructure.

Staff Member Thomas said it was not their intent was not to require unbundled parking for single family homes. He asked the board if it wants net zero in all residential buildings now, or if it would prefer to wait and let the state regulations take effect.

Board Member Zuppan said she was concerned about the impact of net zero on the cost of delivering the low income housing.

Board Members Sullivan and Curtis said they agreed.

Board Member Mitchell said that if we do this upfront it can be done for pennies on the dollar. He said this is a compromise because we could require battery banks as well.

Board Member Curtis said it was still a significant cost. He said we have a three year window to control costs and we should help the developer keep the price of these units down.

President Köster suggested that the board consider net zero policy citywide, and not just put it in this one project. He said this would incentivize developers to get the ball rolling, which would help APC get their project sooner.

Board Member Knox White said houses are sold at the price they can get, not the cost of building. He said he would be glad to exempt the Collaborating Partners from the net zero requirements.

Staff Member Thomas said that whatever the consensus is, they will bring the net zero and workforce housing issues up for discussion with the City Council.

Board Member Mitchell said he does not think net zero will make or break a project.

Board Member Zuppan made a motion to extend the meeting beyond 11pm. Board Member Burton seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Board Member Knox White made a motion to approve the plan and for staff to consider all proposed edits suggested by board members regarding: butterflies, street widths, sea level rise clarity, leave out net zero but recommend council consider the policy, address the waiver issue and consider increasing the number of units before waiving the workforce requirements, lighting guidelines, waterfront language, saving trees where possible, exempting the Collaborative from the 10% workforce requirements but including 42 units of workforce housing in the entire project, exempting single family homes from unbundled parking, adjacent superblocks having different architects.

Board Member Zuppan offered an amendment to include ten foot sidewalks in commercial districts. Board Member Knox White accepted the amendment. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion.

Board Member Burton said he is worried that the net zero requirement would cause a delay in getting the infrastructure done that the Collaborating Partners will need.

President Köster asked for a straw vote on including zero net energy in the plan, exempting the Collaborative and existing structures. Board Members Knox White and Mitchell indicated they are in favor.

Board Member Zuppan said that we need to consider whether the unit cap will prevent this plan from being viable.

The motion passed 7-0.

8. MINUTES

8-A 2017-3812

Draft Meeting Minutes - October 24, 2016

Board Member Sullivan made a motion to approve the minutes. Board Member Knox White seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0-1 (Köster abstained)

8-B 2017-3813

Draft Meeting Minutes - November 14, 2016

Board Member Knox White made a motion to approve the minutes. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. Board Member Zuppan asked that the minutes be amended to accurately reflect her remarks regarding the health of the trees. The amendment was accepted. The motion passed 7-0.

8-C 2017-3814

Draft Meeting Minutes - November 28, 2016

Board Member Sullivan made a motion to approve the minutes. Board Member Knox White seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2017-3810

Zoning Administrator and Design Review Recent Actions and Decisions

Staff Member Thomas listed the recent approvals.

Board Member Zuppan said she would like to pull the AutoZone approval to discuss sharing the parking lot with the neighborhood at night.

9-B 2017-3811

Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Community Development
Department Projects

Staff Member Thomas previewed future meeting items.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

11-A 2017-3808

Subcommittee for Alameda Marina

Board Member Knox White gave an update on their meetings.

11-B 2017-3809

Subcommittee with Commission on Disability Issues regarding Universal
Design Ordinance

None

Board Member Zuppan said the Economic Development Strategic committee plan met and provided an update.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Köster adjourned the meeting at 11:13pm.