

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA HISTORICAL ADVISORY BOARD
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2017

1. CONVENE

Chair Piziali called meeting to order at 7:03pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Piziali, Board Members Jones, Sanchez, Saxby. Absent: Board Member Chan.

Board Member Sanchez introduced himself to the board.

3. MINUTES

None

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

None

5. ORAL COMMUNICATION

Nancy Hird, AAPS, spoke about adding buildings at the Alameda Marina to the Historic Study List. She said the collection of the buildings as a whole, and their WWII history, are worthy of inclusion on the list and asked the board to initiate the process.

Woody Minor gave a history of the study list and explained how the buildings at Alameda Marina fit in the historic study list.

Christopher Buckley, AAPS, repeated the request to initiate the process for including the buildings in the historic study list.

Staff Member Tai explained to the board the nature of AAPS's request to add the buildings at Alameda Marina to the study list. He said they originally received a request in March, 2016. He said the property owner has submitted a master plan application and the historic resources are studied as part of the Environmental Impact Report. He said Mr Minor was able to comment on their administrative draft and they are taking his comments into consideration for the EIR. He said the process will be transparent.

6. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Staff Member Tai said they received written communications from AAPS and the League of Women Voters.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2017-3847

Certificate of Approval - PLN16-0606 - 2307 Clinton Avenue - Applicant: David Kuoppamaki. Applicant requests a Certificate of Approval for a two story rear addition to an existing two story single-family residence. Although the proposed rear addition is designed to match the existing architectural features, the project requires a Certificate of Approval because it involves the removal of the existing one-story rear addition, which is equivalent to more than 30% of the value of the existing structure. The addition will continue the existing roofline to maintain the existing building height. The project also involves demolishing an existing detached garage and replacing it with a new garage with a similar design. The property is listed on the City's Historical Buildings Study List with an S designation. The property is located in the R-5 (General Residential) zoning district. The project is categorically exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 - demolition and removal of a single-family residence.

Staff Member Barrera gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2946715&GUID=C9A2D770-5914-4B95-854D-AF978EF969FC&FullText=1>

Board Member Saxby said the design seems to try and make it impossible to tell the old from the new, and that the standards say they should be differentiated. He asked how that would be addressed.

Staff Member Barrera said there is a discrepancy between the City's design guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

Staff Member Tai said that in most established neighborhoods the preference seems to be to integrate the design of new construction as much as possible.

Board Member Saxby said he hoped that for a more significant structure that the standard for differentiation would be upheld. He said he supports the removal of the existing addition and demolition and replacement of the existing garage. He said he would like to see some small changes to the roof line and/or wall to differentiate the addition from the original structure.

Chair Piziali said the plan is good for the Planning Board but not necessarily for the Historical Advisory Board and that this conflict comes up frequently.

Board Member Sanchez asked why no windows were included along the side of the addition.

Staff Member Barrera said they are still going through design review. She said there are some privacy concerns being discussed with the neighbors that could still impact window placement.

Board Member Sanchez asked if the building height was staying the same.

Staff Member Barrera said that it was staying the same height.

Staff Member Tai said that the board could condition the approval on differentiating the addition from the original structure if they wished. He said that would give staff direction to more strictly follow that standard for future projects. He said one treatment they could use is to add a vertical trim separating the addition visually.

Board Member Saxby said that changes to the roof line could be made to delineate the addition. He said a setback in the wall would also be an option. He said a third option would be a change in materials used on the addition.

Board Member Sanchez asked what the size of the new garage was compared to the original.

Staff Member Barrera said that it was the same size as the original and would accommodate two cars.

Chair Piziali opened the public hearing.

Ronan Kennedy, neighbor, said the character of the original structure is not being maintained. He said the added mass of the design makes it appear much larger from the street and adjacent properties. He said the design does not meet the standards of preserving the form of the existing structure. He said the suggestion of stepping back the walls would meet the standards.

Chair Piziali closed the public hearing.

Board Member Saxby made a motion to approve the application with the condition that staff work with the applicant to provide more differentiation between the addition and the original structure, considering stepping down of the roof, creating a setback in the wall of the addition, and/or simplifying the details of the facades. Board Member Sanchez seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0.

7-B 2017-3848

Review and Comment on the Historic District Principles and Infill Guidelines Section of the Draft Main Street Specific Plan at Alameda Point

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

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2946716&GUID=3062EA54-1429-4A98-A1C9-FDA95F0F4352&FullText=1>

Board Member Sanchez asked for information on what makes a structure in the beehive neighborhood a contributing structure or not.

Ruth Todd, from Page & Turnbull, said there is a process for nominating and determining which structures contribute to a historic district. She said it is based solely on their historic relevance and not based on a structure's condition, design, etc.

Board Member Saxby asked if any of the structures in question were significant in any other way.

Ms. Todd said they were not determined to be individually significant.

Board Member Sanchez asked if the NCO quarters would be removed.

Ms. Todd said new construction could be desired, but there is not necessarily a plan for demolition. She said the city wanted flexibility.

Chair Piziali asked if the recently demolished buildings are where the APC residents would be relocated to in the future.

Staff Member Ott said it would be sited where the old PX was located. She said the first phase of building where the units were demolished would help facilitate the construction of the new APC units.

Board Member Jones asked how they planned to bring all of the Collaborating Partners' units together.

Staff Member Ott said that they three supportive housing providers are spread out over a large footprint right now and that bringing them together around common amenities and services they can be more successful at delivering services.

8. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board Member Saxby said it sounded like there were several reports from the 80s and 90s that did not make it onto the study list, which has not been updated since the late 70s.

Staff Member Tai said they maintain the list on a case by case basis, triggered by project proposals. He said they have expanded the list to include Alameda Point. He said there is an opportunity for the city to improve its record keeping.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2017-3849

Introduction to Design Review and Certificates of Approval

Staff Member Barrera gave a presentation on planning and permit staff work flows.

Board Member Sanchez asked if the design review notices went out at the same time as the certificate notices.

Staff Member Barrera said that sometimes they happen simultaneously and sometimes they are staggered.

Board Member Saxby asked what follow up there is to ensure projects do not demolish more than 30% without going through the process.

Staff Member Tai said there are several steps in the process to check the plans and attain revisions to the permit when there is extra demolition work.

10. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Christopher Buckley said that AAPS was asking the board to initiate placing buildings on the historic study list.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Piziali adjourned the meeting at 8:45pm.