

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, MAY 22, 2017

1. CONVENE

President Köster convened the meeting at 7:03pm

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Mitchell led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: President Köster, Board Members Curtis, Knox White, Mitchell. Board Member Zuppan arrived during item 7-B (before 7:25pm). Board Member Burton arrived at 8:33pm (item 7-C). Absent: Board Member Sullivan.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

Staff Member Thomas said that item 7-A has been withdrawn.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Travis Wilson said parking is the next big fight. He asked that parking be considered in a broader context and not just on a case by case basis. He said the General Plan is outdated and needs updating.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

None

7. REGULAR

AGENDA

ITEMS

7-A 2017-4358

Appeal of Design Review Application No. PLN17-0060 - 40 Garden Road - Applicant: Chung Ly. Appellant: Robert Price. A public hearing to consider an appeal for Design Review Application No. PLN17-0060 for an approximately 978 square-foot two-story rear addition to an existing single-family home. The new addition includes new windows and doors, one new garage door, new siding, and a decorative belly band located on the side and rear elevations. The property is located within a R-1, One Family Residence zoning district.

Withdrawn

7-B 2017-4363

Public Hearing to Consider a Development Plan Amendment for Alameda Point Site A.

Staff Member Thomas gave the staff presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3047810&GUID=5924B260-A15B-4F1E-BC95-4E5D6255255A&FullText=1>

Joe Ernst, Alameda Point Partners, said they have seen significant escalation in construction costs due to a labor shortage. He explained the difficulty in closing the financing package for the project.

Board Member Curtis asked if the \$425/sq. ft. construction cost included infrastructure and other costs.

Mr. Ernst said that was just the hard cost of the unit construction with no land costs.

Board Member Zuppan asked what the purpose of reevaluating the land use before phase II.

Staff Member Thomas said that it was to help ensure that they could get the 600,000 sq. ft. of commercial space out of the project.

President Köster opened the public hearing.

Alan Teague said he is generally in favor of the changes but was concerned about the funding for the ferry terminal and the parking implications of increasing the number of townhomes in the project.

Jacob Adiarte said the project would bring many good union trade jobs along with the construction.

Doug Biggs, Alameda Point Collaborative, said they are strongly supportive of the changes to the site plan. He said their residents will have better access to the amenities of Site A with the removal of a large warehouse and addition of teacher housing.

Michael McDonough, Chamber of Commerce, said the high construction costs are not unique to Alameda. He said the existing businesses at Alameda Point need the improved infrastructure that the changes will bring.

Rob Doud said they have seen the same cost increases as the applicant and supports the amendment.

Vicki Sedlack said we are so close to seeing things happen at Alameda Point and need to support this plan amendment and build all the housing we can for the community and to attract teachers.

Bill Smith said he supports the project because it provides much needed affordable housing.

Karen Bey said she supports the amendment. She said the developer has been very transparent and we should do what is needed to get the project built.

Laura Thomas, Renewed Hope, said they support the amended plan. She said Site A is essential to the city's reputation as a successful and sustainable city.

Brad Shook, Bladium co-owner, said they are in full support of the project. He said they are in dire need of infrastructure at the point.

Angela Hockabout said she supports the proposed amendment. She said we need to increase our density in Alameda to provide housing for all residents.

President Köster closed the public hearing.

Board Member Zuppan said she met with the applicant. She said the changes do not increase the amount of housing, and the changing location of some of the housing helps in some ways. She said the project provides many benefits and she is in support of the amendment.

Board Member Knox White said not moving forward with this plan now would be against many things that the city says they want. He said he supports the plan.

Board Member Curtis said it is a great project but he is concerned that it presents more risks to the city and taxpayers. He suggested requiring the developer put up a bond to ensure phase III gets completed.

Board Member Mitchell said he prefers this revised plan over the previous version and fully supports the plan.

President Köster said he has spoken with the developer about the plan and fully supports the proposal.

Staff Member Thomas said they are focused on making sure phase I is successful. He said the risk to the taxpayers is relatively low and the city would keep possession of the phase III property if nothing moves forward at that time.

Joe Ernst said they would not be in possession of the land for phase III and is not sure if you could even design a bond for that land. He said Site A is going to be the catalyst that makes the later commercial phases at Site A and Site B feasible.

Board Member Curtis said a bond would not put a significant financial burden on the project.

Board Member Zuppan asked if a bond would be something the board would comment on.

Staff Attorney Brown explained that this would not be the right time to deal with bonding issues.

Board member Curtis stated that he would vote in favor of the revised plan provided that staff forwarded his recommendation to City Council regarding securing a bond for phase III.

Staff Member Ott explained that there are bonding requirements in the plans for things like infrastructure. She said the bonds usually require 100% construction design documents.

Board Member Mitchell made a motion to approve the Site A development plan amendments as recommended by staff. Board Member Zuppan seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

Board Member Knox White announced that the Warriors were winning 103-82.

7-C 2017-4364

Hold a Planning Board Study Session to Consider Site A Preliminary Block 9 Design. The Alameda Point Final EIR evaluated the environmental impacts of redevelopment and reuse of the lands at Alameda Point consistent with the Town Center Plan, which included Site A. No further review is required for this review of the project design.

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

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3047811&GUID=05C19841-655E-4086-AF68-F677C443D3B3&FullText=1>

Peter Waller, Pyatok Architects, gave a presentation of their goals and plans for Block 9.

Board Member Mitchell asked about lighting and what the building would look like at night.

Mr. Waller said they will more fully develop the lighting plans as the design progresses.

Board Member Köster asked why the garage access was on Ardent way across from the commercial block.

Mr. Waller said they are still considering their options for that. He said Coronado already has some service access and Orion is a bike lane street and they did not want to break that up.

There were no public speakers.

Board Member Mitchell said he appreciated the modern, but not austere design. He said they are seeing the same off center window treatments over and over and they might want to consider that.

Board Member Knox White said it was a nice looking building. He said he has concerns about the arcade becoming a dead space that hides the retail spaces behind. He said the bike room should be on the Orion side where the bike lane is.

Board Member Curtis said it is a good design and has a nice variety.

Board Member Zuppan said she met with the architect to review the plans. She said she is warming to the plans. She said she likes the promenade and the angled windows that take advantage of the views. She said she appreciates the larger setback for the townhomes.

President Köster said he liked the design of the building. He said he liked the angled balconies most of all. He said the lobby rendering looked a little too much like an office space.

Mr. Waller said they were still having the conversation about setting the retail space back or not.

7-D 2017-4365

PLN17-0050 - Zoning Text Amendment for Second Units. Consideration of a Zoning Text Amendment for modification of regulations pertaining to Second Units (Accessory Dwelling Units), and related regulations, for compliance with State law. The proposed amendments are Statutorily Exempt from the requirements of CEQA pursuant to Section 15282(h) of the CEQA Guidelines, which exempts the adoption of ordinance revisions to comply with Government Code Section 65852.2.

Staff Member Tai gave the staff presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at:
<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3047812&GUID=D55E58FC-7E9E-4E15-ABE7-FED4C9A00D37&FullText=1>

Board Member Knox White asked what the policy reason was for the owner-occupancy requirement.

Staff Member Tai said it was based on previous comments to keep these units away from speculators and in the hands of the community.

Board Member Curtis asked if these state mandates can be required if it affects safety of the residents.

Staff Member Tai said there are rules about safety but they require very specific findings.

Staff Member Thomas said he does not see parking behavior as a way to make a safety argument against approving ADUs.

Board Member Mitchell asked what the setback rules would be for a new building.

Staff Member Tai said that the normal setback rules (ie- 5ft) would apply.

President Köster asked if you could increase the size of the primary residence and then count that when determining the size of the ADU they could build.

Staff Member Tai said that you could do that.

Board Member Zuppan asked if an existing structure that doesn't match the primary residence would be allowed to be converted.

Staff Member Tai said they would not be required to redesign the style of the outside of the existing structure.

President Köster opened the public hearing.

Alan Teague said that ADUs for homes on the historic study list should be contemporary compatible and not try to mimic the historic architecture.

Angela Hockabout said we need to make it harder for people to use cars if we are serious about addressing climate change. She said she wants to make it easier to build these types of units.

Alice Cheng, architect, said she is concerned about the flexibility in the ordinance. She said we should consider how to limit the range of designs that could happen with the ordinance.

Alexandra Saikley, architect, said we should make it easier to increase the number of ADUs. She said they are a great way to keep a community together. She said pre-fab units are a way to make them very feasible.

Frank Maxwell said he supports the ordinance to help ease the housing crisis.

Anita Longoria said she supports the ordinance and does not want to restrict the size to only 600 square feet. She said the design requirements should be consistent without being overly restrictive.

Jim Smallman said ADUs should have different rules for those done within the footprint of the building than those in new structures. He said he is concerned about design guidelines.

Christopher Buckley said the standards need to be carefully crafted. He said the 600 square foot limit should only be permitted for units built within the footprint of the original home. He suggested keeping the original standards for units visible from the street.

Alan Pryor said 1200 square feet seems large. He said an ADU could be a good option for adult children that could not afford the high rents.

President Köster closed the public hearing.

Board Member Burton said he is supportive of getting the ordinance in place. He suggested a change to allow removal of protected trees with the recommendation of an arborist. He said he supports removing the 750 square foot rule for additions. He said lot coverage and other requirements would prevent most units from being as large as 1200 square feet.

Board Member Curtis said he is in favor of the amendment except for the parking issue. He said he is concerned about the parking creating a safety issue.

Board Member Zuppan asked if they could institute a threshold that would trigger a discretionary design review.

Staff Member Tai said that they could require that for some size greater than 600 square feet.

Board Member Zuppan said she would not be in favor of restricting the ADU size if it is within the existing envelope. She said she would be in favor of requiring design review if it was visible and over 800 or 850 square feet. She said she supports removing the 750 square foot rule, and that the applicants should be owner occupied. She said the universal design requirements would require more than 600 square feet.

Board Member Mitchell said is in full support of adopting the recommendation and requiring owner occupancy. He said he is comfortable with staff making the decisions about design.

Board Member Knox White said he would like to see a one year report out of what is being built under the ordinance. He said the intent of the ordinance is to supply low impact housing and requiring owner occupancy to get a permit would be counter to that. He said we should not be afraid of having a mix of styles.

Board Member Knox White said he would be happy to move the staff recommendation with Board Member Burton's recommendation regarding tree removal and adding design review for units that abut the street.

Staff Member Thomas listed proposed changes: design review for units in a front or side yard, adding an owner occupancy at time of application, adding the certified arborist recommendation for protected tree removal, remove the 750 square foot addition parking requirement, with yearly reporting.

Board Member Burton seconded the motion.

Board Member Zuppan asked and received confirmation that a basement conversion within the same footprint that exceeded 50% of the original unit would require a use permit. She asked what parking regulations would apply to those units..

Staff Member Tai said that it would fall within the area of the ADU ordinance and those parking rules, or exemptions, would apply.

The motion passed 5-1 (Curtis).

8. MINUTES

8-A 2017-4366

Draft Meeting Minutes - March 27, 2017

Board Member Zuppan asked to add "utility" in front of meters on page 4, and to clarify that she "asked" about prohibiting residents from having a car.

Board Member Zuppan made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0-2 (Burton and Knox White abstained).

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Staff Member Thomas said this would be Staff Attorney Brown's final Planning Board Meeting and that she would be starting soon as the City Attorney for Berkeley.

9-A 2017-4359

Zoning Administrator and Design Review Recent Actions and Decisions
Staff Member Thomas listed the design review approvals.

9-B 2017-4360

Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Community Development
Department Projects
Staff Member Thomas gave an update on what would be coming on future agendas.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

11-A 2017-4361

Subcommittee for Alameda Marina
Board Member Knox White gave a report on the current plan and said they would be bringing it before the whole board on June 12th.

11-B 2017-4362

Subcommittee with Commission on Disability Issues regarding Universal
Design Ordinance
None

Board Member Knox White said that he met with Catellus, and he thanked Staff Attorney Brown for her service.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Köster adjourned the meeting at 10:00pm.