

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, JULY 23, 2018

1. CONVENE

President Mitchell convened the meeting at 7:00pm

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Burton led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: President Mitchell, Board Members Burton, Cavanaugh, Curtis, Sullivan, Teague.

Absent: None.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

None

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

2018-5814

PLN16-0314 -Design Review Approval - Seaplane Lagoon Ferry Terminal Temporary Landside Improvements. Applicant: City of Alameda. Public Hearing to consider Design Review approval pursuant to AMC 30-37 for temporary landside improvements for a new ferry terminal located at the Seaplane Lagoon in the NAS Alameda historic district. The environmental effects of the proposed project were considered and disclosed in the Seaplane Lagoon Addendum to the Alameda Point Environmental Impact Report. No further environmental review is required under the California Environmental Quality Act

Board Member Teague asked to pull the item for review. He asked for an explanation of the differences between what was in the packet vs. what they have online.

Staff Member Giles said they added an image of the perforated panel. She said they also added a page to show the terminal when it was not light out.

Board Member Teague asked for more detail on the perforated panels.

Staff Member Giles said that they would be 42 inches high and would provide a barrier.

Board Member Teague asked if a guardrail would be less expensive. He said the panel would be a target for graffiti and impact the views around the site. He said he would prefer a guardrail or bench.

Board Member Sullivan recommend the gray plants be replaced with green plants because of the lack of trees in the area.

President Mitchell opened and closed the public hearing. There were no speakers.

Board Member Burton said he was open to the idea of a more open railing.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the item with the condition that the perforated panels at the storm drain outfalls be replaced with a railing. Board Member Sullivan seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 201-5815

Public Hearing to consider a Planning Board recommendation to approve a Master Plan and Density Bonus application for the Encinal Terminals property at 1521 Buena Vista Avenue. Applicant: North Waterfront Cove, LLC. An addendum to a previously certified Focused Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the project has been prepared, in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act

Board Member Burton recused himself because his firm is working on a project for the developer in Sacramento.

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

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3554214&GUID=047A2A27-D6EB-456D-A93C-C1EEB8F7301E>

Mike O'Hara, Tim Lewis Communities, gave a presentation on the application.

Board Member Curtis asked the applicant to resend the county housing graph because the labeling of the data was missing.

President Mitchell asked if this project would have any impact on whether the adjacent Del Monte project would move forward or not.

Mr. O'Hara said they are separate entities and will move forward or not on their own. He said that whichever project begins first would complete the Clement Ave. extension.

Board Member Teague asked why the road cannot come in at Entrance Rd and turn at the edge of the Tidelands property.

Mr. O'Hara said that it is possible but could present some design problems.

Board Member Teague asked whether they considered using trees other than palms.

Mr. O'Hara said they are considering many different species and acknowledged that the fronds are not compostable.

Board Member Teague asked for a review of the memorandum about California housing laws and how the unit calculations were formed.

Staff Attorney Chen gave a brief update on the memo. She said the project meets all the zoning and code requirements and the city cannot reduce the size or density of the project.

Board Member Teague asked what flexibility there was for conditions such as the placement of the entrance road in order to be compliant with the General Plan.

Staff Attorney Chen said that the road placement idea Board Member Teague had could be feasible, may require further study, and is not an objective standard. She said that as long as it does not make the project infeasible, it could be okay.

Board Member Cavanaugh asked if the road could be placed on the eastern edge of the property.

Staff Member Thomas said the Fortmann Marina road is really a parking lot, but a road could possibly go along the eastern edge of the applicant's property if it crossed the tidelands property.

President Mitchell asked how the Northern Waterfront's requirements regarding phasing plans can coexist with a master plan that does not have a plan for the tidelands property.

Staff Member Thomas said that the short time left on the tidelands' lease makes it difficult to expect a full plan for that portion of the site. He said the city does not yet know what it wants to have on that property.

Board Member Sullivan asked who paid for the revenue neutral study.

Staff Member Thomas said that EPS did the study and that the city has used them on many occasions.

Board Member Sullivan asked for clarification on who is in charge of the height limits because she felt the master plan gives conflicting information.

Staff Member Thomas said that the applicant will require an exemption from the height limit in order to meet their density bonus units.

Board Member Curtis asked if the shoreline improvements would be scheduled before construction of units.

Staff Member Thomas said the phasing plan requires that, in addition to the practical fact that they need the geotechnical improvements to be present before the housing is built.

President Mitchell opened the public hearing.

Ken Petersen said he was concerned about the quality of the revenue study and with the legal underpinnings of the unit calculations.

Paul Foreman, ACT, said the proposal falls short. He said only the residential acreage should be considered for calculating the allowable units. He said street acreage should be subtracted from the residential calculations.

Vince Sugrue, Sheetmetal Workers Union, shared concerns that the developer has not agreed to a labor agreement.

Rochelle Trigueros, Bay Area Council, said we are not building enough housing and that delays increase housing costs and homelessness.

Gretchen Lipow said all the new housing will make traffic much worse. She said there is not enough money for schools and no location for a school to be sited.

Daniel Gregg, Carpenter's Union, said there are no labor standards on the project and asked the board to not approve the plan in its current form.

Pat Lamborn said that the realistic capacity of the project were set in the housing element. She said the plan needs to be in absolute conformance with the General Plan, not just "substantial conformance." She urged the board to not rubber stamp a 589 unit project.

David Ross said this is a fantastic project. He said the project should not be able to move forward without a labor agreement so that tradespeople might be able to afford a home in Alameda.

Laura Thomas, Renewed Hope, said the delays are causing further displacement. She welcomes the affordable housing that the project will provide and said Renewed Hope would not support senior only affordable housing at this site.

William Smith said he supports the project. He said the road should be placed in the middle of the site.

Nancy Hird, Save Alameda's Working Waterfront, said dry boat storage should be included as a possible use for the tidelands property in the Master Plan.

President Mitchell closed the public hearing.

Board Member Cavanaugh said the road is his only sticking point. He said it should be on the right (east) side of the property.

Board Member Curtis said he has concerns about the density bonus calculations. He said we do not have a lot of choice in the matter due to state law. He said further delays would increase the cost of the project and that he believes he needs to support the project tonight.

Board Member Sullivan said she is concerned that there is not a total plan as required. She expressed concern about whether the road space was subtracted from the calculations.

Board Member Teague said the objective standards are what is becoming important in the planning process due to state law. He said we do not have enough objective standards. He said the entrance road absolutely needs to go through the four way intersection. He said we need to include the dog leg alternative to illustrate what the option are for Council. He said he is against using Palm trees because the waste is not compostable.

President Mitchell said he feels the plan is not ready to move forward and that he needs more information. He said he would like to treat the meeting like a study session and continue working on the plan. He said he would need to see what the potential road designs would look like.

Board Member Curtis said further delays would increase the costs of the project and get passed on to the consumer. He said the project is going to get built and we should focus on conditions we would like to see instead of creating further delay.

Board Member Teague said that they could recommend the road up the middle and ask the road design to come back in the next phase if council does not approve the easement.

Board Member Teague moved approval of the project with the condition that the road be through the center, that the dog leg road design be considered as an alternative if City Council does not approve the road down the middle, and that the design address the Fortman Marina General Plan item. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. The motion failed 3-0-2 (Mitchell and Sullivan abstained.)

Board Member Curtis asked for a re-vote with a show of hands.

Board Member Sullivan said she would change her vote to a yes.

Board Member Teague made a new motion to include the previous motion and include the demolition and grading timing of the tidelands parcel in the plan. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0-1 (Mitchell abstained.)

President Mitchell called a five minute recess.

8. MINUTES

8-A 2018-5804

Draft Meeting Minutes - March 26th, 2018

Board Member Curtis offered a correction from “are” to “is” on page three.

Board Member Sullivan made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Board Member Cavanaugh seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2018-5805

Community Development Department Recent Actions and Decisions

The staff report can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3554212&GUID=7D78B128-5C9F-4389-9A83-8A1D49F5160E&FullText=1>

Staff Member Tai said that everything on the list was approved except the use permit for extended hours for Habanas.

9-B 2018-5816

Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Community Development Department Projects

Staff Member Tai gave a preview of upcoming meeting items. The schedule can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3554215&GUID=7160FD8E-5F67-4F36-A690-F8CA2292252B>

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board Member Teague said he would appreciate more than seven days to review the complicated design packets that will be coming forward.

President Mitchell asked if they would need a subcommittee for Encinal Terminals.

Staff Member Thomas said that he will wait to see what happens at Council and then ask the developer for an anticipated schedule, at which point the board could decide whether to appoint a subcommittee.

Board Member Teague shared that a proposed state law proposing jurisdictions allocate 125% of their RHNA has been scrubbed.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 10:02pm.