

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2019

1. CONVENE

President Sullivan convened the meeting at 7:00pm

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Teague led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

None

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6A 2019-6579

PLN19-0044 - Del Monte Warehouse Design Review Amendment - 1501 Buena Vista Avenue - Applicant: TL Partners I L.P. Public hearing to consider revisions to previously approved Design Review (PLN14-0059) to modify the design of the monitors (rooftop structures) on Bays 1 and 4 as part of restoration of the historic Del Monte Warehouse. The proposal is limited to architectural changes only and does not affect the previously approved land use, unit count, and parking. The site is zoned M-X, Mixed-Use with a Multi-Family Residential Overlay. The Environmental Impact Report for the Northern Waterfront General Plan Amendment and Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Del Monte Warehouse Project satisfies environmental review requirements for this project under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Note: Audio recording was not captured in the first minutes until the tail end of President Sullivan's comments regarding choice of color for the item.

President Sullivan made a request that the colors more closely match what was approved.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the item with President Sullivan's direction regarding the color. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2019-6576

PLN18-0533 - Use Permit Call for Review - 2400 Monarch Street (Alameda Point, Bldg 44) - Applicant: Jeffrey Nibler on behalf of Wonky Kitchen, LLC. Public hearing to consider a call for review of the Zoning Administrator's approval of an administrative use permit to allow the operation of food trucks within the parking lot of Building 44 at Alameda Point (2400 Monarch Street), and to allow extended hours of operation for the food trucks before 7:00 AM, starting at 6:00 AM, and after 10:00 PM, staying open until midnight. The applicant proposes having up to three food trucks operating on the site at one time, seven days a week. The property is located within the AP-AR (Alameda Point, Adaptive Reuse) Zoning District. The Alameda Point Final Environmental Impact Report evaluated the environmental impacts of redevelopment and reuse of the lands at Alameda Point, and no further review is required for this project. As a separate and independent basis, this project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 - Existing Facilities.

Staff Member Thomas listed the options available to the board. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3862438&GUID=6355BEC4-C22C-451D-BF1D-1B53402471DF&FullText=1>

President Sullivan opened the public hearing.

Kelly Kearney said she operates a catering company on the Point. She said she is concerned by the large number of food trucks being approved in the area. She said there was a vehicle theft in the area recently. She said Matson's lease was not renewed because the sight of shipping containers was not in the City's vision for the area. She said that now the food trucks are using the lot, now leased by Natel Energy, for storage. She said there should be security provided by all the new users of the area. She said she wants them to follow the same rules as everyone else.

There were no other public speakers. President Sullivan closed the public hearing.

Staff Member Thomas said the City is working hard to redevelop Alameda Point. He said it is a work in progress and that they invest a significant amount of money in security, lighting, and infrastructure.

Board Member Curtis asked who owns the property where food trucks are storing items at the old Matson property and how can the issue be resolved.

Staff Member Thomas said they can look into the issue, but that it is separate from the permit issue at hand.

Board Member Teague said the use permit is for two years and can be pulled for violations. He said people should report issues to the City.

Board Member Teague made a motion to confirm the approval of the permit.
Board Member Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

7-C 2019-6582

PLN19-0046 -Design Review for Alameda Marina Waterfront Park 1829 Clement Avenue. Applicant: Alameda Marina Development, LLC. The Planning Board will hold a public hearing to consider a Design Review application to construct approximately 3.5 acres of publically accessible waterfront open space, parks, landscaping and roadway and sidewalk improvements on the Alameda Marina property generally located between Clement Avenue and the Oakland Estuary and between Alameda Marina Drive and Willow Street. The environmental effects of the proposed project were considered and disclosed in the Alameda Marina Master Plan Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2016102064). No further environmental review is required under the California Environmental Quality Act for the proposed improvements.

President Sullivan said she would like to handle the RFQ question first because of the public speakers in attendance for that item.

Staff Member Thomas gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3862441&GUID=CF26EE05-330D-42CD-987C-01AC5925F87B&FullText=1>

Board Member Teague asked how boats would be pulled from the water to be worked on in the boatyard.

Staff Member Thomas said the existing rails could be retrofitted and used by a boatyard.

Board Member Teague asked if the boatyard operator would compete with the service ships.

Staff Member Thomas said they could be complimentary services, the operator could say that they do not need service ships, and could be the same or separate operations.

Board Member Curtis said the RFP was not written in a clear way and did not explain the scope of work necessary for an operator. He said that they would have gotten more response if it was more clear.

Staff Member Thomas said that they could change the RFQ now, at the halfway point, if desired.

Board Member Teague asked if staff was involved in the RFQ and was satisfied with what it contained.

Staff Member Thomas said they saw the first draft and felt it was written to look more for a marina developer and less of a boatyard operator. He said the final version was sent to staff but not reviewed before it went out.

President Sullivan asked if any advertising was placed to promote the RFQ.

Sean Murphy, Bay West, listed the places they sent the RFQ. He said they did not spend money on advertising.

President Sullivan said the boatyard operator may not want a dockyard and concierge service to compete with them. She said the RFQ could do a better job at promoting the opportunity the project provides. She said it is unclear that the operator would be a tenant and not the party doing all the development work. She asked if the applicant would be open to amending and extending the RFQ.

Mr. Murphy said they are invested in the success of the project and want as many qualified responses as possible. He said they consulted experts and their legal team to write the RFQ.

Board Member Saheba asked if the RFQ process allowed for a period of questions and answers that would be distributed to all parties.

Mr. Murphy said they do have that and have had a Q and A process. He said they have received activity on the RFQ to date.

Board Member Curtis said that it was not clear who would be responsible for the development costs and how the lease process would work.

President Sullivan opened the public hearing.

Dorothy Freeman said that Bay West originally indicated that they had no interest in having a full service boatyard. She listed agreements that SAWW worked on with the City. She said the RFQ is designed to discourage responses. She said a new RFQ should be amended and resent and a the clock reset.

John Platt said that when he read the RFQ is seemed to discourage development of a new boatyard at Alameda Marina. He said he reached out to boatyard operators and major players in the marine industry in the Bay Area and none of them had seen the RFQ. He

said that when they did look at it, they all said it was designed to discourage the building a boatyard at Alameda Marina.

Nancy Hird, SAWW, said a boatyard operator she knows says the RFQ makes clear the developer does not want a boatyard operator. She distributed a letter outlining SAWW's requests. She said the developer needs to provide the improvements and not place that burden on an operator.

Peter Brand said reading the RFQ is painful and intimidating. He said it was not sent to the most obvious candidates. He offered to help amend the RFQ and generate an appropriate distribution list.

There were no other public speakers. President Sullivan closed the public hearing.

Board Member Rothenberg said the boatyard infrastructure should be conditioned and incorporated into the sequencing of the open space plan.

Staff Member Thomas said that they will have that condition first in the open space plan. He said they are trying to coordinate all the different agency approvals that the project will need.

Board Member Teague said it seems like there could be changes to the current process. He said that if the current process does not get results, when the applicant comes back he would be looking at ideas to have them hire someone to design the boatyard for them and then they could directly seek an operator.

President Sullivan made a motion to have the RFQ reissued with: a situation analysis, separate the details about the next steps which would be required of finalists, the City approves the RFQ before it is issued, and that the distribution list be reviewed by stakeholders (suggesting Peter Brand), all documents be included in the packet rather than just website links, and advertising in key publications be required.

Board Member Teague raised a point of order that the board can provide direction but that the item is not agendaized to have a formal motion made tonight.

Board Member Curtis said the board's role is to provide input but not to micromanage how the developer implements the suggestions.

Staff Member Thomas summarized the feedback he heard and outlined options to amend and reissue the RFQ while other pieces of the project continue through the regulatory process. He said he does not want people to get the message that the RFQ is discouraging a boatyard. He said he would like to report back to the Planning Board at the next meeting after meeting with the developer.

Board Member Teague asked who would maintain the plantings in the open space.

Staff Member Thomas said the project would be responsible for the maintenance.

Sean Murphy and Cindy Ma gave a presentation on the open space plan.

Board Member Mitchell asked what the minimum width is supposed to be for the Bay Trail.

Staff Member Thomas said that they try to get 14-16', but that sometimes they do not get that much in tight areas.

Ms. Ma said the Bay Trail guidelines state that 12' is their minimum.

Board Member Mitchell asked what the signage plans were for the Bay Trail and boat crossing areas.

Clay Frye said that the signage for the Bay Trail and historic signage is in design at the moment. He said BCDC has very specific signage guidelines. He said they got permission from BCDC to explore combining the Bay Trail and historic walk signage. He said there would be very specific rules and procedures and signage regulating gate closures and signage for that area.

Board Member Mitchell asked for more information explaining the changes bringing the trail away from the water's edge in the Harbor View Park.

Ms. Ma said BCDC's feedback led to pulling the trail back and adding the view pockets.

Staff Member Thomas said Alameda goes first in the process before BCDC and the board can ask for changes in the proposed path alignment if it feels strongly.

Board Member Cavanaugh asked if there were renderings of the project at night and of the art in the plan.

Staff Member Thomas said they could separate the lighting plan from this step and bring it back at a future date. He said the public art component is one of the last things to be completed.

Board Member Teague asked what the timing would be for the water taxi.

Staff Member Thomas said there is no specific timeline. He said their approach has been to require the landings for water shuttles be built with every project. He said that once the projects get built and occupied there would hopefully be enough demand to support service with funding help from the TMA funds that the residents would pay into.

Board Member Rothenberg asked for clarification regarding the ADA accessibility requirements of the plan.

Staff Member Thomas said the project would have to meet all the requirements of Alameda's Universal Design Ordinance.

Ms. Ma said that the civil engineers would figure out the final details related to sloping and access, and that they have chosen materials that would be compatible with the state's path of travel requirements for accessibility.

Board Member Saheba asked what would be the timing of the lighting plan submittal.

Staff Member Thomas said they will have a condition of approval that would require a lighting plan be submitted and approved prior to building permits.

Board Member Saheba asked if the Union St. paseo would have easements or other requirements since they are not in the open space plan.

Staff Member Thomas said the paseo would have an easement and has to meet specific dimensional requirements.

Board Member Saheba said the paseo needs to be design first in order to foster public access and influence the building design.

President Sullivan asked if OSHA has weighed in on the co-location of the hoist and the trail.

Staff Member Thomas said they have a very similar condition at the Grand Marina's boatyard. He said Alameda needs to be comfortable with these types of issues because of our maritime nature and said they feel it makes the Bay Trail more interesting.

President Sullivan said decomposed granite is a constant maintenance problem and asked if that is accounted for in the budget.

Bill Smith, landscape architect, said they are mainly using it in the view pockets and would see less intensive use. He said the owner has a maintenance plan.

President Sullivan said the inclusion of the strawberry tree is a mess and should not be included in the plan.

Mr. Smith said they are only planning to use those trees in over planted areas. He said their plant list is based on BCDC's approved list.

President Sullivan said that many of the choices do not do well in the wind and salt air of the area. She expressed concern about the lack of appropriate shade trees.

Board Member Teague said he wants to see the water taxi dock built. He said the inclusion of BBQ grills is inconsistent with our greenhouse gas goals. He said the uplighting on the palm trees is not something we like in Alameda. He said that he does not like palm trees because the debris has to go in the trash.

Board Member Saheba said he believes there should be a trail that gets you to the water's edge in the park. He said it could be a secondary, minor trail, separate from the busier bay trail. He also questioned the inclusion of the grills in the public realm. He said we need to bring clarity to the paseo.

Board Member Mitchell said the graving dock would be a very positive aspect of the project. He agreed that the grills could be removed, and that the paseo should be part of the open space plan. He suggested that the applicant listen to President Sullivan's botanical recommendations. He said the master plan included two trails in Harbor View Park.

Board Member Cavanaugh asked if there was a standard for the Bay Trail to have separated areas for people walking and on bikes.

Staff Member Thomas said they do different treatments for different areas and activities.

Board Member Curtis cautioned that removing the grills could impact residents that do not have private open space for BBQs.

Staff Member Thomas said they would take all of the feedback and be back with the plan.

7-B 2019-6580

Planning Board Recommendation that the City Council Accept the City of Alameda 2018 General Plan and Housing Element Annual Report and Consideration of the Transportation Choices Plan Annual Report. The review of the annual reports is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act

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

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3862440&GUID=03E414B6-84E6-4917-B052-D03EBEC22C29&FullText=1>

President Sullivan said she is concerned that the top priority is homeless individuals that are not income producing individuals. She said she thought workforce housing would be a higher priority.

Staff Member Thomas said that list is not in order of priority and will be handled together because they are part of the same equation.

President Sullivan said she has a problem listing senior citizens next to homeless people. She said she does not believe there are not any similarities. She asked if transportation dictates the number of parking spaces or if the Planning Board does.

Staff Member Thomas said the Planning Board is responsible for applying the zoning code.

President Sullivan said that the report lists “free bus passes” when they are paid for by the homeowners.

Board Member Teague said he appreciates the changes made. He suggested reordering the six items on page 20 in priority order.

Board Member Teague made a motion to endorse the housing element report with the comments provided. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion.

Board Member Curtis said homeless do not necessarily produce any income but if not addressed will cost the city a lot of money.

Board Member Rothenberg said there is new legislation being introduced at the state level to increase opportunities for live/work units.

The motion was approved 7-0.

Board Member Teague offered several edits, clarifications, and comments for consideration for the Transportation Choices Plan report. He said he opposes charging for parking at the ferry terminals until there is a transit option. He said carpool priority parking could dramatically reduce the number of cars going to the ferry. He said a water shuttle could make a bicycle and pedestrian crossing unnecessary. He said the lights on Main Street are not timed and do not work well.

Board Member Mitchell said carpool parking at the ferry could help.

President Sullivan opened the public hearing.

Anne McKereghan said that Alameda does have homeless individuals earning income while living in their cars or couch surfing and deserve inclusion in the Housing Element.

Board Member Cavanaugh asked if it was possible to have a light rail system connecting Fruitvale BART to the two ferry terminals to serve everyone in Alameda.

Staff Member Thomas said that the development of Alameda Point has established the need for a bus line that connects west Alameda to the rest of the island. He said the issue is getting dedicated lanes for buses crossing the estuary. He said the Miller Sweeney

bridge is the preferred option to become retrofitted as a Lifeline structure in the event of a major earthquake. He said light rail could not cross the Union Pacific line in Oakland. He said running bus rapid transit could roll right over the train tracks.

Board Member Cavanaugh said the bus system runs into gridlock near the bridge, especially in the mornings. He said having a dedicated right of way has to happen for it to be effective.

Staff Member Thomas said the planners agree that having a dedicated lane for buses is key. He said they are even considering the idea of contra-flow peak hour bus lanes in the tubes, or congestion pricing to fund transportation.

8. MINUTES

None

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2019-6573

Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions

The staff report can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3862436&GUID=DDB47C1A-6A08-459E-9887-499040498A3B&FullText=1>

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

10-A 2019-6574

Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Planning, Building and Transportation Department Projects

Staff Member Thomas previewed upcoming meeting items.

Board Member Teague said the board members should read the City Attorney's direction on what is and is not permitted regarding use permit actions.

Staff Member Thomas said they are revising the RFQ.

Board Members Rothenberg, Curtis, and Sullivan volunteered to provide input on the revised RFQ.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

None

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 9:39pm.