

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, MAY 13, 2019

1. CONVENE

President Sullivan convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

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

None

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2019-6883

Planning Board Review of General Plan Update Table of Contents and Land Use Diagram and Classifications. The review of the General Plan Chapters are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act

Andrew Thomas, Acting Director of Planning, Building, and Transportation, introduced the item. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3935593&GUID=B58E2A9F-FEAF-40D0-B58E-44C53663AFA2&FullText=1> .

President Sullivan opened the public hearing.

Christopher Buckley asked that the action steps be listed alpha-numerically instead of as a list of bullet points. He said there are some proposals in the Historic Preservation Element that are still relevant and should be incorporated into the update. He said that, thus far, the changes do not seem to have an effect on historic properties and is okay with the changes.

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

President Sullivan voiced concern that the marina classifications have disappeared from the plan.

Staff Member Thomas explained that the commercial recreation category was blended with the park description. He said marinas are an important part of what makes Alameda different from many cities. He said showing marinas and potential marinas on the map is definitely an option.

President Sullivan expressed her preference for seeing all of the maritime uses listed as their own category. She asked that the jargon regarding climate change be written in plain English. She voiced concern that allowing a five story hotel at Ballena Bay would block views of San Francisco from the beach on Shoreline Drive and Bay Farm. She asked if a hotel would be more appropriate out at the changing Alameda Point. She said the area at Ballena Bay should be a park.

Board Member Rothenberg said she was confused about some of the combinations of sections. She stated she could not tell how the Housing Element would be organized to address different densities.

Staff Member Thomas responded with an explanation of how the Land Use and Housing elements interact, and changes that have been dictated by state law.

Board Member Rothenberg asked why the general industry classification was removed.

Staff Member Thomas led a discussion about different employment areas and their suitability for potentially mixing with residential uses. He explained some of the factors that encourage and discourage employers from locating in Alameda, including infrastructure at Alameda Point and floor area ratios in Harbor Bay, and compared them to cities like Fremont.

Board Member Curtis said comparing Alameda and Fremont is like apples and oranges because of the differences in road infrastructure.

Staff Member Thomas added that the EIR for Harbor Bay Business Park accounted for 17,000 jobs, when there are closer to 3,000 today.

Board Member Curtis said the paragraph describing the history of Measure A was inaccurate and poorly written. He explained the history of development and plans as he recalled for Harbor Bay and South Shore and how that led to Measure A and the reduction in allowed units for Harbor Bay.

President Sullivan said the language explaining the state mandates should be stronger.

Staff Member Thomas illustrated how unit densities get calculated for redeveloped project sites.

Board Member Saheba asked about the mixed use classifications for federal government properties like Coast Guard Island and the Navy Operational Support Center. He pointed out that mixed use areas were just described as the places development may occur in the next 20 years which would not apply, given current uses.

Staff Member Thomas replied that Coast Guard Island is a unique property which may not be available for development anytime soon, but would be if the land were ever auctioned off.

Board Member Saheba said the diagram needs to be a land and water use diagram.

Staff Member Thomas agreed that the marinas and the “bulkhead line” should be included in the diagram.

President Sullivan said she liked how the original map designated federal facilities.

Board Member Mitchell pointed out that the Shipways site should be listed as mixed use. He said the shoreline access points on the east end should be captured on the diagram. He agreed that we should capture the waterside uses more completely.

Board Member Cavanaugh said the area planned for development by the VA is not noted. He agreed that the marinas should be emphasized.

President Sullivan asked if this plan means there will be no new single family housing built in Alameda.

Staff Member Thomas responded that the question of allowing future low density residential would be left for a future policy discussion.

Board Member Teague said combining the Land Use and Design elements makes sense. He said the climate change and conservation pieces should get their own section. He added that the design elements should be included in the Design Element. He said he preferred maintaining separate chapters for Alameda Point and the Northern Waterfront. He asked for a history of building during different time periods so we can see the impact Measure A had on the building of housing over time. He said he is unclear how the multifamily overlay got around Measure A’s limit of one unit per 2000 square feet.

Staff Member Thomas responded by explaining that State Law requires cities to provide adequate amounts of land that are zoned at appropriate densities to support the local jurisdiction’s very low and low income share of the local regional housing needs allocation.

State law establishes that 30 units per acre is an adequate residential density for a city of

Alameda's size to support Alameda's very low and low income regional housing need. Therefore Alameda established a Multifamily Housing Overlay District that allows 30 units per acre and placed it on enough land in Alameda to cover the city's very low and low income regional housing need allocation. Measure A's prohibition of any residential density over 21 units per acre does not overrule State Law, therefore, the Council was required by the State Law to adopt the new ordinance, despite the City Charter prohibition. Staff member Thomas concluded by stating that the City's Charter provisions prohibiting multifamily housing and prohibiting density over 21 units per acre are in direct conflict with State Law, and State Law always trumps local law when there is a conflict.

Board Member Teague asked for explicit decisions on changes to the requirements from the existing document. He said certain provisions should be explicitly considered before requirements are relaxed. He said the federal areas and marinas should be marked out, lightly, in the diagram. He said we should keep the general industry classification because it does not permit certain uses. He pointed out various discrepancies in the map.

President Sullivan asked for clarification about calculating density with or without counting the space for roads.

Staff Member Thomas reviewed the method for calculating gross vs. net density in development applications.

8. MINUTES

8-A 2019-6887

Draft Meeting Minutes – March 11, 2019

President Sullivan pointed out the cannabis item had the wrong project description.

Board Member Teague motioned to continue the minutes to a future meeting.

Board Member Curtis requested that his comments regarding the dispensary lounge resembling an opium den be accurately reflected in the March 11, 2019 minutes.

Staff Member Thomas said they would make corrections and bring the minutes back for review.

8-B 2019-6888

Draft Meeting Minutes – March 25, 2019

Board Member Teague motioned approval of the minutes. Board Member Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0-1. Board Member Rothenberg abstained because she was absent from the March 25, 2019 meeting.

8-C 2019-6889

Draft Meeting Minutes – April 8, 2019

Board Member Saheba motioned approval of the minutes. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

8-D 2019-6890

Draft Meeting Minutes – April 22, 2019

President Sullivan motioned approval of the minutes. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0-1. Board Member Mitchell abstained because he was absent from the April 22, 2019 meeting.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2019-6884

Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions

The staff report can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3935619&GUID=B96735ED-04A5-42DE-87D6-D372A9F9F74E&FullText=1>

9-B 2019-6885

Oral Report - Status Report on Design Review and Development Plan for an approximately 113,000-square-foot hotel with 172 guest rooms, and an approximately 7,000-square-foot restaurant with coffee shop at 2900 Harbor Bay Parkway

President Sullivan said there were 13 community members in attendance at the meeting.

Staff Member Thomas provided an update on the project timeline.

9-C 2019-6886

Oral Report - Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Planning, Building and Transportation Department Projects

Staff Member Thomas outlined the items planned for the next meeting, including the Harbor Bay hotel, Climate Action and Resiliency Plan, and Capital Budget.

President Sullivan said that would be a lot for one meeting, especially after a three day weekend.

Staff Member Thomas said there were also a number of items stacking up for the June meetings.

Allen Tai, Planning Services Manager, described the SB2 planning grant opportunities for updating housing ordinances. He said they can be awarded up to \$310,000 in non-competitive grants to fund the work staff is doing.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

President Sullivan asked if there were some dates under consideration for a planning look back tour.

Staff Member Thomas said they were considering a field trip to look at some housing sites on a weekday evening or Saturday morning. He said they would include the Housing Authority site on Eagle, the 2100 Clement project, the senior affordable project at Del Monte, and the Tri Pointe project near Target.

Board Member Teague suggested adding the Carmel Partners project at the North Housing site. He expressed a preference for a weekend or a Thursday.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.