

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, MAY 28, 2019

1. CONVENE

President Sullivan convened the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Saheba 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

6-A 2019-6938

Consideration of the Proposed Fiscal Year 2019-2021 Capital Budget and Consistency with the City of Alameda General Plan

Board Member Teague motioned approval of the consent calendar. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2019-6939

Public Hearing to consider the final architectural elevations, landscape plan, lighting plan, and parking plan for Design Review No. PLN18-0381 for an approximately 113,000-square-foot five-story hotel with 172 guest rooms and an approximately 7,000-square-foot restaurant with coffee shop, located approximately 400-feet northwest of the corner of Harbor Bay Parkway and Bay Edge Road. The property is located within the C-M-PD, Commercial Manufacturing - Planned Development zoning district. The Harbor Bay Isle Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the development of the Harbor Bay Business Park Planned Development.

Henry Dong, Planner III with the Planning, Building, and Transportation Department, gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3953178&GUID=BFB9780D-CBEA-4611-AD0E-92D88620FF4A&FullText=1>

President Sullivan asked what the distance was from the gravel pathway to any hardscaping of the project.

Staff Member Dong said the building was setback 35 feet from the path and that the patio and fire pit area was within the setback.

Board Member Curtis said the perspective showing how the hotel fit into the larger shoreline context which they included for the previous design was missing from the current submission.

Andrew Thomas, Director of Planning, Building, and Transportation, said that perspective was asked for at the October, 2018 study session. He added that the request from the December, 2018 hearing was to bring back more detailed elevations. He outlined the choices for the Board to consider. He said the Board can approve the plan, or ask for more information or revisions.

Board Member Teague pointed out a discrepancy regarding how many parking spaces were removed between the staff report and the project plans. He said there was an increase in the hotel square footage and a decrease in the restaurant square footage. He requested an explanation from the applicant regarding those changes.

Robert Leach, project applicant, said the project has been going through Marriot's review process as well. He said they have needed to increase some space for back of house operations. He said the two restaurant groups they have been working with require less space than originally planned. He said they negotiated with BCDC to include hardscape improvements within the 35 foot setback under the condition that they be available to the general public utilizing the adjacent trail. He said they have had numerous meetings with the neighborhood and have incorporated most of the feedback into the design. He said they have been good partners and that construction costs are rising and time is a concern.

President Sullivan said hardscape is not typically included in the setback. She said the 75 feet from the water is not a number that is relevant, instead drawing attention to the proximity of the building to the City-owned pathway.

Staff Member Thomas said that when setbacks are referenced, they are relative to the face of the building.

President Sullivan said the landscaping cross section for the lagoon embankment was small and unreadable. She asked if there was a large version available.

Mr. Leach said he has a large version in his vehicle outside the building and could retrieve it for review.

Board Member Mitchell asked how we got from the previous design to the current version.

Mr. Leach said they have changed the design four times thus far in response to Planning Board, City Council, staff, and public input.

Board Member Teague asked what types of plants are included on the berm blocking the headlights of parked cars. He expressed a concern about taller vehicles shining lights over the top of the berm.

Mr. Leach said he would need to retrieve the landscape plan in order to provide further details about plantings on the berm.

Staff Member Thomas said the intent of the plan is to screen the headlights of vehicles facing the pathway and the lagoon.

Board Member Cavanaugh said the maximum headlight height, according to the California Vehicle Code, is 4.5 feet.

Staff Member Thomas said they can easily adjust the conditions of approval to assure a solid barrier of hedges or berms at 4.5 feet.

President Sullivan said we are here to discuss the size of the setback, the landscape plan, and the design of the building. She opened the public hearing.

Brian Tremper said the design looks like a Soviet style industrial buildings. He said he liked the increased landscaping. He said the community input meetings had short notice and one was on Mother's Day weekend and many people could not attend. He said we deserve a better design.

Ed Sing said he is okay with the setback of 35 feet. He said the Board should be given better plan documents for review. He said the community was promised an iterative design process and did not get that. He said there needs to be more contrast and color in the design. He asked that the plan not be approved tonight. He asked that the resolution include a clause stating that the design and landscaping along the lagoon cannot be revised without the express approval of the City with the coordination of the community.

David Ross said that time is money, and Alameda needs the good union jobs that the project will provide. He said the Board should approve the project and stop delaying the process.

Juan Barboza, field representative for the carpenters' union, said they fully support the project.

Pat Lamborn said the Planning Board has the power to decide what this hotel looks like. She said the developer has signed on to the labor agreements over time. She said the

Board does not have enough information yet to make a decision. She said all the HOAs in Harbor Bay opposed the project. She said the project needs to be worthy of the location.

Wei-Ling Huber, UNITE-HERE, said Alameda needs this project for the tax revenue and jobs created. She said the hotel will offer good wages, unlike other hotels in Alameda. She urged approval of the plans so the project can move forward as soon as possible.

John Belperio, field representative for the carpenters' union, said the developer has been engaged and supportive of organized labor from the beginning. He said the project has been through many stages of approval and revision, and construction costs have continued to increase.

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

Board Member Teague asked if they approve the architectural design but not the color palette, would that be enough to move forward. He received an affirmative response from the applicant. He listed previous conditions on the design that would need to be included in any approval, including differentiation between the hotel and restaurant buildings, that the plaster finishes be smooth, and that the berm and landscaping be sufficient to block any parked vehicle headlights from reaching the pathway. He said he is not opposed to hardscaping in the setback as long as they are publicly accessible.

Mr. Leach said the public access requirement is the same agreement they have made with BCDC.

Board Member Teague said he is in favor of the project moving forward. He said the structural design is much improved but did not like the color scheme. He added that the design distinctions between the two buildings on the site need to be carried forward.

Board Member Saheba said we have an opportunity to make a great project on a rare water's edge site. He repeated a previous suggestion to create more connections from the parking lot to the Bay Trail to accommodate the flow of ferry riders. He said he has trouble with the use of thin brick in the new design, saying it reads like wallpaper. He said he would not like to see that type of material used along the base of the building. He said the increased glazing on the ground floor is a good idea but thinks the Board would need to see it before approving. He said the building still feels too massive, asking for increased window sizes. He added that he hopes that the developer has a plan for the art component. He said sprinkling variation in material around the restaurant building detracts from the cohesiveness of the design. He said the solar shading on the southern exposure makes sense, but the sporadic use of them on the northern façade is not useful. He expressed frustration with the poor quality and inaccuracy of the drawings being provided to the board after months of work. He said he is prepared to approve the landscape plan, the parking plan, and the setback tonight. He said the lighting plan and the architectural elevations are not ready for approval.

Board Member Mitchell said he is confused how we got to this design. He said the façade is too large and reminded him of a bunker. He said we have already approved the building height. He said he is fine with the setback. He said it is important that the neighbors inform the design, but that all of Alameda be taken in to consideration. He said the lighting plan should be defined in kelvins and not subjective terms like warm.

Board Member Rothenberg said she agreed with the comments of the other board members. She added that the design is not what she would expect and is not prepared to approve the design tonight.

Board Member Curtis said a lot of money and time has been put into this process by the developer. He said the project needs to get started soon if it is going to get built.

Board Member Cavanaugh said he is not happy with the colors. He said he is okay with the size of the structure. He said he wants to approve the project and move it forward.

Board Member Teague asked how much of the structural design the Board needs to approve to enable the applicant to move forward.

Staff Member Thomas said the Board can approve the setback, landscape plan, and agreeing to the basic configuration of the building. He said he is hearing the Board would like to see the colors, exterior materials, and lighting come back. He said the applicant can submit for building permits right away which would allow the time to refine the outstanding elements.

Board Member Curtis pointed out that some of the board members were not ready to approve the landscape plan.

Staff Member Thomas said he believed he heard some additional conditions to be added for the landscape plan. He said items such as planting choices could easily come back, so long as the basic building blocks are approved.

President Sullivan said the building looks very inexpensive. She said the front of the building looks very different from the back. She said the bigger windows would help but does not want to rush the project given how important the location is and the proximity to million dollar homes. She said she needs to see the landscaping plan. She said the jacaranda might not be the best choice for the windy, salty location. She said the palm trees selected can get to be 100 feet tall.

Board Member Teague asked for an answer about the ability to increase the window size in the rooms.

Mr. Leach said the windows in the rooms are eight foot by eight foot, the largest he has seen in the industry. He said there is also an air conditioner cabinet adjacent to the

windows. He said they need the remaining space to support the modules when they are shipped. He added that they have ten foot ceilings in the rooms. He said it is not feasible or desirable to increase the window size further.

Board Member Rothenberg asked what the purpose of ten foot ceilings would be.

Mr. Leach said they have a narrow bay design to maximize views of the water and that the increased height is appreciated by the customers and requested by Marriott.

Board Member Saheba said the concern is the amount of solid on the exterior, not the amount of glass on the interior.

Board Member Teague moved approval of the 35 foot setback. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Board Member Saheba moved approval of the parking lot configuration. Board Member Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Board Member Teague moved approval of the building structural design with the requirement that the exterior palette materials and colors return for further review. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion.

Board Saheba said he is supportive of approving the footprint and height of the building.

Staff Member Thomas said he is hearing that at least one commissioner would like to keep the size of the windows open for discussion, and to see how the ground floor clerestory windows will look. He said that it is not uncommon for developers to submit building plans and then revise them during the plan check process.

Board Member Curtis said that if there is a structural reason why the windows cannot be any larger they would possibly be putting in an impossible condition.

Staff Member Thomas said the ground floor is not modular construction and therefore the developer believes that adding the clerestory windows there will not present an engineering problem. He suggested approving the building massing, but bringing back the architectural elevations.

President Sullivan asked if the suggestion would approve the articulation on the front which is very different from the back of the building, and said she could not support that.

Staff Member Thomas said there are short rooms and long rooms which can be adjusted to change the articulation.

President Sullivan said she feels the project should come back. She added that approving the project piecemeal will not result in a good project.

Board Member Teague said he does not believe the window plan for the rooms can be excluded from the approval and allow the project to move forward, saying he therefore would not amend his motion. He said he would accept the addition of the first floor clerestory windows.

The motion passed 4-3 (Sullivan, Saheba, and Rothenberg voted No.)

Staff Member Thomas summarized the decision saying the structural design of the building is approved, but the colors and materials would come back. He added that the parking, setback, and massing are settled issues.

Board Member Teague made a motion to have the landscaping plant materials and a cross section of the berm come back for review. Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Board Member Curtis asked when the item would be coming back to the Board.

Staff Member Thomas said that they would bring the item back for the first meeting in July.

Board Member Saheba asked that planning staff review the submissions internally for consistency before distributing them.

Board Member Rothenberg asked for a partial set of plans that shows the floor plans and sections.

President Sullivan declared a five minute recess.

7-B 2019-6940

Review and Comment on the Draft Climate Action and Resiliency Plan

Erin Smith, Deputy Public Works Director, gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3953031&GUID=91EEC739-5EB0-4C5D-AE7D-8C52FA9B2740&FullText=1>

President Sullivan asked what the cost would be for a typical 2,000 square foot home to convert from gas water heater and furnace to all electric and what the impact would be on the monthly electric bill.

Staff Member Smith said they have an estimate of approximately \$20,000 to perform the average retrofit. She said they have not identified the specific impact on the monthly electric bill.

President Sullivan said that she remembers all electric homes having bills of \$300-600 per month. She asked how the decision was made for Alameda to be global leaders on this issue.

Staff Member Smith said the community was the initial source of the interest in setting that goal. She added that it became more of a declarative statement when the City Council passed the climate emergency declaration in March.

Board Member Curtis asked if there was a budget in place for the items listed in the already planned category.

Staff Member Smith said that the budget for those items would be in their associated plans, such as the Transportation Choices Plan.

Board Member Curtis asked if there would be significant diminishing returns for the marginal actions that would make them cost prohibitive.

Staff Member Smith said they include the unit of dollars per metric cubic ton of carbon dioxide removed from the atmosphere in the plan. She said their process was a balancing act between achieving goals and including what was important to the community. She continued to say that those tradeoffs are noted in the plan.

Board Member Curtis said he is concerned about costs of construction increasing which prevents planned developments from proceeding. He said the plan needs to be integrated with what the City is trying to achieve in response to the housing crisis.

Staff Member Thomas said the City will have to look at what they are requiring of new developments and evaluate what new things might be important and what existing requirements need to go in order to keep projects feasible.

Board Member Teague asked that the 2005 baseline be included and clarified in relation to the proposed actions versus business as usual pathways. He said the mitigations should be presented in a way that prioritizes actions for greatest effect relative to cost. He asked that the pie chart have the Transportation category broken down between different classes of vehicles such as trucks versus single occupancy vehicles. He said the telecommuting goal of 1.5 days per week is a strange number, saying someone that telecommutes half a day has commuted. He said encouraging water heating with rooftop solar is a good strategy. He said increased temperatures will lead Alamedans to install air conditioning systems which will increase demand for electricity at the exact time that solar could provide the increased energy. He pointed out that we can purchase clean energy, but that will leave the dirty energy for someone else to purchase. He suggested that if we ban leaf blowers, barbecues should be on the list. He wondered when the last 50 year storm occurred in Alameda.

Board Member Curtis said that sometime between 1984 and 1986 the lagoons overflowed and his dock floated away.

Board Member Teague said the cooperative regional documents and efforts should be open source and not hidden from the public.

Board Member Rothenberg suggested the cost numbers of the mitigations could be included earlier in the report. She suggested including the 2016 Local Hazard Plan in the Appendix which could make the City eligible for certain funding sources.

Board Member Mitchell asked why tsunamis were not included in the list of hazards that were studied, while earthquakes were.

Staff Member Smith said they addressed earthquakes generally because their impacts can be exacerbated by Climate Change. She said that tsunamis are specifically addressed in the Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Board Member Curtis said Dames and Moore, an engineering firm, did a detailed report on liquefaction and tsunami impacts when the original application for the villages of Harbor Bay was submitted.

Board Member Cavanaugh asked where the congestion pricing funds would be allocated.

Staff Member Smith suggested that some of the funds could go into a climate fund.

Liam Garland, Public Works Director, said that the feasibility study for congestion pricing would identify what portion of the funding generated would be needed to sustain the program. He said a climate fund is one option for the excess, expansion of initiatives like AC Transit EZ Passes would be another.

Board Member Cavanaugh pointed out that buses get stuck in the same lanes that vehicles do. He suggested the possibility of having a train system, or bus system on dedicated right of way which connects Fruitvale BART with the West End and the ferry terminals. He asked how we are working with Oakland to make traffic flow better, which he said appears to be the choke point. He expressed concern about a levee system and who is going to bear the costs. He asked how we would deal with the rising water table.

Staff Member Garland said adopting the Plan is critical to acquiring grant funding for the projects specified within.

Board Member Cavanaugh said we do not know what FEMA will do. He said they have eliminated their MOU in the Delta, where he owns 700 acres. He said we need to be proactive in understanding the funding picture.

President Sullivan said the section discussing the Shipways site is already outdated and needs to be updated.

Board Member Saheba asked what the City's position and plan is for the deployment of scooter sharing services.

Staff Member Thomas said the Council has asked staff to create a permitting program. He said they are watching some larger cities that are developing their own permitting programs. He added that cities are seeing injuries associated with scooter use.

Board Member Saheba said the Lime bikes at the ferry terminals were being used and filling the last mile need in the transportation system.

No action was taken.

8. MINUTES

8-A 2019-6933

Draft Meeting Minutes - March 11, 2019

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

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2019-6934

Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions

The staff report can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3950922&GUID=2C0A5766-135B-491A-9E06-1C4ED92D9D3C&FullText=1>

9-B 2019-6941

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

Staff Member Thomas said the June 10 meeting would have a study session on the Alameda Landing waterfront housing plan, a new FAAS shelter on Harbor Bay, and a Design Review for the Fifth Street portion of the Alameda Landing waterfront. He said some streamlining amendments, Alameda Marina Tentative Map, and possibly South Loop Road or Del Monte on the June 24 meeting. He said they have reserved a bus and driver for the tour for Thursday June 6.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board Member Teague said he cannot find the individual resolutions online in the same fashion as the City Council.

Board Member Mitchell announced that he would not be reapplying for a second term appointment and that this would be his last meeting. He said he is becoming Executive Vice President of his children's school PTA and will not have time to do both.

Staff Member Thomas expressed staff's gratitude for Board Member Mitchell's service on the Board and said he will be missed.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Sullivan adjourned the meeting at 10:08 p.m.