

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2019

1. CONVENE

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

2. FLAG SALUTE

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Board Members Curtis, Cavanaugh, Hom, Rothenberg, Ruiz, Saheba, and Teague.

Absent: None.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

None.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6-A 2019-7324

Adoption of Objective Design Review Standards for Multi-family Residential Development as an addendum to the Citywide Design Review Manual. These Standards are applicable to all future multi-family residential development in the City seeking permit streamlining pursuant to state law. The adoption of Objective Design Review Standards is exempt from the requirements of CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3), where it can be seen with certainty that adoption of design standards will not have a significant effect on the environment, and Section 15183, projects consistent with a community plan, general plan or zoning. (Item Continued to November 25, 2019 Planning Board Meeting)

President Curtis said the item would be tabled until the November 25, 2019 meeting.

Board Member Teague wanted to ensure that there would be an opportunity for public comment on the item when it is heard.

Andrew Thomas, Planning, Building and Transportation Department Director, said they would plan to have public comment on the item.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2019-7349

PLN19-0270 - Development Plan and Design Review - 1815 Clement Avenue (between Alameda Marina Drive and Schiller Street) - Applicant: Pacific Shops, LLC. Public Hearing

to consider Development Plan and Design Review application for a four- to five-story residential building with 360 multi-family units and 8 Work/Live units as part of Phase I of the Alameda Marina Master Plan project. 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.

Staff Member Thomas introduced the item. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4154339&GUID=F0C16E65-ABDF-43AE-8DE1-EB057B54EB8F&FullText=1>

Ian Murphy, BDE Architecture, gave a presentation.

Board Member Ruiz asked what the building dimensions are.

Mr. Murphy said it is a very long façade, which dictated their tactics to try and break up the building with different techniques, including the view corridor.

Board Member Ruiz said she was told that the building length would be 485 feet.

Board Member Teague sought and received confirmation that no palm trees were planned for the project.

Board Member Hom disclosed that he met previously with the applicant to review the changes to the plan. He asked if the view corridor would be kept open at all hours.

Mr. Murphy said they discussed the possibility of closing the corridor during certain hours, but that the current intention is to leave it open.

Mr. Thomas said there is a condition of approval in the resolution stating that no gates would be built blocking public access to the view corridor.

Board Member Ruiz asked if there are any legal or physical constraints preventing the ground floor units from having some kind of stoop to help activate Clement Avenue.

Mr. Murphy said the four feet of grade change would require extensive stoops. He added that they went in the direction of having the units feel more private, which allowed them to provide more landscaping at the edge of the building.

Board Member Saheba asked if all residents would have to rely on the Schiller Street loading zone, or if there would be an option for residents on the west side of the project.

Mr. Murphy said he expected large truck loading to happen on the Schiller side of the building.

Board Member Saheba said the plans showed balconies for certain units that would be above the lobby space, and the renderings did not. He asked which was accurate.

Mr. Murphy said the renderings reflect the planned look of the façade.

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

Board Member Teague said he has met with the applicant on multiple occasions. He said he is in support of the project and has no suggested changes.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the item. Board Member Hom seconded the motion.

Board Member Hom said he really liked the architecture. He said the design is a step above most projects he has reviewed.

Board Member Saheba said the corridor needs to feel public. He said the first portal near the street has lighting in the soffit. He said there does not appear to be any lighting in the rear portal and suggested there should be.

Board Member Teague said he would accept that condition regarding lighting of the pathway portal as an amendment to his motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Staff Member Thomas said the decision is final, but can be appealed within the next ten days.

7-B 2019-7350

PLN19-0368 - 2800 Fifth Street - Development Plan, Density Bonus, and Tentative Map - Applicant: Pulte Home Company, LLC. Public Hearing to consider Development Plan, Density Bonus, and Tentative Map applications to construct 357 residential units, 5,000-square-feet of commercial space, internal roadways and alleys, parks and open space on an approximately 17.2-acre site as part of the Alameda Landing Waterfront Mixed-Use Development. The Planning Board may also review and comment on the initial Design Review plans for the project. The project is located within the M-X, Mixed-Use District. The 2006 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report was certified in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the Alameda Landing Mixed Use Development (State Clearinghouse #2006012091).

Henry Dong, Planner III, gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found

at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4154955&GUID=CC9C7888-BF76-45AA-AAA7-E258B70B42EC>

Board Member Teague asked to see the traffic calculations table, stating that there was an error.

Staff Member Thomas explained the trip generation calculator that staff used for the project.

Board Member Teague sought clarification about the labeling of the 11 units that were initially misclassified. He asked if flats larger than 1200 square feet would change the traffic generation numbers.

Staff Member Thomas explained that the flats over 1200 square feet would fit into another classification for multifamily units that have identical trip generation rates per the ITE codes.

Board Member Teague asked how the affordable housing credit would work.

Staff Member Thomas said that the Stargell Commons project was able to provide more units than the TriPointe project required. He said the nine additional units from Phase II are being applied to Phase III.

President Curtis asked that a live copy of the trip matrix be provided to the board members.

Board Member Hom asked if any follow up traffic counts have been conducted since the 2006 EIR was adopted in order to see if the projections were correct.

Staff Member Thomas said that they updated to matrix in 2017 to reflect what was actually built. He said there has not been a major traffic study done since construction took place. He said that the main thing that has changed since 2006 is how much the regional arterials have been impacted, but the project has generated trips in line with the 2006 EIR projections.

Scott Hilk, Pulte Homes, gave a presentation.

Jonathan Boriack, KTGy, continued the presentation by describing the project architecture.

Board Member Teague asked if the pocket parks are privately owned public spaces.

Mr. Hilk said that they are.

Board Member Hom asked why there was not an enhanced crosswalk along Fifth Street.

Staff Member Thomas said the Fifth Street design has been previously approved by the Planning Board and is the responsibility of Catellus.

Board Member Ruiz disclosed that she met with the applicant. She asked if the Board is reviewing the vertical architecture tonight.

Staff Member Thomas said staff has not had time to review the design review yet, but wanted to include it since Pulte had it available to share with the Board. He said the Development Plan was the highest priority for tonight.

Board Member Ruiz asked if the waste management and traffic plan would be part of the vertical design review or part of the development plan process. She said she has concerns that having all of the garages so close together without proper staging areas would be a problem.

Staff Member Thomas said they have not spent a lot of time on waste management questions yet. He said the Board could condition the Development Plan to require a waste management plan be part of the design review submittal.

Board Member Rothenberg suggested that we note that the species in the landscape plan be appropriate for the marine environment. She said the video showed lots of palm trees which the Board has pointed out come with many problems.

Mr. Hilk said they have heard that feedback. He said the video reflected the approved trees from the waterfront park plan. He said they are happy to modify at the Board's direction.

President Curtis said the entrance to Harbor Bay Parkway is a good example. He said 29 years ago they put in 11 palm trees and have lost several while the rest are not thriving in the conditions.

Board Member Saheba disclosed that he met with the applicant. He asked if the 5,000 square foot retail space will have sufficient parking.

Staff Member Thomas said the use is likely to be related to the park and dock activities. He said there are four spaces immediately adjacent to the pad and there is a shared lot across the street with 30 spaces.

Board Member Saheba asked if the space could be used as ancillary space for the residential, such as a clubhouse or similar.

Staff Member Thomas said the requirement is that the space be retail/commercial. He said the resolution is conditioned on them bringing back a plan for the commercial as the project takes shape and becomes populated.

Board Member Cavanaugh asked if there would ever be a connection to the ferry terminal via Mitchell Avenue.

Staff Member Thomas said the City's General Plan envisions Mitchell extending all the way to Main Street through the Bay Ship and Yacht property but that it is not part of this project.

President Curtis opened the public hearing.

Raymond Hsu, President of the neighboring TriPointe HOA, thanked Pulte for working with their community to improve the project. He said they are still concerned with the availability of parking and the height of the four story flats along Fifth Street. He added that Board Member Ruiz was right to worry about the waste management issue, as that has happened in their neighborhood. He expressed concern about the traffic planning on the island.

President Curtis closed the public hearing.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the Development Plan resolution with conditions: adding the waste management plan as part of the Design Review; banning all palm trees from the site due to cost of purchase and replacement, maintenance and liability, and zero waste goals of the City. He recommended that staff reach out to Catellus to add the suggested crosswalk on Fifth Street. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion.

Board Member Hom disclosed that he met with the applicant previous to the meeting. He said he likes the site plan and product mix.

President Curtis disclosed that he had met with the developer.

Board Member Teague expressed appreciation for all the work that went into improving the plans.

The motion passed 7-0.

Board Member Rothenberg made a motion to approve the Tentative Map. Board Member Hom seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

Staff Member Thomas said the Tentative Map would go on to City Council. He said the Development Plan approval was final, but appealable for the next ten days.

Board Member Teague said he liked the changes to all the buildings, except one. He said the large blocks on top of the buildings on page A.2.2.0 are distracting and asked for an attempt to reduce their impact.

Mr. Hilk said they are trying to provide roof decks, which require two staircases and an elevator shaft.

Board Member Saheba said this type of architecture is a bit frenetic but is okay if that is what the developer wants to do. He said the Compass buildings have the same shading elements regardless of orientation. He said this results in some of the south oriented buildings having no shading elements over the glazing of the living spaces. He said this should be taken into account for sustainability reasons as well as creating some visual interest in the alleyways by not having the shade elements on the north facing garages. He said a bit more care and analytical study could be done with an eye towards sustainable design. He said the ground floors of the flats along Fifth Street are detrimental to the streetscape due to the blank façade. He said there are opportunities to open up the interior uses to allow some light to get out and indicate some life beyond the wall. He said page A.4.0.4 shows some details that seem inconsequential and pasted on that need work.

Board Member Ruiz echoed Board Member Saheba's comments regarding the façade of the Landing buildings. She said the video makes the corner of Fifth and Mitchell look very stark. She suggested further study to make that corner more pedestrian friendly. She said the Lookout balcony walls are too large and intrusive.

Board Member Hom suggested some further differentiation between the unit types via material types and color. He expressed concern with some of the design elements of the Compass units. He suggested using different railing designs between the different unit types to help add differentiation.

Board Member Rothenberg and President Curtis concurred with the previous design related comments.

7-C 2019-7351

PLN19-0408 - Tentative Map - Site A Phase 2 at Alameda Point - Applicant: Alameda Point Partners, LLC. - Public Hearing to consider Tentative Map No. 8532 for the proposed subdivision of six lots on 20.1 acres within the second phase of the Site A Development Plan at Alameda Point.

Staff Member Thomas introduced the item. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4154411&GUID=A07DD2C9-599D-4194-BBC8-7B9E6583EF46&FullText=1>

There were no speakers.

Board Member Ruiz said that she no longer needs to recuse herself on any items related to Site A.

Board Member Teague made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

8. MINUTES

8-A 2019-7340

Draft Meeting Minutes – September 9, 2019

Board Member Hom made a motion to approve the minutes. Board Member Ruiz seconded the motion.

Board Member Teague said that on page 10 he would like to call out the amendments in his motion to be relating to street yards and changing work/live to residential.

The motion to approve the corrected minutes passed 7-0.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2019-7325

Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions

The staff report can be found at:
<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4150605&GUID=004691B9-A7F5-44AD-AE0D-9139B5A72ED8&FullText=1>

Board Member Teague explained the software bug that was preventing him from being able to view applications.

Board Member Ruiz said that she has only been able to view the first page of plans on her iPad.

9-B 2019-7327

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

Staff Member Thomas said Site A is the only item planned for the October 28 meeting. He said they expect to bring the Pulte project back November 12, which is a Tuesday due to Veteran's Day. He said Objective Standards are scheduled for November 25, as well as a lot line adjustment and parcel map for the Catellus/Pulte site. He said December 9 would be a public forum on Measure A.

Board Member Teague asked staff to gather feedback from developers on the proposed Objective Standards. He requested further legal opinion from the City Attorney's Office regarding our ability to have two different sets of design criteria based on whether streamlining is invoked or not. He said the affordable housing developers say they do not invoke streamlining out of a fear of antagonizing staff.

Staff Member Thomas said staff is actively working on a streamlined application for the Housing Authority and that they are not that sensitive about an applicant using streamlining.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board Member Teague said he has suggested considering repealing the ADU law and just adopting the state's law in the interest of expedience. He said he will be speaking to a group and will note that he is not speaking on behalf of the Planning Board.

President Curtis asked what the vehicle would be for making the ADU recommendation to City Council.

Staff Member Thomas said they are already working on the topic, but were waiting for the new state laws. He said they can consider Board Member Teague's suggestion at that time.

Board Member Hom said it would be interesting to get a high level review of the recent housing related bills that could impact Alameda. He said he would not be able to attend the October 28 meeting.

President Curtis said he would like to schedule some time on the November 12 agenda to have Board Member Teague present on the recent state housing bills.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Curtis adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.