

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 2020

1. CONVENE

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

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Hom led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Board Members Rothenberg and Ruiz.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

Allen Tai, City Planner, asked the Board to move item 6-A from the Consent Calendar to the Regular Agenda because it requires a public hearing.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6-A 2020-7656

PLN19-0501 - 2800 Fifth Street - Applicant: Catellus Alameda Development, LLC. - Public Hearing to consider a recommendation to approve Parcel Map No. 11038 to subdivide six parcels into four parcels comprising approximately 22.86 acres. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15315 - Minor Land Divisions. As a separate and independent basis, 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) and no further environmental review is required.

Staff Member Tai introduced the item. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4308444&GUID=31E10EA3-C4CA-4CCA-948A-D92810B95340&FullText=1>.

Board Member Teague asked if there would be one homeowners association for each parcel or one for the entire project.

Scott Wikstrom, City Engineer, said the subsequent subdivision will address homeowners associations and this lot line adjustment is just to facilitate the development agreement.

There were no speakers.

Board Member Teague moved approval of the staff recommendation. Board Member Cavanaugh seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2020-7657

PLN18-0562 - Use Permit - 2331 North Loop Road - Applicant: John L. Lipp on behalf of Friends of the Alameda Animal Shelter. Public hearing to consider a use permit to allow the operation of an animal shelter that will include indoor boarding for up to 34 animals, two supervised outdoor animal runs, administrative offices, and community events, in a new, 12,000-square-foot building on a 0.45 acre parcel. Pursuant to Alameda Municipal Code Section 30-4.10.c, animal shelters with supervised outdoor runs require the approval of a use permit when located within 200 feet of any residential district. This project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15332 (Infill Development) and 15183 (projects consistent with General Plan and Zoning).

David Sablan, Planner II, gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4308549&GUID=BF6B453D-5BD6-42A7-ABDD-25ECE72BBBE6&FullText=1>.

John Lipp, FAAS, spoke about the intended use of the facility as an adoption center and described a scenario where they might wish to have more than the maximum three dogs in an outdoor run.

President Curtis said that the problem is noise, not the number of dogs, and that it would be up to the applicant to keep that under control.

Mr. Lipp answered Board Member Teague's questions that there would be one staff person per dog in the outdoor areas and they could meet that ratio if the condition were changed. He answered Board Member Hom's questions to say that the six dog limit is acceptable but they would like the flexibility to have more than three in any given area.

Board Member Teague asked what material the fence around the property would be as it relates to possible acoustic effects.

Jim Moore, project architect, said they would work with the neighbors to design the fence. Answering Board Member Cavanaugh's question, he said runoff from the dog runs would be filtered through the project's storm water system.

President Curtis opened the public hearing.

CJ Jiang said the outdoor dog runs concern the neighbors, including their hours of operations. They said the property values would take a hit. They asked that the dog runs be moved indoors or enclosed, at minimum not share a fence with neighbors, eliminate the rooftop runs, and prohibit public events on the rooftop and asked for the application to be denied until those issues can be addressed.

President Curtis closed the public hearing.

Mr. Lipp, answering Board Member Hom's questions, said the rooftop will not be an event space but members of the public may be brought there on tours.

Board Member Teague said the building design is a done deal and the Board is only discussing the use permit. He said he would support adding the one-to-one ratio into the use permit and removing the three dog limit. He said he would want continued noise complaints to trigger the three dog limit. He said adding some material to the fence that absorbs some of the sound would be a reasonable condition.

Board Member Hom said he is open to some flexibility in the number of dogs. He said the fence detail should be subject to further review by the Planning Director and that the use permit should be subject to review if staff determines there are enough noise complaints.

Board Member Saheba expressed surprise that an acoustical report was not provided for the neighbors to evaluate and to determine the barrier treatments. He supported the one-to-one requirement. He said he would consider adjusting the maximum number of dogs at ground level but not on the roof because of sound projection.

President Curtis said the use permit should be left at three dogs maximum.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the staff recommendation with the following changes: allowing up to four dogs on the outside run and three dogs on the rooftop run; and bring back a staff report on any noise complaints of the residents after a year of operation. Board Member Hom seconded the motion.

Staff Member Tai said the typical standard for use permit complaints, included in this use permit, is three verified violations will trigger a public hearing for possible revocation.

The motion passed 5-0.

7-B 2020-7658

PLN20-0017 - Block 11 Landscape Plan - Alameda Point Site A - Applicant: Alameda Point Partners. Public Hearing to consider the proposed landscape plan for Block 11 at Alameda Point Site A. The landscape plan follows final Planning Board approval of Design Review for the Block 11 building architecture on December 9, 2019. Approval of the landscape plan for the Block 11 is not subject to CEQA under McCorkle Eastside

Neighborhood Group v. City of St. Helena (2018) 31 Cal.App.5th 80, which found that design review for by-right projects is a ministerial decision under Public Resources Code section 21080.

Staff Member Tai introduced the item. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4308590&GUID=197B9608-0760-4AB7-9F26-4B8CDCE9F00F&FullText=1>.

Bradley Sugarman and, BAR Architects, and David Fletcher, landscape designer, gave a presentation.

Mr. Fletcher answered Board questions clarifying the species, sizes, and configuration of the landscape plan.

There were no public speakers.

Board Member Hom made a motion to approve the landscape plan. Board Member Teague seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

7-C 2020-7659

PLN19-0477 - Design Review Study Session - 2390 Mariner Square Drive - Applicant: Banner NorCal Developer, LLC. The Planning Board will hold a study session for a new, six-story self-storage building and outdoor storage for boats and recreational vehicles with associated landscaping and fencing. The proposed building is approximately 72 feet in height at its tallest point and approximately 110,844 square feet in size. The project is located within the M-2, General Industrial (Manufacturing) Zoning District. The proposed building is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 - Infill Development.

Staff Member Sablan gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4308591&GUID=8AA18066-7066-48E2-94EF-5C5191AD3F97&FullText=1>.

Margo Connelly, Banner Storage, gave a presentation.

Board Member Saheba asked if the building would have any sustainability features.

Ms. Connelly said they will meet California building code for being solar ready but have not determined whether the project would include solar.

Mike Offerheid, project architect, responding to Board Member Saheba's question said the screen wall would be the same material used on the building to blend in with the overall project.

Ms. Connelly, in response to Board Member Hom's questions, said there would be approximately 850 units, many as small as 5'x5'. She said the parking study is based off of ITE for the square footage and counts at a similar facility in the area.

Mr. Offerheid said the project would use a variety stamped metal panels on the building siding.

President Curtis opened the public hearing.

Shelley Barnhill, Barnhill Marina, said the project will be a big improvement over the current use of the site. She said the lighting was the main concern that could impact her floating home residents.

President Curtis closed the public hearing.

Board Member Hom said the landscaping of the City's property should be appropriately tied to the phasing of this project. He suggested increasing the landscape setback for the RV parking and screening wall.

Board Member Teague said he likes having more contrast on the metal panels, would like to see solar included in the project, bike storage and EZ Passes for staff. He said the fence may have to be higher, would like to see renderings from other perspectives, the building looks good and the parking analysis looks reasonable.

Board Member Cavanaugh said the large windows would need to keep the bird safe windows ordinance in mind, asked if the street parking would be able to handle busy periods, asked to better understand what function(s) the fence would serve, and asked if the brick designs of nearby buildings could be incorporated into the design.

Board Member Saheba said increasing the buffer of the screen wall, even intermittently, should be explored to allow more plantings. He said his understanding is the glazing does not provide anything for the inside of the building and the building could become quieter. He said he does not see the need for any of the glazing except for the office area and the pattern of the panels could envelop the whole building. He suggested doing more to let the building's function dictate the design. He said the landscaping will be critical and that he would like to see more thought about the sustainable features.

President Curtis said the different color panels and the random pattern detract from the design. He said the design is too busy.

Board Member Teague said he likes the glazing on the corner to emphasize that element but agreed that the other windows could be removed.

8. MINUTES

8-A 2020-7654

Draft Meeting Minutes - November 12, 2019

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the minutes. Board Member Saheba seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

8-B 2020-7655

Draft Meeting Minutes - November 25, 2019

President Curtis asked to add a clarification on page five to make clear that state laws would not overrule elements of Alameda's rent law that were more stringent.

Board Member Hom made a motion to approve the minutes with the suggested amendment by President Curtis. Board Member Cavanaugh seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2020-7652

Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions

9-B 2020-7655

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

Staff Member Tai previewed some ordinance changes that would be coming to the next meeting.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board Member Teague said he would be meeting with the Vice Mayor and others regarding paths forward on Article 26.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Curtis adjourned the meeting at 8.55 p.m.