

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 2022

1. CONVENE

President Asheshh Saheba convened the *meeting at 7:00 p.m.

**Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, codified at Government Code Section 54953, Planning Board members can attend the meeting via teleconference.*

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Ron Curtis led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: President Saheba, Vice President Ruiz, and Board Members Curtis, Rothenberg, Cisneros*, and Teague.

Absent: Board Member Hanson Hom

**Board Member Cisneros joined the meeting after the roll call.*

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

None.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2022-1665

PLN19-0556 -- Design Review Amendment -- PLN19-0556 - Site A Block 11 at West Atlantic Avenue and Pan Am Way -- Applicant: UDR, Inc. A Public Hearing to consider amendments to the previously-approved Design Review applications for Block 11 at Site A. This action is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act under McCorkle Eastside Neighborhood Group v. City of St. Helena (2018) 31 Cal.App.5th 80. As a separate and independent basis, the environmental effects of the proposed project were considered and disclosed in the Alameda Point Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse #2013012043). No further environmental review is required.

Andrew Thomas, 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=5379989&GUID=8240DCA5-261F-4060-AAE5-444187E64F94&FullText=1>.

President Saheba opened the board clarifying questions.

Board Member Alan Teague asked for clarification on where the four different doors lead to. He wanted to know how the residential entrance was distinguished from the retail entrance.

Hillary Dowden, a developer with UDR, explained the layout and the entrances.

President Saheba opened public comment.

David Israel, the architect, also discussed and explained the difference between retail entrances and residential entrances.

Betsy Mathieson, an Alameda resident, had questions about the hanger doors. She wanted to see the South Elevation.

President Saheba closed public comment and opened board discussion.

Board Member Teague was not totally in favor of this design but he would not stand in the way of its approval. He thought the way it was before made it clear how you were supposed to get into the building, and this way it kinda blends in.

President Saheba agreed that there was no clarity of entryway. He thought there needed to be more work, perhaps with the canopy design.

Vice President Teresa Ruiz had requested from the applicant the building plan and thought there was no confusion and was in support of this amendment.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the amendment. Board Member Xiomara Cisneros seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0 with Board Member Hom absent.

7-B 2022-1666

A Public Workshop to Review and Comment on the Draft Housing Element Update Zoning Code Amendments Regarding Definitions and Regulations for Residential and Related Land Uses.

Director Thomas introduced this item and gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5379991&GUID=F97232D8-E3DF-44D1-9F85-F0EA8FC27926&FullText=1>.

President Saheba opened the board clarifying questions.

Board Member Teague asked how they were proceeding in regards to Article 26.

Director Thomas explained the position they were in. Alameda has to adopt a Housing Element and zoning that complies with State Law, it will conflict with the city's Charter. State Law trumps local initiative and local charter.

Celena Chen, Staff Planning Counsel, added that to the extent that State law conflicted with the Charter Provision, the city must follow State Law.

Board Member Teague stated he was not a fan of Section 26 but he was a fan of complying with the law. He discussed hypothetical ways they could move forward.

Vice President Ruiz wanted to know more about the redlining section and was concerned that separating different parcels it was another form of redlining.

Director Thomas discussed how this was not redlining but they were setting boundaries.

Board Member Cisneros discussed the theme of Article 26, she believed it should be eliminated since it was inherently a conflict. She also discussed Project Homekey and matching what they did.

Staff Member Tai discussed Project Homekey and what was allowed.

Board Member Ron Curtis discussed the concerns that Alameda citizens had shared with him.

Board Member Rona Rothenberg asked about C1, C2, and CC. She wanted to know if multifamily housing had been built in those districts by conditional use.

Director Thomas explained that the CC districts are Park St and Webster. He then discussed what the zoning code said.

President Saheba asked about assisted living and where memory care was listed and considered. He wanted to make they were flexible with the zoning for those types of facilities.

Staff Member Tai discussed the definition of assisted living/care. He added that currently, they were treating those as a commercial-type facility. If it was in the R1-R5 then they would want to have a public hearing.

Heather Coleman, the consultant, also discussed the definitions of assisted living.

There was then a conversation about assisted living facilities counting toward the RHNA (Reginal Housing Needs Allocation) numbers and Staff Member Tai discussed overall housing needs.

President Saheba opened public comment.

Zac Bowling discussed State Law, how it trumped local laws, and the work he had done at the State level. He was very much in support of the staff's approach of using an MF Overlay. He suggested that staff also do an Affordable Housing Overlay as Berkeley had done.

Karen Bey discussed ideas she had for dealing with Fair Housing inequities. She suggested rezoning the North Park District Maritime Manufacturing Zoning, to allow for transitional and affordable housing. She also pointed out that historically the West End had carried the burden for low-income housing.

Josh Geyer supported the approach that the staff was taking and he also agreed with what Zac Bowling had said. He also agreed with Vice President Ruiz that this felt like another form of redlining, different types of housing for different types of people.

William Smith also seconded what Zac Bowling, Karen Bey, and Josh Geyer had said. They needed to take a hard look at Affirmative Fair Housing and thought Vice President Ruiz said it well with wondering if excluding fair housing from R1 was redlining or fair.

Christopher Buckley, Alameda Architecture Preservation Society, discussed a letter the society had sent. Their main concern was the proposed upzoning in the R2-R6 to allow multi-family, they felt it was premature. He discussed different strategies for getting additional units.

Alex Spehr was very much in favor of upzoning on Webster and Park provided they could keep the historical look of those areas. She was also supportive of Alameda's upzoning to allow for more density.

President Saheba closed public comment and opened board discussion.

Board Member Teague liked Exhibit 1 but wanted it to show the items that had changed. He then discussed definitions and which ones needed to be broader. He pointed out that until he is told otherwise by the city attorney he will follow Article 26 but would find it difficult to not do whatever he could to bend it. He wanted to see duplexes allowed in R1 and allow up to 4 units in an existing building exempt from density limits. He thought that triplexes should be allowed in R2 and to allow quads in R3 and R4. He also thought that they should go to the council and ask to be allowed to do SB-10 in all R5 and R6. He then discussed how they could continue the MF Overlay and which large parcels needed to be upzoned. He wanted to increase the density of the whole island but in a controlled fashion.

Vice President Ruiz echoed Karen Bey's comment that historically the West End had carried the burden of supporting low-income housing. She was also in agreement with Board Member Teague regarding Article 26, they were bound by it but could find creative ways to circumvent it. Generally, she was in support of the staff's recommendation. She wanted to see clarification on the definition of dwelling and gave suggestions on better word choices. She also had questions about Senior Care categories and other dwelling categories.

Director Thomas said they would check all the definitions.

Board Member Cisneros wanted to hear more from Board Member Teague on the definition of multifamily.

Board Member Teague explained why he wanted the definition to say "5 plus" and not just "3 plus" and the reason for it. He explained in detail why changing the definition was important.

There was then a conversation on zoning and meeting the RHNA.

Board Member Cisneros was concerned for all the energy going into the workarounds for Article 26. She was also open to of the MF Overlay but preferred to make changes to the Zoning Code.

President Saheba wanted to see clarification on the floating homes section and where that zoning was allowed.

Director Thomas explained the Estuary District.

8. MINUTES

None.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2022-1662

Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions

Recent actions and decisions can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5379981&GUID=F6DDE061-ECA1-485C-9FA7-7B8BC0E2474F&FullText=1>.

No board members wanted to pull any item for review.

9-B 2022-1663

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

Staff Member Tai announced that the next meeting would be on 2/14/22. The staff hoped to bring back some zoning updates. Also two projects, the infill development at Santa Clara and the Hilton Hotel at Harbor Bay Gateway. Later in February, they hoped to continue with the Housing Element Workshops and some Annual Reports to bring forward.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Vice President Ruiz asked if she still needed to recuse herself from any Encinal Terminals discussion.

Staff Counsel Chen would connect with her offline.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Therese Hall wanted to know who on the Planning Board or in the city was involved with the Oakland/Alameda Access Project to represent Alameda's interests.

Staff Member Tai discussed how Alameda has been involved.

Director Thomas added that the city had been actively involved in that project and that it was a good project for Alameda and Oakland. He then added that anyone was welcome to reach out to him personally.

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Saheba adjourned the meeting at 9:07 p.m.