

APPROVED MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA HISTORICAL ADVISORY BOARD  
THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 2022

1. CONVENE

Chair Thomas Saxby called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

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

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Saxby, Board Members Lau, Sanchez, and Wit.

Absent: Vice Chair Lynn Jones.

3. MINUTES

None.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

None.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATION

Mike Van Dine discussed the Freedom of Information request for the texts between Mayor Ashcraft, Allen Tai, Andrew Thomas and Doug Biggs regarding the project on McKay Ave.

6. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

**7-A 2022-2083**

*Public Workshop to Review and Comment on the April 2022 Draft Housing Element*

Allen Tai, City Planner, introduced this item and gave a brief presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5662275&GUID=AFB12801-625B-4FB1-9C2A-BD15DABF6F2F&FullText=1>

Chair Saxby opened the board clarifying questions on the Transit Overlay District.

Chair Saxby asked for clarification on what information would benefit the staff.

Staff Member Tai discussed what staff was looking for in this workshop.

Board Member Norman Sanchez asked for clarification on the Transit Map.

Staff Member Tai discussed and gave explanation on the Transit Map.

Heather Coleman, the consultant, also provided information and clarification on the Transit Map.

Chair Saxby asked how the Transit Overlay district would be effected by the Design Review process. He also wanted to know why the 1000sq ft. was chosen.

Staff Member Tai said it would go through the same Design Review process. He then discussed requirements for the district. He answered that the 1000sq ft. was considered large enough to accommodate families while keeping it affordable.

Board Member Jenn Wit asked about transit data and how that might change in the future.

Staff Member Tai discussed current transit lines and what factors had to be considered.

Board Member Alvin Lau asked setbacks in the Transit District.

Staff Member Tai said that it was the same requirements in the base zoning district.

Chair Saxby opened public comment on the Transit Overlay District.

Betsy Mathieson had questions about the “by right” design with no discretionary approval, she was concerned there would be no historic protection. She discussed her concerns about protecting existing historic neighborhoods. She also brought up her issues and concerns with the bus lines.

Christopher Buckley, Alameda Architecture Preservation Society (AAPS), discussed that the Transit Map was too reliant on a high quality transit routes. He brought up his concerns about future upzoning based purely on future bus routes.

Chair Saxby closed public comment and opened board discussion on the Transit Overlay District.

Chair Saxby was not in favor of the Transit Overlay District, he saw it as a blunt force tool. He discussed the many negative effects this would bring to established neighborhoods. He would rather see this plan of action applied to targeted limited areas to see if it would even work.

Board Member Sanchez asked for clarification on what would happen if another established bus zone came along in the future.

Staff Member Tai clarified the language around Design Review and what conditions would need to be met for those requirements. He went into detail about what “by right” meant. Board Member Lau asked if they could make the overlay district smaller.

Staff Member Tai discussed what standards and definitions were set forth by State Law.

Chair Saxby closed discussion on the Transit Overlay District.

Ms. Coleman gave a presentation on the Objective Design Standards.

Chair Saxby opened board clarifying questions on the Objective Design Standards.

Chair Saxby wanted to know what projects fell under the Objective Design Standards.

Ms. Coleman explained that it was any project that State Law required ministerial review against Objective Standards.

Staff Member Tai explained new state laws and how that had effected everything.

Board Member Sanchez asked for clarification about SB-9 excluding historic districts.

Staff Member Tai explained SB-9, which only applied to R1 zones, and pointed out that there were no R1 zones in Alameda that were also historic districts.

Board Member Wit wanted to make sure that these designs encourage livability and community gathering.

Staff Member Tai discussed the design standards and what staff looks for, like open space.

Board Member Sanchez discussed contextual elements and wondered how literal they would be with those requirements.

Ms. Coleman gave examples of what they would looking for.

Chair Saxby asked what the appeal process would be like.

Staff Member Tai answered that the Objective Design Standards were created to support Ministerial Review, which there is no appeal. He discussed other options that were built into the standards.

Chair Saxby opened public comment on the Objective Design Standards.

Christopher Buckley, AAPS, believed these were a very good set of standards. He discussed the standards they like but were puzzled why the North Park St Area was not included in the Traditional Design Area (TDA). He went into detail about suggestions on how to help the applicant and window guidelines.

Chair Saxby closed public comment and opened board discussion on the Objective Design Standards.

Board Member Sanchez asked what the ramifications were for falling out of the TDA.

Ms. Coleman explained what the TDA was used for in the set of standards, standards for mixed use building and the neighborhood context standards. She went into detail about what those entailed.

Chair Saxby thought it was important to include the North Park St Wedge neighborhood in the TDA since it was such a historic neighborhood. He also wanted the West Side of Park St, between Lincoln and Buena Vista, to be included in that discussion as well.

Staff Member Tai discussed historic parts and TDA boundaries of Park and Webster and where higher levels of development could take place with more contemporary design.

Chair Saxby suggested that there be more diagrams and graphics. Images make the design details more clear and helps things come together. He also agreed there should be a mandatory list of features for buildings as well as two that were optional. He gave suggestions on other design requirements he would like to see.

Board Member Sanchez discussed the wedge area on Park St and if the TDA could be extended there.

Staff Member Tai discussed the area and all the different types of uses that area had. He added that while they were making room for more housing they were not going to compromise on design.

Chair Saxby was also concerned about the proposed upzoning and wanted targeted approach to that as well.

Staff Member Tai discussed those concerns and went into detail about what other factors had to be considered and why upzoning was needed.

#### 8. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

None.

#### 9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

None.

10. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Saxby adjourned the meeting at 9:04 pm.