

**Minutes of the Special Planning Board Meeting  
Monday, March 12, 2007**

1.     CONVENE:             7:39 p.m.

President Lynch advised that prior to this meeting, a tour and meeting had been held at Alameda Town Centre. He noted that the Board members would speak to that session, following by the closing of that session, and the opening of the regular session of the Planning Board.

2.     FLAG SALUTE:     Member Mariani

3.     ROLL CALL:        President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Cunningham, Ezzy Ashcraft, Kohlstrand, Mariani and McNamara.

Also present were Planning and Building Director Cathy Woodbury, Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas, Assistant City Attorney Donna Mooney, Supervising Planner Douglas Garrison, Planner I Simone Walter.

President Lynch invited comments from the Board regarding the tour at Alameda Town Centre.

Member McNamara excused herself from this discussion.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft thanked Harsch Investments, Target and the Safeway gas station for participating in the public dialogue. She had heard concerns about shopping cart controls within the center and off premises. She noted that Walgreen's had installed security strips that lock the cart wheels if they were to be taken off the lot. The applicants indicated those strips could be installed at Safeway. She believed that more cart bays should be installed within the parking lot.

Member Kohlstrand wished to thank Harsch Development Corporation and the representatives from the other developments that coordinated the tour. She believed it was very useful, and wished to reiterate the comments about the work involved in resolving the circulation issues at the site, particularly those related to bike and pedestrian access. She believed there should be more focus on trucks at this time. She acknowledged that there would be challenges, and she looked forward to seeing some resolution on those items. She believed a sidewalk on the east-west roadway was important. She believed the Safeway Gas design would create conflicts in including the sidewalks, and hoped that would be kept in mind. She would like to see more focus on the area by the waterfront.

Vice President Cook was sorry that they did not get to the waterfront, and did not believe the water orientation of this project had been properly addressed. She expressed concern about the improvements taking place to the east of McDonald's. She believed that the

four separate stand-alone buildings felt to her like restaurant destinations. She hoped to see a mix of building scales so a shopper could get a cup of coffee quickly without going into one of the sit-down restaurants. She would like to see a safer way for people to cross the street. She expressed concern about the pedestrian and bicycle issues, and was also concerned about the gas station at such a busy corner. She noted that they had not discussed the parking garage at Mervyn's, and would like to hear more public discussion on that subject, especially regarding the circulation dynamics.

Member Cunningham expressed concern about the threshold for the development, as well as the reasoning behind it and the economic model. With respect to the proposed site plan at Building 800, there was a service yard at right angles to the main road going past Target. He would like to know how the traffic flow would work by the service dock at Building 800.

Member Mariani noted that the visual was very important in being able to take the features in, and added that many people attended the tour. She was uncomfortable about part of the tour referring to proposed projects as "done deals." She wanted to be extremely mindful of the residents of the Willows, and hoped they could be accommodated.

Member Kohlstrand expressed concern about the massing of the proposed Target building, because of the traffic generated and the size of the store. She added that it would be surrounded by residential property.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft wished to echo Member Cunningham's comments on green building design, and noted that the Target in Davis would be LEED certified. She noted that the Climate Protection Task Force was becoming very active in the City, and that both Peet's Coffee and Clif Bar had decided to build LEED certified buildings. She was anxious to see what Target could develop along those lines.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Cook about the truck route, Mr. Thomas noted that the truck route would run down Park Street. He explained that there were a very limited number of roads that could be used as truck routes in Alameda.

Member Mariani noted that the arches, vines and the wildlife expressed a small-town charm in the center, which was more comfortable than a big Target. She was very concerned about the massing of the Target in the center.

President Lynch suggested that the Target team provide a matrix to the Board in terms of the Targets around the Bay Area, with a visual of the store and a description of the store's dimensions.

The public hearing was closed.

Member McNamara returned to the dais.

4. MINUTES:

- a. Minutes for the special meeting of January 31, 2007.

Member Cunningham motioned to continue the minutes for the special meeting of January 31, 2007, to March 26, 2007

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 7.

- b. Minutes for the meeting of February 12, 2007.

Member Cunningham motioned to continue the minutes for the meeting of February 12, 2007, to March 26, 2007

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 7.

- c. Minutes for the meeting of February 26, 2007.

Member Cunningham moved to continue the minutes for the meeting of February 26, 2007, to March 26, 2007

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 7.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION: None.

6. ORAL COMMUNICATION:

Mr. David Howard expressed concern that the Target traffic studies did not do enough analysis regarding traffic coming across the bridges and in the Tubes en route to Target, particularly down Constitution Way, past Washington School and Park, and down Shoreline or Otis, and then back on the way out. He had not seen any studies that analyzed that traffic pattern. He noted that during the walking tour, people asked questions during and after the tour, and that there were no speaker's slips available. He noted that President Lynch closed the public hearing for that item, and noted that Item 8-C changed the rules and procedures, possibly pushing Oral Communications after Staff Communications. He hoped this would not mean that this would make it more difficult for the public to speak in the future.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she was there for the entire tour, and while there were no speaker slips, there were many speakers. She noted that their names and comments were taken down, and that Mr. Thomas had stated clearly that the comments would be incorporated into the final record. She estimated that there were over six speakers, and that some spoke more than once. She did not want the public to be left with the

misimpression that public comment was not welcome, and noted that over 50 people were there.

President Lynch noted that it was never the desire of the Board or staff to curtail any public comment, and that comments were encouraged.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR: None.

8. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 8-A. **Green Building and Bay-Friendly Landscape Presentation (AT).** A presentation by StopWaste.org regarding Green Building and Bay-Friendly Landscaping Ordinance. Representatives from StopWaste.org will present information on the benefits of adopting an ordinance, the areas addressed by the ordinance, who has adopted and implemented similar ordinances, and technical resources available from StopWaste.org to help with adoption and implementation.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Karen Kho, StopWaste.org, introduced herself and noted that their presentation would address an integrated approach to design, construction and maintenance of buildings and landscapes. She noted that benefits of green building included more efficient use of natural resources, greenhouse gas reductions, and social benefits to residents of buildings, including increased productivity in schools and businesses. These practices were intended to reduce the level of exposure of both construction and maintenance workers in terms of toxic materials. The financial benefits of these practices would include lower energy and water bills, as well as the reduced need for replacement of materials over the long term because they were more durable and designed better. She displayed the green building standards on the overhead screen, and provided an overview of the green building-rating program. She displayed building and commercial and residential landscaping practices within the green building program. She provided an overview of the practices involved in the three sets of sustainable programs, including the site and community, and how well the landscaping connected with its community. Practices during construction included protecting topsoil and recycling construction waste to minimize impacts on the community, particularly protecting healthy topsoil, avoiding the introduction of invasive plant species and maintaining a diverse plant palette. This would lead to greater plant health and resiliency. Water energy efficiency would be encouraged by reducing the amounts of wood being used in a building with more efficient design. Bioswales help increase water efficiency on-site, and help the project achieve a LEED Gold rating. Plants that tolerate the summer dry climate are encouraged, and high efficiency irrigation systems are encouraged. More efficient appliances are available on the market.

Ms. Kho noted that the operations and maintenance aspect of the program would ensure that the green building practices incorporated into a building or landscape would continue over the life of the building and landscape. Over-watering and over-fertilizing of plants would be unhealthy for the plants, and would waste resources. Toxic fertilizers and pest control would be discouraged in favor of healthier materials. She noted that the following policies would be included:

1. Lead by example. A model green building ordinance would apply to public projects and public/private partnerships.
2. Adopt an environmentally preferable purchasing policy for all City operations

- and maintenance.
3. For private projects with no public money involved, the City would take a role in educating, motivating and providing incentives to private developers.
  4. All applicants would submit a green building checklist appropriate to the type of project proposed to apply for their entitlements. There was no requirement for a score, but it was a required part of the submission. A green building consultation for developers would be encouraged.
  5. Staff review and comment on green building and landscaping aspects of the project.
  6. In some communities, completion of the green building checklist was included as a condition of approval.

She displayed a summary of green building policies of different cities around the Bay Area. She noted that they would be available for assistance and education to staff and City officials.

President Lynch requested a copy of the PowerPoint presentation to the Board members, and inquired whether StopWaste.org served only Alameda County. Ms. Kho confirmed that they served Alameda County. While other counties have green building assistance, other programs do not have the extensive training provided by StopWaste.org. President Lynch thanked Ms. Kho for her thorough presentation.

President Lynch noted that he would be leaving the meeting and turned the meeting over to Vice President Cook.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Stan Schiffman, Chairman, Alameda Task Force on Climate Protection, noted that he was delighted that the Planning Board was discussing this topic. He was sure that one of the Task Force's recommendations would be to encourage the City to adopt a green building ordinance.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired about the details of green building certification. Ms. Kho noted that she did not have that information on hand, but would provide it to the Board members.

Member McNamara noted that this was a huge effort, and looked forward to incorporating these policies into City efforts.

Member Kohlstrand inquired whether there was a similar set of guidelines for commercial development. Ms. Kho noted that they recommended the use of the LEED rating system, which had an extensive set of guidelines for commercial developments. She could provide that to the City at a later date, and that they were available online.

Member Cunningham noted that he was very supportive of this effort. He inquired whether the demolition ordinance would be separate from the green ordinance or sustainable ordinance. Ms. Kho noted that they were typically separate ordinances. Ms. Woodbury noted that the City already had a demolition ordinance, which already had a Recycling and Waste Reduction requirement.

Member Mariani noted that she supported green building practices, and added that while it may be more expensive at the front end, the savings had been worth it in her own home.

Member Cunningham noted that when green practices were designed into a building design, it saved costs from the beginning as compared with retrofitting the building.

Ms. Kho noted that much of the costs were associated with the learning curve. She noted that there was a directory of green building professionals at [www.apBuildItGreen.org](http://www.apBuildItGreen.org).

Member Cunningham suggested using architects that were LEED-certified.

Acting President Cook suggested adding this item to the Work Program discussion for Item 8-B.

8-B. **Workshop Program Discussion (CW).** A presentation and discussion of Planning and Building Department work program priorities, resources and items for future Planning Board Consideration.

Ms. Woodbury summarized the staff report and identified the members of Planning staff. She displayed a PowerPoint presentation, and described the elements of the Strategic Work Program in detail.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Member Mariani thanked Ms. Woodbury for the organized outline, and inquired whether the density bonus plan had a deadline with respect to the Housing Element. Mr. Thomas replied that State law required that the City adopt certain ordinances and keep them up to date, including the density bonus and the secondary unit. He noted that the City identified those as two high-priority actions in the 2003 Housing Element, and that the State required that they be included in the Housing Element. He noted that those items had been placed on the back burner even though a lot of work had been accomplished, and did not want to make the same promises to the State during the next Housing Element cycle that had not been fulfilled from the last time. Staff had renewed concern about those outstanding items, and that much of the work had already been performed.

Member Mariani expressed concern about the default position, and added that Alameda's needs were different than the statewide guidelines.

Member Cunningham noted that it would be beneficial for the City to be mindful of what other cities were doing with respect to Work/Live and Land Use. He believed there had been many good discussions with respect to the density bonus, which related to Measure A.

Acting President Cook inquired how the City could have a Density Bonus without having density under Measure A. Ms. Woodbury replied that there were many ways to have density without multiple family units, and believed that a workshop would enable the Board to explore those possibilities.

Mr. Thomas noted that the City was in the process of developing a Secondary Unit Ordinance that would be in compliance with State law, because the current ordinance was not in compliance with State law. State law also required adoption of an ordinance that explained how the required Density Bonus ordinances would be implemented with respect to affordable housing.

A discussion of priority-setting ensued.



Member McNamara inquired what would happen after a consultant is hired for State-mandated items. Ms. Woodbury noted that they would come to the Planning Board for their recommendation to City Council. She added that there would be a number of workshops and other opportunities for the Planning Board to become involved before they were asked to make a recommendation to Council.

Member Cunningham noted that the many members of the public had requested a comprehensive island traffic study, which would involve an understanding of trip generation and traffic flows within the Island.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Transportation Commission has spent considerable time working through a set of Citywide policies, which would be packaged into a Transportation Element update. As part of that, an environmental consultant and traffic consultant will be hired to do an EIR for that process. The policies would come through the Planning Board for recommendation to the Council. One task was to examine the transportation policies in conjunction with the City's land use plans, and to provide information with respect to how the transportation network would work with the Citywide development plan, including the major ones on the West End. He noted that the Transportation Commission has finished a global set of policies for the General Plan, and that they have begun to tackle more specific policies. The pedestrian policy is completed, and they have moved to the transportation demand management policies. They have set up a series of routes throughout the City based on their understanding of transportation needs and flows throughout the City, and where it was needed to enhance transportation effectiveness to accommodate those flows. He added that they would test those assumptions as part of the Transportation Element Update.

Member Kohlstrand noted that she had participated in some of the early workshops, and added that the Transportation Commission had put a lot of effort into the activity, which they also initiated. She noted that the Public Works Department had taken over from there, and she would like to see information following that transition. She believed it was important to ensure that State-mandated compliance items were met, and noticed that staff had not mentioned the Land Use Element, as well as compliance with the Subdivision Map Act. She inquired when those two items would be brought to the Planning Board.

Ms. Woodbury noted that the Subdivision Map Act should have been listed, because that addressed housing as well. She noted that it was not at the level of the Density Bonus Ordinance and the Secondary Unit Ordinance, and that staff would need to bring it up to speed with the State law. She understood that was in the works. She endeavored to put related projects together to streamline the information flow.

Member McNamara believed that it would be very beneficial to have a flow chart of the pending permit process, for residents who wished to do a remodel or other modification to their home. Ms. Woodbury noted that the kind of flow chart would depend on the kind of process, which was not as simple as it seemed.

Member McNamara noted that Line 12 addressed providing articles from the local newspaper, and noted that had been done several weeks before regarding Alameda Towne Centre, which she believed was educational for the public.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft believed the Chamber of Commerce would welcome a presentation of green building ordinances. She believed the introduction of green building practices was easier to introduce than had it been when the library was being designed and built. She noted that with the increasing opening of the waterfront to the public, it would be important to have increased awareness of green-friendly design and landscape architecture. She believed it was good for the City, and that it should be implemented as soon as possible. She requested that any photocopies be double-sided to minimize the amount of paper consumed.

Acting President Cook agreed with the previous comments, and thanked Ms. Woodbury for her work. She would like to see a waterfront design and access element, which addressed gateway treatments in Alameda. She believed it should be broader than the Northern Waterfront, and should also include Alameda Point. She would like to revisit the downtown visioning plan, *and follow-up steps to include in the work program going forward*, which she believed was an important step forward in Alameda's planning process.

Member Cunningham noted that he sat on that task force, and when the outgoing City Manager, Jim Flint, left, he disbanded that group.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft would like to see a drawing of what was happening with Long's. Ms. Woodbury noted that she had just provided that to City Council, and would be happy to provide it to the Planning Board as well.

Acting President Cook would like a better understanding of the Planning Board's role in Alameda Point. She noted that she was the Planning Board representative for some of the Base Reuse Advisory Group's meetings, and when it was disbanded, she understood that occurred because the work needed to be brought back into the purview of the Planning Board. She was surprised that there was no presentation by the developers before the Board, and wanted to understand the Planning Department's and Planning Board's roles in that project.

Mr. Thomas noted that the City Council, acting as the ARRA, was looking for a developer to replace APCP in order to step in where they stepped out. He described the process of the Conditional Acquisition Agreement, and that they chose not to proceed. If they had chosen to proceed, they would have begun to fund the process. The new development team would begin the entitlement process for a Master Plan for Alameda Point, and they would develop their own proposal for Alameda Point. He described the two-year entitlement process.

Acting President Cook noted that she did not want to see that process rushed, and that she would like to ask the developers whether they would agree to the [PDC] or change it. She

believed it was given more weight than it otherwise would have been.

Mr. Thomas noted that in order to achieve all the goals in the Alameda Point General Plan would take some compromise. He added that everyone would not be able to get everything they wanted, and that tradeoffs were necessary.

No action was taken.

**8-C. Planning Board Rules and Procedures.** Resolution amending the Planning Board Rules and Procedures.

Ms. Mooney noted that the section on page 5 (Deliberations and Decisions) that discussed a Board member who abstains was outdated, and was at least 17 to 20 years old. She noted that *the rules presently state* that the Board member was not required to indicate a reason, and suggested removing that section altogether. She suggested substituting language similar to, "Conflict of interest shall be according to State law."

Acting President Cook wished to revise the Conflict of Interest section, and did not want the removal of an outdated section to be misconstrued. She would like it to read that the policy would be governed by State law.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she was uncomfortable voting for something that she has not seen in writing.

Member Kohlstrand noted that her intent in recommending that the Staff Communications be moved forward was to allow time to hear a report from staff, but did not have a preference where it was scheduled in relation to Oral Communications. She believed the public felt more comfortable in having it come after Oral Communications.

Member Cunningham believed it made more sense to keep it where it was scheduled.

Member Mariani noted that City Council held their Oral Communications at the end of their calendar, which required members of the public to wait many hours to speak. She preferred to hold it at the beginning of the meeting.

Board member Kohlstrand moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-07 to amend the Planning Board Rules and Procedures.

Board member Mariani seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 6 (Lynch absent).

9. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION:

Acting President Cook noted that a letter had been received from Helen Sause regarding some possible items for discussion for a Measure A forum. It reminded her that they had discussed forming a small committee for a Measure A forum; she would like to start that process soon.

Ms. Woodbury inquired whether the Board would like that item to be placed on the next agenda in order to appoint an *ad hoc* committee.

Board member Kohlstrand moved to place discussion of an *ad hoc* committee for a Measure A forum on the next agenda.

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote – 6 (Lynch absent).

Ms. Woodbury noted that an agenda item would be placed, allowing the Board to appoint an *ad hoc* committee to work with staff on the Measure A forum/workshop.

In response to Member Kohlstrand's inquiry regarding the allowed number of members to be in compliance with the Brown Act, Mr. Thomas confirmed that there could be three members.

10. BOARD COMMUNICATION:

- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board Member Mariani).

Mr. Thomas noted that the next meeting would be held the following Thursday, March 15, 2007. A status report would be received from ACTIA on the Broadway-Jackson Project Study Report (PSR). Staff had invited the Chair of the Alameda Transportation Commission, John Knox-White, to attend the meeting, because the Transportation Commission had taken the lead for the City of Alameda in pressing for a second look at the CEQA thresholds for transportation impact analysis. He noted that the mitigations needed to be examined more closely. They would be looking for consultant teams who could provide good ideas and advice on the CEQA threshold issue. He noted that Chinatown was very excited about that as well.

- b. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Board Member Kohlstrand).

Member Kohlstrand advised that there was nothing new to report.

Mr. Thomas noted that the subcommittee might not exist any more, and added that the Northern Waterfront item had been removed from Board Communications. He noted that he would check with Public Works and the Transportation Commission to find out whether this item should be retained on the agenda.

- c. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Climate Protection Task Force (Board Member Cunningham).

Member Cunningham advised that a meeting had been held two weeks before, and that another one would be held on March 21, 2007. He noted that their packets contained a lot of goals and actions to identify the top priorities.

11. STAFF COMMUNICATION:

a. Future Agendas and work program

Mr. Thomas distributed the list of 106 applications that were currently on file in the Planning & Building Department to the Board members. He noted that many projects did not come to the Planning Board. In terms of upcoming agendas, he noted that they intended to limit the agendas to only one major item, plus other less challenging items. On March 26, the Northern Waterfront EIR and General Plan Amendment would be heard. A design review on Haight Avenue would also be heard.

Mr. Thomas noted that the workshop would be held on March 29, which was designed to generate a lot of good information and would focus on two alternatives to the PDC. One alternative would be relieved of the Measure A constraint, and one would not be relieved of the Measure A constraint but would address changing the plan to be more supportive of transportation.

Mr. Thomas noted that April 18 would be a special meeting held in lieu of the April 9 meeting cancelled due to vacation schedules. He noted that would conflict with the [ICLEI] Task Force meeting. The major item on that agenda was the EIR public hearing on Harbor Bay Village VI General Plan Amendment, and that a decision would not be made at that meeting. A very large turnout was expected at that meeting. The other three items were expected to be fairly easy, and may be placed on Consent Calendar, with the possible exception of the Hawthorne Suites parking exception.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Safeway gas proposal would be held on April 23, 2007, and staff anticipated being ready for the Alameda Landing Phase I development plan. Site planning issues would be discussed, but architectural issues would not be discussed. The shopping center may be discussed.

Mr. Thomas noted that the May 29 meeting may contain the Transportation Element update, and that a joint meeting may be held with the Transportation Commission for that item.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether a Zoning Administrator would be hired. Ms. Woodbury noted that the role of Zoning Administrator was fulfilled by the Planning and Building Director, or someone designated by the Planning and Building Director.

Member McNamara inquired about the status of Long's. Ms. Woodbury noted that it was a façade renovation, and that an Art Deco theme to the exterior had been developed. She noted that all the design review letters would be sent to the Planning Board members, and noted that several parking spaces would be lost.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired about the street trees in front of the library. Ms. Woodbury believed there had been a delay in getting the planter boxes.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

10:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew Thomas, Secretary  
City Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the Planning Board meeting of March 26, 2007. This meeting was audio and videotaped.