

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting  
Monday, January 23, 2006**

1.     CONVENE:             7:01 p.m.
2.     FLAG SALUTE:     Vice President Cook
3.     ROLL CALL:         President Cunningham, Vice President Cook, Kohlstrand, Lynch, and  
                                  McNamara.

Board member Mariani was absent.

Also in attendance were Planning & Building Director Cathy Woodbury, Deputy City Attorney Julie Harryman, Supervising Planner Andrew Thomas, Planner III Douglas Garrison, Contract Planner Chandler Lee.

4.     MINUTES:     a.       Minutes for the meeting of January 9, 2006.

M/S Cook/McNamara to approve the minutes for the meeting of January 9, 2006, as presented.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

5.     AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:       None.
6.     ORAL COMMUNICATION:             None.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 7-A. **FDP05-0006/DR05-0133 – Peet’s Coffee – 2001 Harbor Bay Parkway (CL).** Applicant requests a Final Development Plan and Major Design Review to allow a one-story building of approximately 138,000 square feet in floor area including a 14,300 square foot two-story office component, with 128 parking spaces and over two and one-half acres of landscaped area, to be constructed on a 8.85 acre site. The site is located within the Harbor Bay Business Park in the C-M-PD, Commercial Manufacturing, Planned Development Zoning District.

M/S Kohlstrand/Cook and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution PB-06-04 to approve a Final Development Plan and Major Design Review to allow a one-story building of approximately 138,000 square feet in floor area including a 14,300 square foot two-story office component, with 128 parking spaces and over two and one-half acres of landscaped area, to be constructed on a 8.85 acre site.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

- 7-B. **PM05-0002 & PM05-0003; 1090 and 1350 Marina Village Parkway (ATh).** Applicant: Alameda Real Estate Investments. The applicant is requesting the approval of two parcel maps creating a total of four parcels and the conversion of existing berths, within these four parcels, from rental to condominium ownership. These parcels cover existing marina facilities only. No new residential or commercial uses are proposed. No new construction or alteration of existing facilities is proposed. All existing easements and permit requirements concerning, but not limited to open space, public access and vehicular access will remain in effect. **(Applicant requests continuance to the meeting of February 13, 2006.)**

M/S Kohlstrand/Cook and unanimous to continue this item to the meeting of February 13, 2006.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

8. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

8-A. **Grand Marina Study Session (ATh).** Study Session on proposed 40-unit residential development located at the intersection of Grand Street and Fortmann Way in the Northern Waterfront area.

Supervising Planner Andrew Thomas presented the staff report.

In response to an inquiry by President Cunningham whether an EIR or a negative declaration would be needed, Mr. Thomas did not anticipate any significant unavoidable impacts from the 40-unit. He noted that some mitigations would be needed, but he believed that everything could be mitigated to a level of "Less Than Significant."

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. David Day, applicant, Warmington Homes, presented the proposed site plan on the overhead screen.

Mr. Jason Nearing, civil engineer, Carlson Barbie & Gibson, described the features of the master plan, including parking, landscaping, pedestrian corridors, and open space areas. He emphasized that the view corridors were maintained to the waterfront, including a pedestrian corridor in several locations to maintain easy pedestrian access to the existing open space along the waterfront.

Mr. Don Rickey, architect, Dahlin Group, discussed the architectural features of the homes. The square footage would range from 1300 to 2308 sq. ft. for the various plans. The architectural would be coastal, reminiscent of that found in Santa Cruz or Sausalito, using materials like stucco, metal roofing for accents, shingle siding and vertical siding.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Lynch regarding the economics of reducing the number of homes and making them larger, Mr. Day replied that it would become difficult to make the project economically feasible if the number of homes was reduced below 30 homes.

In response to an inquiry by Board member McNamara regarding apparent inconsistencies within the presentation regarding parking spaces, Mr. Day clarified the parking scheme, pointing out the conceptual land plan idea for the Pennzoil City site, which included the perpendicular parking. A discussion of the pedestrian pathways ensued.

Board member Lynch noted that he liked the attempt to separate pedestrian and automobile traffic, but also appreciated staff's concern that they may cause issues with both drivers and pedestrians. He suggested a paving pattern or cobblestone design element could suggest a pedestrian way.

President Cunningham believed that the landscape plan lent itself to a terrace scheme, which he realized may be contrary to Alameda's goals. He noted that if a lifestyle environment were to be

created, he did not want see a series of individual dwelling houses on very small lots. He suggested investigating semi-detached homes with a zero lot line. He did not want to create a series of wind tunnels with narrow alleys between houses.

Board member Kohlstrand requested clarification of the reciprocal easements. Mr. Day replied that they were very similar to a zero lot line concept; a reciprocal easement placed the property line equidistant between the two homes. Through the CC&Rs, a borrowed easement provided for an eight foot side yard.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that because of Measure A, some creative solutions for the site are not being implemented and some strange-looking developments were resulting from Measure A limitations.

Mr. Day noted that with Measure A, duets could be implemented, but that only two units could be attached.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Kohlstrand regarding the zoning for the Pennzoil site, Mr. Thomas replied that it was zoned Manufacturing. The Northern Waterfront General Plan Amendment would recommend that it be rezoned for residential.

President Cunningham supported the alley approach, and noted that it worked well in Bayport. He did not want to see a PDA with a street lined with garage doors, and believed that the proposed streetscape was very attractive. He would like to see a three-dimensional model of this project.

Board member Lynch believed that this project would be viewed best as a blank slate. He would have liked to consider other models, regardless of some of the local limitations faced by the Board. He was not sure that Measure A could withstand a challenge, and suggested that the applicants look at the Playa Vista development, which had won many awards. He would like to see a similar development in Alameda. He believed that terracing could be included, and that a mix of condo-style and single-family homes could be included in the development. He added that there was open space where concerts could be held, and that the entire effect of that development was stunning.

Vice President Cook noted that marina occupancy were cyclical, and asked about vacancies at the Marina. Mr. Day confirmed that the occupancy rate was at 98% at the Marina.

Board member Lynch would be in favor of additional open space and less parking. He inquired why gates and permit parking would even be considered. He believed that residents of other neighborhoods would want to have permit parking, which may be a slippery slope.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff originally had a negative reaction to the gates, and noted that permit parking and the gates were not staff-initiated ideas.

Board member McNamara inquired whether the outside restroom would be maintained by the

harbormaster, and suggested that the current restroom be torn down or re-faced to match the residential design more closely.

Vice President Cook expressed concern about the design of the development, and noted that she supported residential waterfront use. She noted that a resident of a nearby development had commented that the proposed lots were even smaller than his. She did not see the tradeoff for the public in return for the density. She did not agree with the narrowing and privatizing of the streets, and believed the streets should remain in the public realm.

Board member Kohlstrand agreed with Vice President Cook's comments regarding public streets and the view corridors. She did not have a problem with the number of units, but was concerned about the size of the units in the limited amount of space. She noted that was a challenge to accomplish within the limitations of Measure A.

President Cunningham noted that a three-dimension massing model would be valuable in assessing the mix of architectural styles on the streetscape. He inquired whether like styles should be grouped together to accomplish a larger picture. He noted that the third story bothered him, and would like to see it integrated in a more pleasing way. He expressed concern about the massing of the development. He liked the articulation of the design, and how it picked up details from the surrounding neighborhoods.

In response to an inquiry by President Cunningham regarding this project's economics, Mr. Thomas replied that the project is privately financed and no City funds are being contributed to the project. This project will pay Citywide development impact fees, which help fund a variety of services, such as traffic improvements to park maintenance and improvements. Staff anticipated that it would pay a fair share of improvements within the Northern Waterfront to allow the area to build out. It would be subject to the public art requirements. President Cunningham requested that the amount committed be identified and integrated into the design. He encouraged residential development.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff would review the Board's comments with the applicants, and would focus on the changes to the site plan to respond to the comments. Staff will also complete the environmental document for this project.

Ms. Woodbury complimented the Board on the depth and detail of their comments.

No action was taken.

9. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION:

a. Update on Catellus Mixed Use Project

Supervising Planner Andrew Thomas presented this report, and noted that the Bayport project, which had approximately 500 units, was a portion of a larger master plan approved in 2000. In addition to the residential portion, there were plans for a 1.3 million square foot office/R&D park, which has not moved forward since its original approval due to the Bay Area office market conditions and the dot-com bust. Catellus and the City agreed to investigate the possibilities of changing that portion of the plan to another conceptual program. The larger use would be included in the environmental document to act as a maximum envelope, and the use could be made smaller within that document. The new proposal would include 300 housing units, 300,000 square feet of retail, and 400,000 square feet of office. He noted that would require a series of amendments to documents, including a General Plan Amendment, zoning amendments, a Master Plan Amendment, and a supplemental EIR. He noted that page 3 of the memorandum outlined the community engagement strategy for this process, which was designed to keep the community involved throughout the design and entitlement process. Staff also intended to incorporate the boards and commissions, particularly the Planning Board, into this process as often and as early as possible. He noted that there was a successful open house/community meeting the previous Saturday, January 21, 2006. A scoping session has been scheduled for February 9, 2006, at 6:30 p.m., to be held in Council Chambers before the Zoning Administrator.

In response to an inquiry by President Cunningham regarding the Zoning Administrator, Mr. Thomas replied that at this time, Cynthia Eliason would serve as the Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Thomas noted that the second major workshop would be held on February 15, 2006, which he encouraged the Board members to attend. A study session with the Planning Board would be held on March 13, 2006, during a regularly scheduled meeting. The EIR would be released approximately a month after that meeting, and transportation issues would be a major part of that discussion. A study session with the Transportation Commission would be held in late April; transportation, the project layout and Measure A issues would be part of that discussion. The first official hearing on the EIR would be held before the Planning Board in May, which would be widely noticed. There would be a presentation before the Economic Development Commission in May. The official hearing where the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed General Plan Amendment, rezoning and Master Plan Amendments would be held in June and July.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Lynch regarding the number of people who lived and worked on the old Alameda Naval Air Station, Mr. Thomas replied that it was approximately 17,000-18,000. Mr. Lynch noted that his father had worked there, and that there was always traffic.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Lynch regarding water taxis, Mr. Thomas replied that Alameda had its own ferry service now and were partially funded by MTC. The City also worked closely with the Water Transit Authority, with the idea of transitioning the ferry service from an Alameda-run service to a regional water transit service. He noted that a water taxi between this site

and Jack London Square would have to be funded by this project, perhaps in combination with Alameda Point.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that a better pedestrian environment should be created in this area, and that there should be coordination between the department heads in the cities of Alameda and Oakland.

Board member Lynch noted that there was a significant financial impact to the Board's decisions, and that there was a tradeoff between retail and residential. He believed this was the time to address that issue because of the planning process that leads to a determining vote. He believed that a General Plan Amendment would be needed, and that the financial implications to the City's General Fund would be significant. He added that some jurisdictions ask for a financial feasibility study, which he did not see as part of this package.

President Cunningham believed that Board member Lynch's point regarding financial feasibility was well taken. Mr. Thomas advised he would bring that concern to the team, and believed it would be doable.

Board member Lynch noted that he was not a retail expert, nor was the general public, and did not believe he should get involved in the discussion regarding the type of retail. He wanted the tax revenue from the General Fund to pay for services.



10. BOARD COMMUNICATION:

- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Northern Waterfront Plan (Vice President Cook).

Vice President Cook advised there was nothing new to report.

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

Board member Mariani was not in attendance to present this report.

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

Board member Kohlstrand advised that there had been no further meetings since her last report.

11. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Update on Northern Waterfront General Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Report.

Mr. Thomas advised that the EIR would be released within one or two weeks, and that it would be brought before the Board for action after that time.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Woodbury, Secretary  
City Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the February 13, 2006 Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and videotaped.