

# DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD  
MONDAY, APRIL 25, 2011  
7: 00 p.m.

1. CONVENE:           **7:07 p.m.**
2. FLAG SALUTE:     Board member Wallis
3. ROLL CALL:        President Ezzy Ashcraft, board members Ibsen, Kohlstrand, Wallis, and Zuppan (arrived later).

Absent: Vice-President Autorino and Board member Lynch

4. MINUTES:         Minutes from the Regular meeting of February 28, 2011

President Ezzy Ashcraft requested that the meeting minutes be amended to correct a typographical error on page 5. Board member Wallis moved, seconded by board member Kohlstrand, to approve the meeting minutes. **Approved as amended (5-0).**

Minutes from the Regular meeting of March 14, 2011 (Pending)  
Minutes from the Special meeting of March 28, 2011 (Pending)

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION: **None.**

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

## Written Report

### **6-A** Future Agendas

Andrew Thomas presented an overview of future projects.

Board member Kohlstrand asked that the transportation thresholds be placed back on the list for board review.

### **6-B** Zoning Administrator Report

Meeting of 4/5/2011-Canceled

Meeting of 4/19/2011-Canceled

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:  
**None.**

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:  
**None.**

## 9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A PLN11-0046 – Rezoning – 1348 Weber Street.** A proposal to rezone a 2,738 square foot parcel from C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) to R-4 (Neighborhood Residential District). The current residential use of the site is nonconforming, which prohibits the rebuild of the structure if over 70% destroyed. The proposed change will make the existing duplex residences a conforming use, thereby allowing the applicant to rebuild the dwelling if destroyed.

Brian Stanke, staff planner, presented the project.

Board member Kohlstrand asked why the General Plan designation was not also changed to reflect the Zoning code change.

Mr. Stanke explained that the Planning division did not support spot zoning at this time. The existing General Plan designation allows for more flexibility, should the property owner want to develop a commercial use on the ground floor in the future.

Board member Kohlstrand asked that staff review the potential to clean up all areas that could benefit from rezoning and or general plan amendments.

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, agreed that staff would review the potential to clean up the zoning and general plan map as time permits.

Motion made by Kohlstrand, seconded by board member Ibsen, to approve the project.  
**Approved 5-0.**

- 9-B Use Permit – PLN11-0040 – 1408 A/B, 1410, 1412, 1414, 1418, 1420, and 1504 Encinal Avenue – Jawad Jaber.** Review of a Use Permit for the operation of a variety of businesses in several retail spaces facing the public right of way, such as 1) coffee shop, 2) office space, 3) retail and 4) restaurant and 5) additional uses in a C-1, Neighborhood Business District. Pursuant to AMC 30-4.8.c.2 and 30-4.8.c.4 a Use Permit is required for the operation of businesses that are not permitted by right in the C-1, Neighborhood Business District. **Approved as amended 5-0.**

Simone Wolter, Staff Planner, presented the project.

Board member Kohlstrand appreciated the effort put forth to develop a mechanism to expedite businesses to locate here, but she was concerned that the true impact of a new business cannot be reviewed by the board. She asked what the benefit would be for a future tenant to go through this process, opposed to a tenant getting their own Use Permit.

Ms. Wolter explained the genesis of the project, and explained the Zoning Compliance Determination process for the listed uses covered under this Master Use Permit. This master use permit allows for an expedited review.

Board member Ibsen supports the use permit and feels comfortable with the parameters set

in the use permit.

Board member Wallis voiced his concerns about the mix of uses and how the mix of uses, two years from now, may become deleterious to the neighborhood.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she is concerned that the mix would not be diverse and Morton Street would fill up with only one kind of use.

Mr. Thomas suggested altering the conditions of approval to return to the board for review within two years. He pointed out that the existing uses would be precluded from this review, to protect their right to exercise their business.

Board member Wallis supported this idea.

President Ezzy Ashcraft would like to see that the board give more thought to finding three in regards to 'deleterious effects to other business districts and existing businesses.' She does not support that zoning compliance determinations be completed over the counter. Instead, she recommends that any future tenant sit down with the planner and review the conditions of approval. She then asked whether this master use permit is similar to the proposed form-based code as proposed for the North of Lincoln area.

Board member Kohlstrand asked for clarification on condition number 9 and the expiration date of the Use Permit.

Ms. Wolter explained that a Use Permit becomes null and void, pursuant to the development code, if the uses covered in this use permit are not active for a duration of two years.

Mr. Thomas elaborated on the expiration date and suggested that the board may want to consider a review period in two years to evaluate the efficiency of the use permit and establish if the proposed uses under this use permit are still the right mix for Morton Street.

Board member Wallis asked for more clarification on the legal framework for extending the use permit for two years again after the initial approval date.

Ms Wolter explained the difference between condition number 7 and 9 and explained the revision process in two years.

President Ezzy Ashcraft supported a two year review and written zoning compliance determination.

Board member Kohlstrand added that the planning division be called out as the division that would issue the zoning compliance determination. She supported a review in two years.

Mr. Thomas suggested language revisions to condition number 9 to reflect the requested changes by President Ezzy Ashcraft and board member Kohlstrand. He also explained that existing uses established under the use permit, within the two year period, would not be subject to review when the mandatory two year review comes before the board again.

Board member Zuppan asked how the suggested uses were assembled. She found the mix if uses to be not particularly synergistic.

Ms Wolter explained that the mix of uses was solely based on the archaic C-1 zoning code that allows certain uses permitted with use permits.

Motion made by board member Ibsen, seconded by board member Kohlstrand, to approve the project as amended. Approved 5-0.

### **9-C Review and Comment on Staff's Preliminary Responses to the Regional Sustainable Communities Strategy – Initial Vision Scenario.**

Board member Zuppan pointed out that the study did not take into account the changes in the population age mix, nor the change in business operations, i.e. people telecommute more frequently now. She found the study to be inadequate.

Board member Kohlstrand thought that the study did encompass major shifts in education, business operations, and population trends. She stated that the purpose of the ABAG plan was to establish competitive housing in-fill rates in the Bay Area so that work-related commuting distances were reduced from the valley areas. She supported this effort.

Board member Wallis pointed out that the study lacks an evaluation of public health impacts and intergenerational behavioral shifts in the general population.

Board member Kohlstrand stated that transportation constitutes about 40 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions in the State. She reasoned that compacter development is important to counter that transportation impact. She supported the comments suggested by Planning Staff. In addition, she requested that the letter point out the things that Alameda is already doing to counter greenhouse gas emissions and develop housing units. She believes that establishing housing values to concentrate development in the existing bay region is important as oppose to seeing development out in the valley areas which the bay area then has to serve. She also emphasized that the Regional Transportation Plan needs to include the efforts that will occur at Alameda Point.

Board member Zuppan seconded comments made and stated that Alameda Municipal Power operations should be included in the comments on the Initial Vision Scenario.

No action taken on this item.

### **9-D Review and Comment on Summary Report for the Community Planning Process for Alameda Point.**

Mr. Thomas, Planning Services Manager, provided an overview of the planning process and summarized the findings made in the summary report.

President Ezzy Ashcraft opened the public comment period.

Ms. Karen Bey, Alameda resident, spoke in favor of keeping the ferry terminal in the seaplane lagoon in the future plans. She believes that the ferry terminal location would be a pivotal instrument to counteract transportation impacts on Alameda. A ferry terminal would be essential to making Alameda Point a world-class development. She recommended that the planning process not cap the housing numbers too early, because housing generally can support the backbone infrastructure needed within a development.

Ms. Pryor, Alameda resident, urged the board to include affordable housing so that all demographic groups would be able to afford living at the Alameda Point development.

President Ezzy Ashcraft closed the public comment period.

Board member Kohlstrand was supportive of the upcoming community forums on economic constraints and traffic impacts. She would like to see the cost assumptions that would be required to replace the infrastructure, see which components will be preserved.

Board member Zuppan stressed that the jobs and housing balance is paramount for any development plan for Alameda Point.

Board member Wallis cautioned to look city-wide for spill-over impacts when developing plans for Alameda Point.

Board member Ibsen seconded previous comments. He stressed that presenting the pro-forma to the public, to present the economic numbers, will be key in moving this project forward. He cautioned not to frame the discussion in terms of more housing vs less housing or similar contrasts.

President Ezzy Ashcraft pointed out that the forums had a lot of repeat visitors and as such thinks that the summary may be a bit skewed one way or the other. She urged that planning staff, which does this as a profession, provide the backbone of the analysis and policy recommendations. She also strongly supports the location of a ferry at the seaplane lagoon to anchor the transit-oriented development at Alameda Point. She considers a joint auction between the Navy and the City to auction off parts of Alameda Point hugely regrettable.

Mr. Thomas explained that staff is considering keeping the ferry terminal in its current location because the cost of relocation would be significant and would take away funding opportunities for others, also important, infrastructure components.

Board member Kohlstrand pointed out that the ferry is not the key feature that will make a transportation oriented development work or not, since more people need to get to the east bay and not that many people need to take the ferry.

Mr. Thomas explained the next steps, timeline, and the involvement with the City Council.

No action taken on this item.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

**City Council Report - Update on the City's Green Initiatives**

The Board received this item. President Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that staff should work with CASA on this issue. No action was taken on this item.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

President Ezzy Ashcraft recommended that Board member Zuppan be an alternate on the Webster Street Vision Implementation Committee.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 10:15 pm