

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting
Monday, April 23, 2007**

1. CONVENE: 7:10 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Member Kohlstrand
3. ROLL CALL: Acting President Cunningham, Ezzy Ashcraft, Kohlstrand, and McNamara.

President Lynch, Vice President Cook and Board member Mariani were absent.

Also present were Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas, Assistant City Attorney Donna Mooney, Planner III Douglas Garrison.

4. MINUTES:
 - a. Minutes for the Alameda Towne Centre Workshop of March 12, 2007.

Board member McNamara noted that she was absent from the 4:30 p.m. March 12 meeting because she recused herself.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that on page 2, “Yawn” should be spelled “Yian.”

Acting President Cunningham noted that in the middle of page 2, the sentence reading “He would also like a bus stop . . . he was happy with a grid of pedestrian sidewalks, that is” should be completed.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved approval of the minutes as amended.

Board member Kohlstrand seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 3. Abstain: 1 (McNamara). Absent: President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Board member Mariani. The motion failed for lack of a quorum and will be considered at the next meeting.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Future Agendas

Mr. Thomas provided a handout and a brief presentation of future agenda items.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION:

Mr. Mark Shepard, Frank Bette Center for the Arts, wished to urge the Planning Board to consider incorporating the arts community in the planning process while incorporating green plans. He noted that successful communities incorporated a thriving arts community broadly supported by civic government and business, and he believed it was very important to support the creative and artistic populace in Alameda. He believed it would enhance Alameda's attractiveness to visitors and potential residents, and would like the City's support in their effort to actively market Alameda.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 8-A. **DP07-0001 - Catellus/Prologis - Alameda Landing Mixed Use Development (AT).** The applicant requests Development Plan approval for the waterfront promenade, streetscape cross-sections for Fifth Street and Mitchell Mosley Avenue, and the Alameda Landing Transportation Demand Management Program. The project area is located south of the Oakland Alameda Estuary, north of the College of Alameda and the Bayport Residential District, east of Coast Guard Housing, and west of Webster Street. The site is in the M-X (Mixed Use) Zoning District. **(The applicant requests a continuance to the meeting of May 14, 2007.)**

Board member Kohlstrand moved to recommend continuance of this item to May 14, 2007.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 4. Absent: Lynch, Cook, Mariani.

- 8-B. **TM06-0003 - Shane Barber - 1000 Atlantic Avenue (DV).** The applicant requests approval of Tentative Parcel Map 9387, allowing the conveyance of up to 8 separate commercial spaces located within one building to separate owners. The project site is located in the M-X (Mixed Use) Zoning District.

Board member Kohlstrand moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-11 to approve Tentative Parcel Map 9387, allowing the conveyance of up to 8 separate commercial spaces located within one building to separate owners.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 4. Absent: Lynch, Cook, Mariani.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A. **PDA02-0004 - 523 South Shore Center (Alameda Towne Centre) (DG).** The applicant is requesting modification of Conditions 1.a and 1.d of Resolution No. PB-03-40. These conditions require the construction of an east-west sidewalk along the rear of businesses fronting onto Otis Drive prior to the occupancy of Phase II—b of shopping center redevelopment. The applicant is requesting the Planning Board approve a modified sidewalk plan and the timeframe for implementation. The site is located within a Central Business District with Planned Development overlay Zoning District (C-2-PD).

Mr. Garrison summarized the staff report.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Randy Kyte, applicant, described the position of Harsch Investments on this issue, and noted that they preferred Option B. They believed that after much technical analysis in 2004 with staff and engineers that they came up with the right solution by adding more north-south sidewalks in order to tie the bank and restaurant pads to the main center. He noted that not much had changed in terms of technical feasibility associated with 13 driveways interrupting the walkway. They have begun speaking with each property owner and/or tenant about how to split the sidewalk along the property line.

Mr. Kyte noted that the characterization that they were willing to do either/or was not completely accurate. They believed that after much technical analysis in 2004 with staff and engineers that they came up with the right solution by adding more north-south sidewalks in order to tie to the bank and restaurant pads. He noted that not much had changed in terms of technical feasibility and liability associated with 13 driveways interrupting the walkway. They would consider that, and have begun speaking with each property owner and/or tenant about how to split the sidewalk along the property line. They believed the alternative plan was a superior plan, and they wished to address the issue conditioned by City Council on Building 500 and Building 300 that the occupancies be withheld until the issues are brought back before the Planning Board. They anticipated opening Bed Bath & Beyond in the next few months.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Dorothy Reid believed the applicant was before the Board to be able to occupy Buildings 300 and 500. She inquired whether that could be done without having to make a decision on the sidewalk, which she believed was premature. She noted that parking was governed by the total amount of the Gross Leaseable Area (GLA), which was unknown because the PDA was incomplete. She noted that the Safeway side had 528 parking spaces, which would be enough to compensate for the lost spaces if the sidewalk were to be built on the other side.

Ms. Susan Decker appreciated the efforts made by the City and Harsch to make the center more pedestrian-oriented. She believed that adding north-south walkways would help, but did not believe it was the best solution. She suggested the use of raised crosswalks in the parking lot to calm speeding traffic.

Mr. Michael Krueger reiterated Ms. Decker's comments, and did not see the north-south sidewalks as a substitute for the east-west sidewalk at all. He noted that he had many photos of pedestrians already walking in the middle of the roadway; he noted that it was already unsafe and a liability issue. He did not believe the east-west roadway was necessary when the north-south roadways were already available, and did not believe that inconvenience was a sufficient reason to add the east-west roadway at the expense of safety.

Mr. Jon Spangler spoke on behalf of Pedestrian-Friendly Alameda, and noted that the tertiary treatment of pedestrians at South Shore has long concerned him. He believed that equivalent access for pedestrians was a reasonable request, and noted that four-foot sidewalks were too narrow. He added that there were no separations of sidewalks from the traffic lanes. A six-foot sidewalk on both sides of the roadway would be feasible by removing parking spaces. He did not believe it would be acceptable to reroute pedestrians to Otis Drive. He suggested making the sidewalks wider, and making vehicle lanes 10 feet wide, and that rumble strips be added to slow traffic down. He agreed with the suggestion for raised sidewalks. He added that the use permit was granted four years ago, following detailed questioning by the Planning Board, and added that Target was not included in these plans. He urged the developer to follow up on the plans in the right way.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

In response to an inquiry by Acting President Cunningham regarding continuing pedestrian access from Otis into the body of the parking lot, Mr. Kyte replied that the proposed walks proposed in 2004 addressed the connections through the adjacent properties to Otis, and that they were sensitive to that. He acknowledged that the signage could be better.

In response to an inquiry by Acting President Cunningham regarding the history of pedestrian safety and accidents, Mr. Michael Corbitt, Harsch Investments, replied that there were no history of accidents specifically on that road.

In response to an inquiry by Board member McNamara regarding Ms. Reid's suggestion of split sidewalks, Mr. Corbitt replied that they had examined that possibility. He noted that there were 23 driveways in that area, and that the idea of putting a solid sidewalk on that side, and short-stopping all the drive lanes would reduce the parking in a critical portion of the shopping center. Also, trying to transplant parking from the new to the old Safeway lot in terms of expecting people to use it was a concern because of the demand for parking in front of the Safeway store. He noted that it was a parking requirement in the anchor leases that a certain parking ratio be maintained. He did not believe that was viable as the alternative on the north side, and noted that textured pavement and raised table sidewalks through the driveways, as well as rumble strips, would be feasible.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft expressed considerable concern that the occupancy requirement seemed to have been overlooked or ignored. She noted that information discussed between staff and the applicant was not taken back to the Planning Board. She noted that there were few areas in the City where a pedestrian could walk down a sidewalk without crossing a driveway. She inquired whether the additional parking spaces along Shoreline Drive as a result of the construction could be credited towards the parking requirements.

Mr. Kyte noted that in 2004, they spent considerable time working through the conditions, and met with staff several times to address many of the conditions. Their examination of the safety and liability issues led them to the conclusion that the north-south walk was a better solution. He noted that the parking ratio was four per 1000, and that the additional parking on the south side ultimately supported the additional retail that had been added. Safeway was a major addition to the shopping center, and he added that the parking should be placed where the need was. They decided that parking should be placed on the south side of the center to support Bed Bath & Beyond. He noted that it was written into the leases that the old parking lot would be removed. Once the road is placed on that parcel, a bike-pedestrian path would be placed there, and the area would be added to the beachfront area for buildings and parking.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that the Board had been told that north-south sidewalks could be added, or that the sidewalk requirement could be partially pushed onto the adjacent property owners. She believed that would put the Board and the City into a very bad position, and did not want to see that problem repeated. She did not want to see this situation show up on Whitehall, Franciscan or similar streets. She strongly believed that when the parking was installed adjacent to a particular building, that the applicant should not propose a too-large building that required so much parking that could not accommodate a full-length sidewalk along that roadway. She understood the issue with the parking leases, and would go with the alternative of pushing it to the north side as a second option, but did not believe it was the best solution for this particular site. She would not support the north-south sidewalk, and would rather see a full-sized six-foot-wide sidewalk on the south side of that driveway. As a secondary option, she would support Option B.

Mr. Kyte noted that it was determined that the sidewalk would be on the north side, within the existing roadway right of way. Of the 24 feet, four feet would be taken for the sidewalk, leaving two 10-foot lanes. He noted that they had received very succinct direction in 2004 on how to approach this issue, which ran contrary to the Planning Board's wishes. He noted that they were working hard to develop the right solution, and came up with the idea to push the sidewalk north. They had discussed the idea of elevating the crosswalks through the driveways with staff, and they had mutually agreed to use a colored stamp concrete to clearly delineate the walkway. The walkway would also have a four-inch raised curb the entire length. He noted that they were comfortable in that recommendation.

Mr. Corbitt advised that Bank of America had signed a preliminary letter of understanding, and that the surveying would also need to be done. Wells Fargo had also signed the letter, and Washington Mutual had also begun examining the letter. He noted that the owner of Burger King had indicated he would sign it as well. He noted that they wanted to have the safest environment possible.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that she could accept Option B, although she did not believe it was the superior alternative. She wanted to ensure that the development was sized so that the needed parking and sidewalks would be available on the site without having to push them off-site.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that on page 2 (paragraph 1-b) of the resolution covering Option B, the applicants had agreed to complete construction by April 2008. She noted that this had begun in 2003, and was concerned about the timeframe. She was particularly concerned about the construction of the east-west walkway, and did not believe people would be in more peril walking on a sidewalk than sharing a lane with cars.

Mr. Kyte noted that it would take at least a year to design the parking lots and get them through the City's permit process. He believed the timeframes were fairly aggressive, and would pursue them with diligence.

Acting President Cunningham noted that this condition addressed public safety in an east-west orientation, yet the proposal addressed a north-south orientation, which he found to be at odds. He did not believe that solution would address the design and safety needs of the project. He suggested that some traffic calming measures be employed to maintain additional safety elements, and that any unsafe condition be mitigated. He did not perceive any Board support for the north-south orientation, and believed the existing east-west condition was the orientation to be pursued. He believed the timeframe should also be discussed.

Board member McNamara believed the Board's frustration stemmed from the presentation of this project in a piecemeal fashion, and believed there were more recent site plans than those from 2003 to accompany the most recent changes. She supported the east-west alternative, and although it was not optimal by any means, she believed it was the best of the two alternatives presented. She suggested that the Board add a condition with some traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps or raised crosswalks that cross the access road.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Kohlstrand regarding the timeline, Mr. Garrison noted that the condition was written to set up definite timelines and milestones; the first was to get the agreement of the property owners, then the permits and then to complete the construction. He noted that the three-month interval was an estimate made by the applicant.

Board member Kohlstrand requested that in the first stage, the agreement from the property owners be brought back in concert with the first phase to provide assurance before the Board considered signing off on Target and the rest of the development.

Mr. Kyte replied that the letters from the property owners could be in place, and that they would be delivered to the City. He noted that they were very detailed in terms of the items of agreement.

Board member Kohlstrand moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-12 to approve Option B, with the following amendments:

1. Traffic calming measures, such as rumble strips, raised crosswalks and/or speed humps should be provided to slow traffic along the roadway;
2. The applicant will provide quarterly status reports to the Planning Board with the first report to coincide with the review of the Target proposal, which currently stood at June 25, 2007, or August 23, 2007, whichever comes first; and

Board member McNamara seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 4. Absent: Lynch, Cook, Mariani.

- 9-B. **Initial Study IS05-0001; Planned Development Amendment PDA05-0001; Major Design Review DR05-0010; Use Permits UP06-0003, UP06-0010, UP06-0012 and UP06-0013; – Applicant: Safeway, Inc. 2234 Otis Drive (adjacent Alameda Towne Centre) (DG).** The applicant requests approval of Planned Development Amendment, Major Design Review and Use Permits allowing the demolition of an existing bank building and redevelopment of the property with a gas station. The project includes three covered pump islands, each containing three pumps, for a total of eighteen pumping stations. Fuel will be stored in three 20,000 gallon underground storage tanks. In addition to the approximately 7,500 square-foot canopy covering the gasoline pumping facilities, the project includes an approximately 625 square-foot building, housing the cashier's desk, restrooms and retail sales of convenience items. The applicant is proposing twenty-four hour operations and the sale of beer and wine. An Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. The site is located within a Central Business District with Planned Development overlay Zoning District (C-2-PD).

Mr. Garrison presented the staff report, and recommended approval of this application.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Todd Paradise, applicant, Safeway, noted that there were several Safeway fuel centers in the Bay Area, including Dublin, Livermore and Morgan Hill. He added that the fuel centers were owned and operated by Safeway, and that they were a vital part of the program, adding convenience to the grocery operations. He described the background of the site plan, and displayed a presentation of the proposed project. He noted that following a community workshop in early March, they dropped the request for alcohol sales.

Mr. Chris Furcoe, noted that his company had worked on many hundreds of gas stations across the nation. He summarized the technological advances featured by the proposed gas station, and noted that California was on the leading edge of regulatory reform. He stated that the proposed station would be state of the art, and added that the tanks and piping would feature double-walled fiberglass. The gas station would meet the most stringent earthquake standard (Category 5 earthquake standard). The air quality would be aided by a Stage 2 vapor recovery system.

Ms. Debbie Cartegener, land use attorney, Cassidy, Shimko, Dawson & Kawakami, confirmed the applicant's understanding regarding condition of approval #8, regarding the monitoring of the driveways for five years. She understood that Safeway would provide the funding as necessary for that, and the actual monitoring would be performed by the City. She noted that a gas station project normally did not take two years to complete, and that the applicant was concerned about moving forward as quickly as possible. She noted that there was no guarantee that the Target application would be heard in two months, and requested that the Board consider this project at this time.

Mr. Garrison noted that Safeway would provide the funding, and that the City would likely hire a consultant to perform the monitoring.

Ms. Debra Banks noted that she had offered an initiative to have a petition circulated through the St. Francis condominiums regarding the concerns raised during the early April meeting. She expressed concern about the mitigated negative declaration, and whether it was sufficient to cover the environmental concerns of the community. She also expressed concern about the traffic flow, and noted that it was almost impossible to make a left-hand turn from St. Francis. She was also concerned about the environmental integrity, and whether the ground and landfill would support this type of system. She expressed concern about safe waterways and structural integrity, especially with respect to earthquakes. She was also concerned about unmanageable traffic on Otis Drive.

Mr. Mark Irons inquired about the mitigated negative declaration. He thought the traffic would flow in two directions, as is typical for gas stations in Alameda. He understood that the higher number of pumps would expedite usage, but was concerned that it would attract even more cars, causing congestion. He understood the urgency, but believed it may be best to wait. He was concerned about the cumulative effects of this project.

Ms. Dorothy Reid wished to clarify the start of monitoring period, and would like to see it monitored five years after the shopping center is completely developed through the PDA. She believed it would take five years to build it up and see that effect. She inquired why the applicant wanted the gas station on the site at all. She noted that the original plan was to remove the existing gas station. She questioned whether the center needed a gas station in this spot at all, regardless of the quality of work that the applicant has done. She noted that the center has been without a gas station for three years, and that people have figured out where to go for gas. She noted that people really wanted a service station.

Mr. Jon Spangler, 1037 San Antonio, noted that he usually bought his gas at a locally owned full-service Chevron station. He noted that the north side entrance of the gas station off Webster was not supposed to be used, although people did it all the time. He suggested that it be redesigned so that a driver could only enter on one side, and exit through another. Regarding pedestrian safety, he suggested that the exit be on the south side of the gas station into the shopping center, with a raised safe crosswalk barrier to slow traffic. He believed the post-completion monitoring period should be at least 10 years rather than five years because most gas tank failures and toxic waste problems occur long after five years. He emphasized that monitoring and mitigation was a cost of doing business.

Mr. Randy Kyte noted that they had been working with Safeway gas for two years, and added that Safeway has been on the Island since 1958. He noted that they also had concerns about their earlier concerns, and believed they had done a very good job in revising the plan in conjunction with staff. He believed that the circulation from the shopping center to Otis made good sense, and added that they would work on their own mitigation plan to ensure there would be no queuing problems in the east-west drive aisle,

which would be detrimental to the shopping center; Safeway agreed with that assessment as well. They believed the plan has progressed well, and acknowledged their effort to add the sidewalk.

Mr. Bill Smith, 724 Central #9, noted that he had spent 20 years redesigning bicycles, and continued to work on alternative vehicles. He discussed charging stations for electric bikes and automobiles.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft commended the applicant for their decision not to sell alcohol at the gas station. She appreciated the support of the east-west sidewalk. She did not believe the gas station for South Shore Center should be supersized, and noted that the previous gas station had fewer pumping sites. She noted that it was also busier, and meant more cars in the shopping center. She proposed that there be no more than 12 fueling stations with six pumps, and she liked the biodiesel proposal. She noted that the Dublin station had 12 fueling positions, and that there were usually fewer than three cars waiting to fuel. She inquired whether the hours for refueling from the big tanker trucks could be limited to off-peak hours, and whether the station should be a 24/7 station. She agreed with Mr. McKay's suggestion in his email that any light generated should be designed so it did not adversely impact the adjacent neighbors, and that additional landscaping should be added along the Otis Drive side of the lagoon to further shield neighbors on the other side of the lagoon.

Board member McNamara noted that she had used the Dublin Safeway fuel center often, and enjoyed the orderly flow of traffic, which was a one-way flow. She remembered the gas lines of the 1970s, and noted that similar events may negatively impact the surrounding streets; she inquired how long the monitoring would continue. She added that traffic queuing was a serious concern for her. With respect to the emails on lighting impacts sent by residents of Laurel and Powell, she would like to know which landscaping view would be supported. Mr. Garrison explained the perspectives and scale of the illustrations. Mr. Thomas noted that the preliminary landscaping plan was on page PL-1, which was more reliable and specific than the perspective illustrations.

A discussion of the photometric plan ensued.

Board member McNamara expressed concern about the refueling times, and inquired about the anticipated refueling timeframe. Mr. Garrison replied that the CEQA document noted that truck deliveries were generally prohibited during the late night hours by the AMC (11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.). He noted that the specific truck delivery times had not been identified.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicant be asked whether they would be willing to limit truck deliveries to early morning hours.

The applicant noted that with respect to deliveries during early morning hours, there were physical limitations for deliveries; a full truck was the safest way to deliver fuel, and most drivers would not leave the site if they could not drop off the entire load because of the remaining vapors in the truck. They would need some flexibility for that reason, and he discussed the technical aspects of the fuel delivery process, which he noted was relatively quiet.

Board member McNamara noted that the concern was regarding conflict with traffic and respecting the neighbors' noise concerns. Mr. Gold noted that it was important that the Planning Board and the residents felt comfortable, and invited them to talk with other cities who have the Safeway fueling stations.

Acting President Cunningham inquired whether a year-long monitoring process would be acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Gold replied that they would be willing to do so, and to discuss other items of concern at that time. He noted that they wished to be good neighbors, and added that they had a good reputation for doing the right thing with respect to their operations.

Board member Kohlstrand stated that she would like to remove the shopping cart restrictions between Trader Joe's and Safeway, and noted that they were often abandoned on the sidewalks. Mr. Kyte replied that the perimeter may have been too narrow, and added that they had many shopping carts scattered all over the center.

Board member Kohlstrand shared the same concerns as her fellow Board members, and believed the lighting plan would be respectful of the neighbors across the lagoon. She believed that there were too many gas pumps on the site, and suggested reducing it by two or four. She was not comfortable with a continuous curb cut adjacent to the shopping center, and that it should be narrowed down with the same kind of circulation on the shopping center side as on Otis, while providing a safer environment for pedestrians. She noted that the truck traffic should be accommodated from the westernmost driveway as well. She was not comfortable on the proposal as shown because of its size, and believed it was too big for the site. She believed the architectural design was very positive, and liked the proposed treatment; she believed the landscape plan was reasonable.

In response to an inquiry by Acting President Cunningham question regarding the Category Five earthquake design criteria, Mr. Gold replied that California had seismic zones one through four, and there were higher zone levels that engineers use as a multiplier to determine the force of an earthquake. He noted that this site was in Zone 4-A, and that magnitude of earthquake would be approximately 7.4. He noted that when the Loma Prieta earthquake hit in 1989, none of the tanks were damaged. He noted that the tanks were structurally secure sitting either above or below ground, and added that the piping was flexible. He noted that they had never had any problems with the underground storage systems because of earthquake activity.

Acting President Cunningham inquired about monitoring in Condition 8, Mr. Gold replied that the purpose of the condition was to monitor traffic flow at the project driveway at the

direction of Public Works over concerns of queuing into the public right of way. He noted that it was never intended to address other issues as such air quality because that was well addressed through monitoring and reporting requirements that gas stations go through.

Mr. Peter Galloway, OmniMeans Traffic Engineers, noted that the queuing issue was put in as a safeguard. Their analysis indicated that they did not expect a maximum queue of over two vehicles per island when there was maximum demand at the station. After the study was completed, Public Works decided they would like to monitor the driveway for an additional five years as a safeguard to determine if there were any problems of the driveway traffic spilling onto Otis.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that this was a larger station than the one that was there before, and noted that this existing shopping center was not an optimal location; she believed that the Park Street and Otis location was a better location. She noted that this was a response to the public's request for a fueling station in the center of the island.

Acting President Cunningham noted that he has been concerned about overdevelopment on this parcel, and believed it would be in the community's best interest to mitigate that.

Board member Kohlstrand would like a raised six-foot-wide sidewalk at the location. She did not feel comfortable establishing conditions on the project at this time.

Acting President Cunningham called for a five-minute recess to allow staff and the applicant to confer.

Mr. Dan Gold, Consulting Engineers, project architect, noted that the proposal of limiting the applicant to one smaller curb cut in the back would not work for the applicant. He understood that the quantity of pumps was an issue for the Planning Board, and proposed establishing driveways similar to the current driveways, with two driveway openings from the bank. They would be willing to maintain those driveway openings, give or take a few feet, to ensure there was proper truck circulation. They wished to move the kiosk forward, and demonstrated on the overhead screen one dispenser that would be eliminated as a compromise. An additional area of transition space would be gained, reducing the width of the driveway openings to approximately the same width existing now. He noted that it would be very difficult to make the station work if the driveways were restricted further. He noted that the opening was currently 23 feet, and that they would widen it to approximately 40 feet.

A discussion of the proposed measurement changes ensued.

Board member Kohlstrand suggested moving the kiosk all the way forward.

Mr. Gold noted that in that case, the traffic would go through the major queues.

Board member Kohlstrand expressed concern about the presence of a continuous curb cut, which was not typical in Alameda. She did not believe it was the best solution for

Alameda, and believed that too many pumps were being fit onto one site. She did not believe it was a good design.

Mr. Gold noted that he was most concerned with the circulation, and that it made good design and business sense to keep them as open and flowing as possible. He was less concerned about the number of dispensers than making the wrong decision on the access.

Board member Kohlstrand emphasized that the City was trying to accommodate pedestrians.

Mr. Gold noted that reducing the width to 35 feet may work if the truck were able to pass through.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Kohlstrand whether the raised, stamped pavement table would differ in height from the rest of the east-west sidewalk, Mr. Gold confirmed that it would.

In response to an inquiry by Acting President Cunningham regarding the number of pumps requested by the Planning Board, Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she was looking for 12 pumps.

Acting President Cunningham noted that the Planning Board wished to maximize the length of the raised sidewalk to encourage pedestrian safety. He noted that there should be access to accommodate four lanes.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that she would like to see the final redesign before approving it, and would like an additional condition that the walkway along the southern side be a minimum of six feet.

Mr. Thomas noted that would be part of a motion to continue and redesign for Planning Board final approval.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-13 to adopt the mitigated negative declaration.

Board member McNamara seconded the motion, which passed with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Board member Mariani.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to extend the meeting to 11:15 p.m.

Board member Kohlstrand seconded the motion, which passed with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Board member Mariani.

Board member McNamara moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-13 as revised on the supplemental staff report and amended by adding conditions 23, 24, and 25 as follows:

1. The number of pumps will be reduced to 12;
2. No more than 70 feet be devoted to driveway access on the south side property line, with the rest being raised sidewalk; and
3. Tanker delivery would be limited to non-peak hour periods.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 3. Noes: 1 (Kohlstrand) Absent: President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Board member Mariani. The motion failed.

Board member McNamara moved to continue this item to the meeting of May 14, 2007.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, which passed with the following voice vote – 4. Absent: President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Board member Mariani.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

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

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

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

Board member Kohlstrand advised that no further meetings had been held.

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

Acting President Cunningham noted that the next meeting would be May 16, 2007 at which time the draft of the Task Force's findings would be reviewed.

12. ADJOURNMENT:

11:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary
City Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the May 14, 2007, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.