

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY FEBRUARY 27, 2012
7: 00 p.m.

1. CONVENE: 7:05 P.M.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board Member Knox White
3. ROLL CALL: President Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice-President Autorino, Board members Burton, Henneberry, Knox White, Köster, Zuppan.
4. MINUTES:

Minutes from the Regular meeting of December 12, 2011

Board member Henneberry called for approval of the December 12, 2011 meeting minutes. Board member Burton seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0, 2 abstentions (Knox White and Köster).

Minutes from the Regular meeting of November 28, 2011. (Pending)

Minutes from the Regular meeting of January 9, 2012. (Pending)

Minutes from the Regular meeting of January 23, 2012. (Pending)

Minutes from the Special Joint meeting of February 13, 2012. (Pending)

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, stated that staff would like to request to continue item 9C because the bylaws require the entire Board to be present and take the action.

Board member Ashcraft made a motion to withdraw item C unless Board member Zuppan becomes present to take action on the item.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Written Report

6-A Future Agendas

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, stated that the future agenda items consist of the second workshop on the Housing Element update including all proposed amendments to the housing element and proposed amendments to the Alameda municipal code and the initial Alameda Point workshop for the March 12, 2012 meeting. The March 26, 2012

meeting consists of the Park Street Streetscape presented by Public Works, the use permit for the College of Alameda Flea Market, the Public Art Ordinance Workshop, and 6-month review for 1051 Pacific Marina. The April 9, 2012 meeting consists of draft amendments to Alameda Municipal Code related to massage uses and bicycle guidelines presented by Public Works, and two development applications. The April 23, 2012 meeting consists of the Draft Alameda Point Zoning Amendment and Final Environmental Impact Report and Final Recommendation of the Park Street Code. The May 14, 2012 meeting consists of Public Art Draft Amendments for final approval by the Board and the first draft of the revisions to the municipal code dealing with farm animals. For the February 21, 2012 meeting of the Zoning Administrator, he approved a use permit for a restaurant located at 1315 Park Street to operate until 2 am, and there was no opposition to that. Lastly, the February 28, 2012 of the Zoning Administrator will consist of a hearing on a use permit for a chain link fence at 1600-1618 Park Street.

Greg McFann, City of Alameda Chief Building Official, reported on Alameda's Six Initiatives for Customer Service at the Permit Center.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Jon Spangler, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling Instructor, stated that last weekend he spent time teaching a new group of League of American Cycling Instructors. He spoke about the door zones and Class II bike lanes. For the past year, he measured bicycle lanes in Alameda and many of the lanes do not take the cyclist out of the door zone such as Oak and Central Avenue and if bicyclists turn right they will have to ride on the left hand edge of the bike lane to stay out of the door zone. Thus, bicycle and driver safety education is crucial and it would be good to have something similar to Alameda's Pedestrian Safety initiative.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

None.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

9-A. Design Review and Landscape Plan Amendment for Alameda Landing Retail Center- TRACT 7884 (Alameda Landing) Applicant: Catellus Alameda Development, LLC. A Landscape Plan application for landscape improvements for an approximately 23-acre retail center, a Design Review application for Building K for Target Stores at the retail center, and a sign program for the center. The site is located north of Stargell Avenue, south of Mitchell Street, west of Marnier Square Loop and east of the 5th Street extension in western Alameda.

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, Presented the application.

Board member Knox White asked once the final design review is approved by the Planning Department is that appealable by the public or the Board?

Mr. Thomas replied the final design review is meant to be a check of the final construction plans to make sure they are consistent with the plans approved by the Board. So, they are not brought back to the Board or public for comment.

Board member Köster asked if staff knows what is going to be included in the tenant locations.

Mr. Thomas stated that staff developed a retail tenancing strategy with Catellus in 2007, but at this point staff does not have tenants identified for the other buildings.

Ken Kay, Landscape Architect for the Alameda Landing Retail Center, presented the landscape and open space plan.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked if he is working with the architects of Target to incorporate green elements into the building.

Mr. Kay replied yes and he has had a session with Kevin Alba and SGPA who are the main architects for the site.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked what is the timeframe for installing the amenities and will the entire site be landscaped once the Target project starts.

Mr. Kay stated there are four public streets that surround the site so there are access issues and the Target store will require as much access as possible when it first goes in. He estimated that the planting associated to the store will go in first, but Sean Whiskeman, VP of Development at Catellus, would comment on this. He explained that the entire site will not be planted with big species, but big trees will be present on Mitchell Avenue and in the plazas.

Board member Knox White asked about the use of palm trees since they are not native to the area, but shopping centers seem to like them.

Mr. Kay replied that the use of the palm trees was incorporated into the Tree Master Plan. So, what he incorporated a small group of trees in various areas of the site similar to the layout at San Francisco's AT&T Park and along the Embarcadero.

Vice President Autorino referred to the Fifth Street Entry Plaza section on page 6 and asked for clarification about the landing urbanized streetscape at the arrow where the road comes down to two lanes and there is parking. He wanted to know does the illustration show one lane each way.

Mr. Kay replied that the cars would be directed to the north and the south at that point and some cars would go straight up to the urbanized street, but the demarcation shows drivers coming from 5th street could go straight or turn left to go to Building K or right to go to Building A. Furthermore, the engineering is going pretty well on the development plan and he was taking the plan and showing the layout in a graphic form. So, if there are questions

he can follow through with the engineers.

Vice President Autorino explained that he had trouble visualizing the urbanized streetscape on 5th Street.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to the Fifth Street Linear Greenway section on page 8 (located to the far right of the diagram) and she asked if the bike lane is placed throughout 5th street.

Mr. Kay replied that the bike lane goes up 5th Street to the Stargell Avenue side and the January 9th meeting shows the plan's cross sections for all the streets and does include the bicycle plan in entirety.

Board member Henneberry asked about the Memory Trail concept and if Mr. Kay plans to incorporate historical information into the entire center or just into the trail.

Mr. Kay replied that the Memory Trail would start at the Central Plaza at Stragell Avenue and 5th Street. He would like to see the trail continue up to the water at some point. He also mentioned that Square Peg, the signage identity consultants, have considered the historical aspect.

Board member Henneberry replied that the maritime history of Alameda is very important and shouldn't be segregated to just one side.

Board member Burton referred to the Main Gateway Plaza diagram on sheet 4, Building A which includes a square on the lower right hand corner of the building. He wondered if the square was supposed to be a building entrance.

Mr. Kay stated the buildings are hypothetical and he doesn't have plans for the buildings at this level. Also, the landscape is working itself around where the building entry would possibly be.

Board member Burton referred to the Landing Central Plaza diagram on sheet 7. There is an arrow to Building K and on the opposite side, there's an arrow to Building A. He wanted to know if the lines' intention is to indicate something that goes across the walkway.

Mr. Kay stated yes there will be enhanced paving to reinforce the pedestrian connection down that spine and subject to cost they would enhance the spine by using a series of trellises as detail similar to what one might find on the Target building.

Board member Burton referred to sheet 4 and questioned the bump outs along the landing street and the elements that are turned in the opposite direction. One was labeled trellis with bike racks and benches, but the elements are closer in at the street itself.

Mr. Kay replied that the elements are trellises and one would be able to walk under since they are a gateway through.

Board member Burton again referred to the illustration in sheet 4. He asked about the narrow white rectangles, which were 45-degrees away from the red squares.

Mr. Kay replied that they are large benches.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for public comments.

Mr. Spangler stated he is impressed with the commitment Catellus has shown to the project. First, he referred to page 4, Area A on the upper right hand corner and the possibility of kiosk/bicycle lockers being built there in the January meeting. Second, he explained that the design team mentioned including a bike station and he wanted clarification. Thirdly, he wanted to know if there would be showers for employees who want to commute to work by bicycle. Fourthly, he explained that priority must be given to bicycle rack's functionality and security. He also mentioned that on the curved area, located in Area V and Area E, there was on street parking. He hopes that the bicycle lane will have a 6' foot width that was mentioned in the January meeting. Finally, he would like to see valet bike parking or supervised bicycle parking included in the plan.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to the top of page 4 of the staff report regarding the main entry plaza or Gateway Plaza she would like the Board to comment on the area.

Board member Burton referred back to his previous comment about the Main Gateway Plaza diagram on sheet 4 regarding Building A where there is a square on the lower right hand corner of the building. He predicted that the building entrance would be on the parking lot side of Building A and if that is true he questioned whether bike parking, lockers, and racks that are shown along Stargell Avenue is a legitimate location since the cyclists have to find there way to the entrance way.

Vice President Autorino replied if you move bicycle facilities to the front of the buildings you're cutting down the width of the sidewalk with the bicycles.

Board member Zuppan stated that there is a lot of seating, but a lot of the seating is near low bushes without shading. She would like for the design team to find to create natural shading for seating that is not surrounded by trees.

Sean Whiskeman, VP of Catellus Development Corporation, replied to Board member Burton and Board member Zuppan's comments. He explained that the plan's includes over 110 bicycle racks and the intent of the racks is to spread across a number of different buildings and serve a couple of different functions. The specific rack found in the illustration is for a bike co-op or kiosk and the final locations in place will be worked out with staff and Bike Alameda.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that there are a lot of bicycles with trailers, which are used to haul children or groceries. So, the design team should look at accommodating the nearby residential neighborhood that uses those bicycles.

Mr. Whiskeman replied to Board member Burton and Board member Zuppan's comments.

He stated that the small square of the building suggests a small architectural element; a beacon of some sort, and the design team may or may not include an entrance depending on the occupant of the building. He also stated that shade is provided in a couple of different ways potentially umbrellas or canopies are available and when you see dashed lines on the plans that suggests canopies are present to protect that area with shade.

Board member Henneberry stated that Stargell Avenue and 5th Street would likely be a busy intersection, so will there be something on the corner to mitigate a car crashing into pedestrians standing on the sidewalk.

Mr. Whiskeman stated there would be a curb and bollards in order to slow a car down.

Mr. Kay stated the large landscape and bio-retention swale areas would deter people from getting in the way of traffic. The bollards and the placement of the curb and plaza prevent smaller cars from hitting pedestrians.

Board member Henneberry asked would the area between the bollards and the tree on Stargell Avenue contain a regular curb without parking.

Mr. Kay replied that parking will not be present and there is a lowered landscape area near the stripes. So, the landscape pushes pedestrians back on to the plaza enough where you won't be on top of where the cars are.

Obaid Khan, City of Alameda Supervising Civil Engineer, stated that in terms of right turn vehicles going over the curb and possibly hitting pedestrians, staff doesn't expect this to happen because right turning cars usually drive slower than through traffic.

Board member Zuppan stated that a lot of research shows that drivers are more careful when they allow pedestrian to intrude into the street. She also stated that research indicates that when there are no cues requiring drivers to be more careful that drivers tend to pay more attention to the street environment. So, there are two sides to the safety coin.

Vice President Autorino stated that the 5th Street area with the bollards has great landscaping so is it possible to landscape the Stargell Avenue side so pedestrian would not be on that portion of the plaza. He explained there should be a clear delineation of the street and the plaza with a defined entranceway.

Mr. Kay replied that there is a good balance between hard and soft landscapes and as the design team goes through the details with staff, he will keep that in mind.

Board member Knox White asked if the current configuration of Stargell Avenue and 5th Street (illustrated as six lanes) the final configuration of Stargell Avenue, or is there a proposal to widen Stargell Avenue.

Mr. Khan stated that there are no plans to widen Stargell Avenue so this direction is final. When Alameda Point is further developed then staff will look into the configuration.

Board member Knox White stated that when the Stargell Avenue extension was built,

Catellus originally was going to pay for a portion of the construction, but the payment has not been received.

Ms. Debbie Potter, Project Manager for Catellus, stated that Catellus is obligated for the construction cost of the Stargell Avenue extension and they paid for the acquisition of the right of way at the College of Alameda so they have put in \$8 million into the development. Currently, there is a payment schedule setup for the construction cost.

Board member Knox White stated that based on Board member Henneberry's comments about the entryway, the intersection will be one of the least desirable intersections in the City because there will be 6 lanes of traffic coming up Stargell Avenue and the intersection will be the second widest intersection in the City. Also, he had a hard time visualizing people spending time in the entry plaza and he believes the space would be considered a drive by space and less of a public space because of the traffic and that's a concern. He hopes the design team can find a way to buffer the design of the intersection with trellises, but not a wall. Also, considering that bike racks will be located near the intersection, he feels that bikes will be at risk because there will be little pedestrian activity. Furthermore, he believes that cutting the shopping center off from Bay Port and the College of Alameda is a miss opportunity for connecting the space with the rest of the island.

Board member Köster asked if there is a way to include water elements around the intersection and near the public art location in order to mitigate noise from traffic.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for Board comment on the Frontage along 5th Street section on page 5 of attachment 1, Area B.

Board member Knox White encouraged Catellus to look at including street bike parking in front of the buildings at 5th Street and secure the parking with bollards.

Mr. Thomas stated that the January 9th staff resolution had a detailed condition about the placement of bike racks. There are distinctions between visitor and employee bike parking and employee parking may be effective in bicycle cages or corrals.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that it's important to have buses running through the area, is Catellus helping AC Transit fund the service.

Mr. Thomas replied that Catellus and Public Works have been working directly with AC Transit to determine the best locations for bus stops. When Alameda Point and Alameda Landing are built out there will be a greater demand for bus service and this project is conditioned to supply shuttles because the shuttles are part of the Transportation Demand Management plan. The Transportation Demand Management program would kick in either when a total of 100,000 square feet of commercial space is built or the first 100 housing units are built.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for Board comment on the Entry Plaza, the Central Plaza, and the 5th Street Linear Greenway.

Board member Knox White stated that the project should look at incorporating residential

over the 5th Street businesses in the shopping center and incorporate retail across the street on 5th Street within the residential so the plaza starts to become an identifiable place.

Mr. Whiskeman replied that there are restrictions and that idea was not contemplated as part of the retail plan. However, on the residential side that idea has been contemplated before and the idea can evolve as the residential plan proceeds.

Board member Zuppan stated that although there was an explanation of erecting canopies throughout the plan she would like to see more trees included in the seating area.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked how many trees are shown in the plan.

Mr. Kay stated 797 trees on the 23-acres, plus the roadways.

Mr. Thomas replied that staff could include a condition with the final landscape plan that staff will work with Mr. Kay to ensure that the Board's questions are answered, especially putting trees and seating within close proximity of each other.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she is a champion of bay friendly landscaping. She referred to page 10 of the plan in the asterisk in the bottom corner, which states "The plant list is subjective to refinement based on plant availability and size." She would like Mr. Kay and his team to include a minimum number of different species and varieties of plants because the attractive elements includes the variety of plant types, sizes, and heights.

Mr. Kay replied that there is a sense of the minimum plant species used, but he needs to receive detailed soil reports before he does anything. The plants shown are ones that are generally available so there won't be a monoculture.

Board member Knox White stated that the staff report mentions view corridors. When you refer to the first page of the plan, the current plan of the retail center, there is a building in front of this view corridor that this greenway is going into. He finds the greenway interesting, but if it connects to a typical sidewalk with a building sitting there, then it is a lost opportunity to connect the west end over to the waterway.

Mr. Kay replied that across the street from the illustration is slated as a village green surrounded by residential development so this will contribute to the other side of the street. He thinks in reality the variety of the landscape is more important than one type of landscape for 17 feet and the design will be pleasing in the residential section and for pedestrians making their way up 5th Street.

Board member Knox White replied that he was referring to the building on the other side of Mitchell Avenue not on the other side of 5th Street.

Mr. Whiskeman stated that graphically they wanted to get a sense of the entire project so they used the shopping center, residential, and waterfront plans and there will be discussion on how to be mindful of how the shopping center is built and how the view corridors are

maintained into the waterfront.

Kevin Albaugh, Senior Associate with MBH Architects and architect for the Target store, reported on the Target structure and how it fits into the site plan.

Vice President Autorino asked on the front elevation illustrated on page 14, are there others windows by the Target sign.

Mr. Albaugh answered yes there are other windows where you see Building K. The windows would be small about 3' feet wide and 8' feet tall.

Vice President Autorino stated that the main entrance wasn't placed in the middle because you assumed customers would be traveling along 5th Street.

Mr. Albaugh replied that given Target's operations and store layout, it works best for their business model to have the entrance door off to the side.

John Dewes, Target Store Regional Development, stated that the way the interior of the store is laid they don't build doors in the middle of the building, so they usually have the door on the left or right hand side.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked about the windows on page 13 and what would the customers look into.

Mr. Albaugh replied the translucent windows look into offices.

Vice President Autorino asked why there aren't more windows on the building since you want to mirror the buildings in the development.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that the front elevation and length of the building is 495' feet long. In the City of Alameda, many of the commercial blocks are not that long. So, she echoes Board member Autorino's sentiments.

Mr. Dewes replied that the store plan design is based no a fixurization plan so it's not comparable to an office building where you can have glass around the building. So, if you include windows on the Target store, they would look into a stock room or behind a fixture.

President Ezzy Ashcraft replied is it possible to do more of a treatment that you have on the left west elevation where you have the display windows.

Mr. Dewes replied that is doable, but the building's plan is to use windows to break up the building's mass throughout.

Mr. Albaugh referred to the sidewalk plan illustration and the overall design of the building. He said the sidewalk will offset the building and will mimic breaking the building down so pedestrians are passing a variety of elements.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to the resolution (found on item number 4 on page 4) voted on later about the addition of 4-6 green screens on the front elevation to soften the large expansion of wall.

Mr. Thomas replied that the resolution considered how to create a pedestrian scale environment along that long edge. Mr. Kay raised a number of good points about how the building goes in and out and the inclusion of landscaping. One of the main focuses was to find a way to make the I-beam horizontal element more interesting with more shadow lines and a traditional kind of trellis feature than the traditional modern horizontal beam.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for public comment.

Jon Spangler stated that he is a Target shopper and the point about windows is well spoken. It would be nice to have real light coming into the building so he refers to the Alameda Library as a good example. Secondly, regarding the external lighting of the signs, he would like to see a 50% reduction of the amount of light emitted and the shape have more curve and narrowness. Thirdly, the color of the building of the target the off-white color seems to be a glaring standout compared to the rest of the elevations and that should be toned down in order to keep up with the rest of the shopping center.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for Board comment on Building K.

Board member Burton stated that based on the questions that were asked about the placement of windows there seems to be an error by the team by not including an illustration of the building's interior layout as part of the staff report. Secondly, he doesn't see the Target layout as a real effort to tailor the building into the specific site plan and there should be substantial break down of the building's mass. The trellis elements would not be something pedestrians would be walking amongst and won't be provide shade or shadow. He agreed with Board member Autorino that the entrance should be placed in the middle for the pedestrian-oriented development in theory. When referring to the staff report on page 6, he doesn't see a support for the pedestrian experience adjacent to the building. When referring to page 7, each side of the elevation design is comprised of smaller elements and he determined that it's flat. Lastly, regarding the 2nd to last paragraph on that page there is consistent stucco finished base incorporated around the building, but on the elevations it is described as concrete, he would like clarification about the material.

Board member Köster stated that he has seen some Target with multiple entranceways and he would like the design team to look at including another entranceway on the other side of the building. He referred to the main site plan, page 1, the green arrow that links the two Buildings K and Building A. He questioned what Building A will be given this is a secondary spine to the project, then who will walk on this spine. He thought this was an entrance to the Target, but in reality people would want to park as close to Target as possible and then drive to Building A. Thus, the pedestrian experience would be tarnished.

Board member Knox White stated that he echoes everything that both board members said. He doesn't think that the employee entrance should be placed where it is.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked if there is a rationale for taking pedestrian through this route only to come to an employee entrance to Target, is it possible to angle the pedestrian entrance closer to the main entrance.

Mr. Whiskeman said there are multiple sidewalk paths that will lead pedestrians from center drive to Building K. Since the way the parking is constructed, the main spine puts pedestrians a little apart from the entrance. He explained if one were to walk in front of Building I then across the way would be another sidewalk that takes you off center to the right of Target's entrance. The main pedestrian connection to the clump of buildings in the middle to Building K will not lead you to Target's front door because of the way parking is configured. However, there may be a design solution that we can get the pedestrian promenade over one drive aisle so it ends up closer to Target's entrance, but there is also a pedestrian sidewalk that will lead you from Building I and Building J to Building K in addition to the proposed entrance it is closer to the street, the living landscape pedestrian experience, and residential neighborhood. Thus, a majority of customers may come from the parking lot not necessary coming from Mariner Square Loop and have to experience that long walk. So, that is something that can be considered and Mr. Albaugh can come back to the Board about this issue.

Board member Knox White stated that in order to preserve the pedestrian experience the parking spots should connect to the rest of the shopping center and Target. He pointed out that Mr. Kay did an excellent job along Mitchell Avenue, and he is wondering if Sub Area B could become mixed-use in order to correspond with development along the waterfront. Regarding the illumination of the Target signs, the signs will be placed across from homes and the signage should be on the side that this building is pretending to front. He proposed a condition to remove big illuminated signs across from residential developments.

Vice President Autorino stated that people will be going to Building K as a destination and it may be problematic to have another entryway on the opposite side of the building because of the loading dock. He would like to see more windows in the front of the building and for the design team to break up the façade in order to make the building as harmonious with the area as possible. He doesn't understand why there is a lighted Target sign on every side of the building, but he brought up the condition that the signs cannot be on before 7 a.m. or after 10 p.m.

Board member Henneberry agreed with Board member Autorino and exclaimed that the design team could only do so much with a 140,000 square foot building. However, he believes there can be a way to soften the building and make it more acceptable to its surroundings

Board member Burton stated that he liked the color palate and the earthier tones and brick help the building blend with the landscape.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to the Planning Commissioner's Handbook created by the League of California Cities, Design and Review section, which state that most people prefer a degree of aesthetic complexity and variety while monotonous facades symbolize

Approved Meeting Minutes
February 27, 2012

intuitionism. In order to avoid the monotony, the building should be broken into smaller units with varying shapes, sizes, windows, textures and colors. She believes the plan's is headed in the right direction, but she would like the architects to review the following items: (1) break up the large expanse of the front facing south façade and remedy this with public art; (2) reduce the illuminated signs especially in the back of the store; (3) soften the colors of the rear elevation facing north (refer to page 13). The order that one sees the colors differs and now receive dark brown bands framing the panels and that should be soften to blend with the surroundings; (4) consider how the Green arrow around Building A to Building K could be moved over in order to shift people closer to where they want to be; (5) have the architects bring material samples so the Board can review; and (6) incorporate sustainable elements into the plans of the building. She wanted staff to go back and incorporate the Board's suggestions before the Board votes.

Scott Cuyler, Creative Principal and Co-Founder of Square Peg Design, reported on the company's first attempt at programming the site for the driving audience and at this point, they are not looking at pedestrian signage.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for Board comment on the proposed signage located on page 18.

Board member Burton stated that the plan is headed in a good direction, but the plan needs to be developed further. He believed that the Sail logo specifically with the letter "L" is interesting, but the logo may be too delicate given the scale. In terms of the horizontal options for the Alameda Landing identity, he was intrigued if it can be done an anti-graffiti proof material. He liked the primary site tenant identification where all the signs are located on one side.

Board member Zuppan asked if the letter "L" with Sail is suppose to be a weather vein or sail that switches around with the wind.

Mr. Cuyler replied that this is a preliminary design report so more work will be done and no it's not a weather vein.

Board member Knox White stated that having a kinetic aspect to the sign would be unique and interesting.

President Ezzy Ashcraft agreed with Board member Burton that less is more, but make it fun and interesting.

Mr. Thomas stated that the landscape and open space plan has a majority of support, but with a few conditions: (1) look at final plan to ensure seating and shading; (2) look at Stargell Avenue main entrance at 5th Street to make sure trees and landscape are placed to create a buffer, while making it attractive primarily on the Stargell Avenue side; (3) place a water feature at that corner to reduce the traffic's noise; and (4) create a list of the minimum plants that will be used in the landscaping plan. Regarding the Building K design review the overall theme heard was that there was not enough variation and not enough visual interest. There are 8 different design strategies that staff and the project team can use to improve and

soften the elevations. He also stated that the focus on the south front elevation should be enhanced and softened the façade and 5th Street elevation. Staff wants to know if the Board is ready to approve the plan with these conditions or should the design team continue working on the plan and come back for another hearing. Ideally, staff would like to craft the conditions in order to move forward into the next phase of the design.

President Ezzy Ashcraft said the rear of the building does not need bright red columns or the illuminate the Target sign.

Mr. Thomas replied that the eight conditions for the Building K would be: (1) including window displays on the south and west elevation will enhance the building; (2) include more green screens on the front elevation and primarily on the right hand side to soften it and bring more landscaping to the front near the green screens; (3) the use of vertical public art either standing away or applying to the building to the front elevation so there is some visual interest on the right hand side of the elevation, similar to Perforce Software on Blanding Avenue (4) take out the illuminated Target signs that face the residential neighborhood or the waterfront; (5) the trellis elements along the front improve pedestrian experience so pull the trellis away from the building to create shadow or allow pedestrians to walk under; (6) move the planes in and out, but not a huge amount along the eastern portion of the front elevation as you move along the main entrance; (7) use materials particularly on the pedestrian level and along the southern front elevation that are interesting; (8) As Board member Burton stated along the front elevation, the brick shoulder walls read the exact same height so there may be some fairly small changes in the height of the elevations.

Mr. Dewes stated that the illuminated signs along the rear and the west side facing the residential would be taken away from the plan. As Mr. Thomas' pointed out, the right half of the south elevation where the brick portion sits along the wall will project out more. Regarding the list of conditions, he can work with all of the suggestions, but the second entrance suggestion will not work because it is not part of Target's layout models.

Vice President Autorino replied that the picture shown of Del Monte mimic the warehouses along the Embarcadero in San Francisco. The building style along the front would bring more of the maritime feeling.

Mr. Thomas stated that they did talk about the Del Monte building and the repeating rhythm is very pleasant as you drive or walk along the building.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked to discuss drawing 3 in the loading zone area, and was there something in place to screen the loading dock.

Mr. Dewes explained there will be a screen wall with the same materials of the main building's palate, the length will be around 70' to 80' feet long and 12' feet high.

Board member Köster referred to slide 14, where the entrance of the building is located. He asked if there was a way to move the food court over to the corner, towards the tower in order to shift the store entrance closer to the secondary spine that runs down the plan.

Mr. Albaugh stated there are windows between the food service area and the entry vestibule and the far left of the vestibule is all glazed windows, creating a big glass box. So, there is visual connection to the outside corner from the food service area from its current location.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for a motion to extend the meeting past 11 p.m.

Vice President Autorino made the motion to extend the meeting till 11:30 p.m.

Board member Henneberry seconded the motion.

Board member Knox White stated that the new rules for City meetings is that if three consecutive meetings go past 11 p.m. then the Board would have to hold more meetings in order to get business done.

The motion was approved 7-0.

Mr. Thomas stated that the resolution with the amended conditions and bring the revised resolution upon consent next week.

President Ezzy Ashcraft proposed a subcommittee to work on the design review.

Vice President Autorino stated he doesn't want to delay the project anymore so he believes the conditions work and he believes a subcommittee will enter into additional unnecessary discussion.

Board member Burton stated that a subcommittee might work, but he would like to have it brought back before the Board to have assurance that the revised design is something that the Board is happy with.

Mr. Thomas stated there is one other way to move forward. He explained there's an on-going process under this scenario where the design team will implement the conditions then look to City staff approve the revisions. There can be a system setup where he can report to the Board about the process the way staff reports on the process of the design review.

President Ezzy Ashcraft envisioned delegating two of the board members with professional design background to come in and simultaneously work with Mr. Thomas look over the revisions.

Board member Knox White stated that the Board could call a review if they don't like the final plan. Also, the one thing that is not on the caveat and will keep him from voting to approve the Building K plan is the pedestrian connection in the fake entrance that is currently designed in this building.

Mr. Thomas replied that another way of handling the situation would be for staff to conduct a final design review before building permit is issued. He responded to Board member Knox White's comments regarding the pedestrian connection.

Board member White explained to Mr. Thomas that there usually isn't an acre of parking lot in front of pedestrians and when looking across they see their destination. He referred to constant J-walking habits made by drivers who park across the street to go to the Alameda Theater because it is a direct path.

He suggested re-orienting the parking in front of Target so that it lines up with the parking between Building A and Buildings E and D so all the parking and the pedestrian pathways are straight across Building K.

Board member Zuppan stated she likes the idea if you make something interesting and worth going to at the end of the path then it solves some of the issues. Also, the lighting should not shine up into the air at night.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that the options for Board approval are: (1) stick to what is laid out in the staff report or (2) have the Board not approve the plan and require staff to continue to work plan and come back for another hearing. She stated that she is calling for an approval of the plan with conditions and when the final design review is finalized then staff should report the plan to the Board.

Vice President Autorino called a motion to approve the plan with the conditions defined by Mr. Thomas and the final design review will come back to the Board for approval.

Mr. Thomas stated that he would provide the interior building layout to the Board before the design review.

Board member Zuppan seconded the motion.

The motion passed 5-2. (Board members Burton and Knox White opposed)

Mr. Thomas stated that he would include the statement made by Board member Zuppan in the existing conditions. Board member Zuppan requested for the design team to look at including something interesting such as public art at the central pedestrian pathway that intersects with Building K.

Board member Knox White called a motion to extend the meeting until midnight.

Seconded by Board member Burton.

The motion was approved 7-0.

9-B. Review of Draft Prioritized Transportation Project List.

Obaid Khan, City of Alameda Supervising Civil Engineer, reported on the transportation project list that would be moved for review by the City Council.

Board member Zuppan asked how did staff calculate the points and can Mr. Khan explain if

safety considerations were included in the evaluation.

Mr. Khan referred to the bike plan and he explained that the ranking is listed in the back of the sheet. When calculating the points he referred to the bike plan project. Regarding safety considerations, he said that is a tricky question, but staff looked at different modes of transportation to see how safety is incorporated into the design.

Board member Zuppan stated that she was looking at the project that strengthened current seismic standards.

Mr. Khan replied that regional and lifeline connectivity would be ranked high in priority.

Board member Knox White stated that this is a great process and he was glad to see the City is going through this process methodically. He believes the scoring is still missing a couple of things: (1) transit benefits should have some sort of grade because you want to know what does the scoring mean and if staff provides points then they should give clarification for what the points mean; (2) the Regional Significant scoring seems off because it basically says that local projects score very poorly while regional projects receive bonus points; (3) the Economic Development section is vague and should be gradated to show why points are given; (4) the Transportation Element points are aimed towards public works working with another agency and half the points are created by meeting small policies and he suggested that there should be four general pan objectives. Therefore, the scoring side needs to be more methodical, an example, the former ACTIA scoring does calculate it's funding into a great spreadsheet. His other concern was the way that the projects are called out. Some projects are vague and there should be consistency on how the projects are defined. Also, he believes the spreadsheet should include a column that explains the types of funding that the projects could match with. Additionally, he wanted to know how staff would add new projects to the list and prioritize the list that the community brings up. Lastly, when the list is finalized it would be good to have regular updates on the top projects.

Mr. Khan replied that the transit benefit would be looked into and regional significance is a very critical item because when going to MTC, Caltrans, or FHWA for grants the agencies are looking for regional significance in order to fund projects. He and staff would look at the sheet and refine where necessary. The Economic Development section is something that staff will look at and they are looking at major projects such as Alameda Point and Northern Waterfront, not for infill small single-family developments. If there is, an economic development gradient staff will look into it based upon specific plans that exist for Northern Waterfront and Alameda Point. The Project Readiness section is a good idea and staff will add points. Regarding the Maintenance section, the project mentioned on Broadway and Jackson project went into the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan and was a cosponsored application with the City of Alameda and Oakland. This was the first time the City has cosponsored with the City of Oakland on this project. Although most of the project's footprint is located in Oakland, it creates a great regional collaboration and the plan has multimodal elements such bus rapid transit, bike lanes and transit exclusive lanes, which are important and received a lot of regional support.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked about the Broadway project's solution to the freeway

entrance from 7th street.

Mr. Khan stated it will be the 6th Street frontage street and there is some opposition, but City Council members who represent Oakland Chinatown are supporting the project.

Vice President Autorino stated that it would be nice to delineate what the current priorities are for street projects.

Mr. Khan replied that is based on the Pavement Condition Index and the amount of traffic the street receives.

Board member Zuppan made a motion to extend the meeting for another 10 minutes.

Seconded by Board member Knox White.

The motion was approved 7-0.

9-C. Election of Planning Board Officers. The Planning Board will elect a new President and Vice President for the upcoming year, as required by the Planning Board By-Laws.

Vice President Autorino stated that the way the elections works is by seniority and the next person in line would be Board member Zuppan.

Vice President Autorino made a motion to name Board member Zuppan the President of the Planning Board.

Seconded by Board member Knox White.

The motion was approved 5-2.
Köster and Henneberry abstained.

Board member Knox White moved to name Board member Burton the Vice President of the Planning Board.

Seconded by Vice President Autorino.

The motion was Approved 7-0.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Mr. Thomas and Board member Zuppan thanked President Ashcraft and Vice President Autorino for their work on the Planning Board.

13. ADJOURNMENT: 12:10 AM