

# APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD  
MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2012  
7: 00 p.m.

1. CONVENE: 7:05 P.M.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board Member Kohlstrand
3. ROLL CALL: Present: President Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice-President Autorino, Board members Burton, Henneberry, Kohlstrand. Zuppan.
4. MINUTES: Minutes from the Regular meeting of October 24. 2011.  
Minutes from the Regular meeting of November 28. 2011. (Pending)  
Minutes from the Regular meeting of December 12. 2011. (Pending)

## 5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

President Ezzy Ashcraft made a motion to move Agenda Item # 11 "Board Communications" up to the top of the agenda since Board member Zuppan was not present and was unavailable to approve the draft minutes.

Vice-President Autorino made a motion to move Agenda Item # 11 up to the top of the agenda.

Board member Henneberry seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 5-0.

President Ezzy Ashcraft added one other agenda change. Item 9-A was taken off the agenda list because the application was withdrawn.

Vice-President Autorino made a motion to remove Item 9-A off the agenda.

Board member Henneberry seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 5-0.

## 11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

President Ezzy Ashcraft explained that Board member Kohlstrand would be leaving the Planning Board. She read a resolution from the City of Alameda recognizing Board

member Kohlstrand's accomplishments.

## **6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

### **Written Report**

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

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, reported on the future agenda items. The next hearing dated January 23, 2012 would be a design review for 2004 Clinton Avenue and a speaker would make a presentation on universal design and housing. On February 13, 2012, the Draft North Park Street Code and Draft Environmental Impact Report for the North Park Street Code would receive public comment. The February 27th hearing would review and take action on the architectural design for Building K, landscape and open space plan for the Alameda Landing Project. Additionally, the Board would comment on the Public Works Department's Prioritize List of Transportation Projects. On March 12th, the Board would review the housing element update; this would be the second in a series of workshops. Mr. Thomas plans to have all the proposals for the Housing Amendment prior to the March 12th meeting. Furthermore, he plans to have the draft amendments to the public art resolution before the March 26th meeting.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked Mr. Thomas to give a brief update on the redevelopment process after the state dismantled all redevelopment agencies.

Mr. Thomas replied Alameda Landing is dependent on redevelopment, but he asked Debbie Potter to further explain the situation.

Debbie Potter, Manager of Alameda Housing Development and Programs, reported on the outcome of redevelopment agencies. She explained that all agencies must be dissolved by February 1, 2012 and the City is unable to replace redevelopment with an optional or new program. So, a number of cities and counties have looked into designating a successor agency or housing agency once the dissolution is in effect. On January 4th, the City of Alameda became the selector agency and the Alameda Housing Agency will be the successor for the housing in Alameda.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked are there any projects in Alameda that would be in jeopardy or would be halted.

Ms. Potter stated that the City and the Redevelopment Agency had to identify all of its enforceable obligations. Once the enforceable obligations are identified, then they are able to move forward. The Alameda Landing, Boatworks, and Islander Motel projects are enforceable obligations and can move forward. However, there is a move in the state legislature to postpone the dissolution from February 1 in order to buy a little time to better manage the unwinding of the agencies.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked staff to provide an update of the redevelopment process later this year.

Board member Kohlstrand stated that Tax Increment Financing funds redevelopment and would that now go into the general fund.

Ms. Potter replied that the Tax Increment Financing monies would go back to the county and the county would establish a trust fund. The money would then pass through agreements and any extra money would be distributed through all the tax entities that receive a share of the property tax. She further explained that the City of Alameda is actually a low tax jurisdiction so the City wouldn't receive a significant amount back to the general fund.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

None.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

**9-A. PLN11-0372 – 1537 Webster Street.** The applicant seeks a use permit to operate a tattoo business within an existing 2-story commercial building. The proposed business will serve customers by appointment and walk-in service daily from noon to 10 pm with five employees per shift. Retail sales will be limited to jewelry and store branded fashion accessories.

The application was withdrawn.

**9-B. Development Plan Amendment, Master Street Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Addendum Applications– PLN11-0328, AT TRACT 7884 (Alameda Landing) Applicant: Catellus Alameda Development, LLC.** A proposed Development Plan and Master Street Plan amendment to construct an approximately 23 acre retail center with eleven buildings and associated parking, landscape and street improvements including the extension of 5<sup>th</sup> Street and Mitchell Street. The site is located north of Stargell Avenue, south of Mitchell Street, west of Mariner Square Loop and east of the 5<sup>th</sup> Street extension in western Alameda.

Mr. Thomas presented a staff report on the Alameda Landing Development Plan Amendment in response to November 28th's public workshop. He provided a one-page memorandum about the traffic study conducted and included supplemental information about levels of service. He brought up critical questions that were raised by the Board during the November 28th hearing, which was how the interface would work with buildings along 5th Street and the planned residential development across the street.

Sean Whiskeman, VP of Development at Catellus Corporation, gave a schedule update.

Board member Henneberry asked Mr. Thomas about Building A in the Alameda Landing's Environmental Impact Report whether it would be a grocery store.

Mr. Thomas replied that the Urban Decay Analysis looked at how the project's potential impact could create blight and cause smaller stores to close. If Catellus pursues tenanting Building A as a grocer, then they would have to work with the City and both parties would have to jointly agree to amend the Retail Tenanting Strategy approved in 2006.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked Mr. Whiskeman if the range of retail that Catellus is looking to include into the retail center consistent with page 5 of the staff report.

Mr. Whiskeman replied yes that the tenants would include electronics, health and beauty, home improvements, home accessories, restaurants, and more.

Board member Henneberry stated the use of Building A as a grocery store is a big issue for many people. He asked if Catellus decided to pursue including a grocery store in the retail center whether the issue would come before the Planning Board in addition to the City Council.

Mr. Thomas said the Planning Board could comment on the decision and the comments would be taken to the Economic Development Commission and then the City Council.

Board member Henneberry replied that it could be construed as a planning issue and should come to the Board for review.

Farimah Faiz, City Deputy Attorney, reaffirmed Mr. Thomas' comments, which stated that the Board could make comments and the comments would be routed to the City Council.

Board member Kohlstrand asked Mr. Whiskeman to summarize the site plan changes from the last Board meeting.

Mr. Whiskeman replied that the bicycle circulation and pedestrian connections that are present along the buildings' entrances on 5th Street Buildings were discussed and the design team felt they followed up with the Board's comments. The backside of Building K was another concern and they addressed the issue with some design concepts to help the Board make their final recommendation.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for the Board to make a motion to limit public comments to three minutes.

Vice-President Autorino made a motion to limit public comments to three minutes.

The motion was seconded by Board member Kohlstrand.

The motion was approved 6-0.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for public comment.

Patrick Corder, Member of the Alameda Firefighters local 689 and Alameda resident, spoke against Target selling groceries.

Doug Biggs, Alameda resident and representative of the Alameda Point Collaborative, approved the development plan amendment made by Catellus. He believes that the landscaping plan should incorporate climate appropriate, drought tolerant and locally grown plants possibly provided by Ploughshares Nursery.

Dominic Weaver, Alameda resident, stated that the development that was being considered is very important to the City's economic development, but he was opposed to the Target Supercenter aspect.

Erwin Hiptch, representative of Local 2850 Food Workers Union, explained that he would like the site plan to be further looked into.

Wilhelmina Slater, Alameda resident and member Local 2850 Food Workers Union, explained that she supports the small business and worries about the creation of vehicular traffic around the site.

Tony Daysog, Alameda resident, said that there are major issues at play such as economic issues and blight impacts, but he felt the project would help bring economic progress and employment opportunities. He encouraged the Board to analyze the economic development portion of the project and vote to move the project forward.

Dough Bloch, member of Teamsters Joint Council 7, thought this project was a bit difficult because the union supports economic development, but the grocery store component was a direct threat to the City's grocers.

Karen Bey, Alameda resident, stated that the size of the Target is too large and she would like to see a smaller footprint of about 85,000 to 90,000 square feet. Her main concern was to not kill off other retail districts such as Alameda South Shore Center and Marina Village. She explained that the retail center's total footage would be 300,000 square feet and Target's footprint would be 140,000 square feet and that would not allow enough space for waterfront retail. Regarding Target's design, she wanted the design to fit the neighborhood and the waterfront. Therefore, Catellus should complete a full master plan for the area, which includes a marketing strategy that fits in with the development plan. Lastly, she did not want to see a grocery store in the Target store.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked Ms. Bay to explain her request to have a marketing strategy included in the development plan.

Ms. Bey referred to the staff report's executive summary, where Catellus would present

their marketing strategy to the Economic Development Commission and that should not occur separately from the Planning Board's approval process.

Jon Spangler, Alameda resident and a League of American Cycling Instructor urged the Board to proceed with the development as it is and he agreed with Ms. Bay's comments about the design of the Target store itself. He also commended Mr. Biggs for commenting about including locally grown plants in the design plan.

Carol Gottstein, Alameda resident, stated that she is in favor of the Target store plan. However, she wanted clarification about whether there would be a grocery store in the Target store and if proposed another grocery store in the Building A.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to Ms. Bay's comment about reducing the square footage of the Target store in order to give more space to the waterfront area.

Mr. Thomas replied that the Alameda Master plan entitlements allow up to 300,000 square feet of retail, so Catellus can explain why they chose Target's size. He went on to explain that the intent of the retail center was to create a format for large stores in order to bring in goods and services that are not found within the City.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked a Target representative to come up and explain whether Target would sell groceries and if so how much space would be devoted to groceries.

John Dewes, Target's Regional Development Manager, addressed the Target store format question. He explained that less than 10% of the store's floor area would contain groceries.

President Ezzy Ashcraft emphasized the need to have an appropriate waterfront design. She asked Mr. Whiskerman to reply to Ms. Bay's comments about the full master plan and to describe the waterfront plan.

Mr. Whiskerman exclaimed that the retail component was the first piece to the Alameda Landing project and the residential phase would follow. Catellus views the retail as the driver to building the streets and building the core component in order to activate the waterfront area. They are establishing the framework for the waterfront area to fit in once they complete the retail and the residential phases.

Board member Kohlstrand replied although Mr. Dewes touched on the retail that is coming first, there is a component north of Mitchell Avenue that is unclear. She went on to ask if it's their intent to include retail on 5th Street all the way up to the water.

Mr. Whiskerman stated that additional retail would be part of the waterfront.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for the Board to comment.

Board member Henneberry asked Mr. Thomas about the Supplement Environmental Impact Report. He stated that it addressed the urban decay issues as a lead into the retail leakage and the harm to grocery stores was considered very low. He questioned

whether there was additional analysis conducted in order to know if the Target store would reduce every grocery stores' base operations such as reducing store hours or the number of employees.

Mr. Thomas replied that Amy Herman would be able to explain more about the urban decay analysis. The objective of the analysis was to see if stores in the City would close due to the construction of Alameda Landing's retail center and the conclusion was no.

Amy Herman, ALH Urban and Regional Economics and author of the Alameda Landing Urban Decay Analysis, explained that Mr. Thomas gave a good summary of the findings. The report's findings indicated a low impact level of impact that was not severe enough to cause stores to close and some stores show an over performance to industry averages. Furthermore, the standard of decay is the closure of a store for a long enough period of time to which conditions of decay (blight) would start to materialize.

Board member Kohlstrand referred to the staff report on page 7 (indicated by red arrows) and attachment 1. She wanted assurance that the buildings fronting 5th Street, which showed according to the cross section a wide sidewalk between the two buildings and between 5th Street does not have cars parked in that area.

Mr. Thomas replied that parking is not intended for that area, but the markings may show a form of public art or other demarcation of the sidewalk leading people up to the water.

Board member Kohlstrand referred to the staff report on page 6b, section C to the upper left hand side. She wanted to know if the bike lane is really inside the sidewalk.

Mr. Thomas stated the illustration contained a typo and the sidewalk and bike lane were mislabeled.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to page 4, Buildings D and H and exclaimed that either side of the passage way did not have bicycle parking.

Mr. Thomas replied that staff could create a condition to include visitor bicycle racks for Buildings D and H.

Mr. Whiskeman was willing to include bicycle racks near Buildings D and H and he would welcome additional comments as the project evolves.

Board member Henneberry stated there are 5 findings that the Board must agree on and urban decay is a great portion of the findings. He would like Ms. Herman to explain the urban decay analysis and findings again.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that Board member Henneberry was looking for the retail center's development impact on other grocery stores, but objective of the urban analyses was to review the retail center's impact on causing stores to close and remain closed.

Ms. Herman replied that the analysis also looked at the potential for stores to be

released to other tenants. She mentioned the fact that Alameda has a low vacancy rate and strong retail market.

Board member Henneberry wanted to know how Ms. Herman produced the figures for the analysis.

Ms. Herman explained that she purchased a database from a provider and they gave estimates of the sales for various stores of the trade area. She used that information and the square footage information to conduct her calculations. She was not able to publish the data that was provided by the company due to a confidentiality agreement.

President Ezzy Ashcraft questioned whether the data was current.

Ms. Herman stated that she purchased the data in the fall of 2011.

President Ezzy Ashcraft gave an overview of the Board's requirements in order to approve the draft resolution.

President Ezzy Ashcraft commented on the fact that she would like to capture the sales tax leakage that is being sent to other Target stores. She would also be comfortable at capping Target's percentage of nontaxable goods per the total square feet at 10%.

Board member Kohlstrand explained that she is comfortable with the way Target is described, including the amount of groceries that are placed inside the store and the design of the bicycle and pedestrian circulation. She mentioned the only areas of concern were when pedestrians moved along 5th Street to the north and then moved along the Target store. She had issues with the treatment there and the fact that there is parking adjacent to 5th Street. Additionally, she was concerned with the treatment of the loading dock on Building A because they are putting a loading dock right near the pedestrian pathway. Furthermore, she referred to page 3, the Pedestrian Circulation section, when pedestrians move away from Building G to Building K and head to the crosswalk the design team should maintain a consist width of the sidewalks. Finally, she needed clarification on how pedestrians and bicyclists would cross the segment of Mariner Square Loop safely since the pedestrian and bike circulation stops right at the edge of the property.

Mr. Thomas replied that staff would continue to work on that issue and one of the conditions is to work with the property owner, Ms. Cathy Wagner, and Catellus.

Vice-President Autorino agreed with Board member Kohlstrand and he believes the project will be an economic generator and create a dynamic part of the west end of Alameda.

Board member Zuppan referred to the diagrams on pages 5a and 5b that highlights the traffic and turn lanes. Within the last diagram on page 5b, the northwest corner where 5th Street and Mitchell Avenue meet do not have turn lanes going over to the left at Mitchell Avenue or going by the Village Green turning left where the Target store would



be. She wondered why there isn't a turn lane when it's labeled a turn lane and why wouldn't it be necessary to have a left turn lane there.

Mr. Thomas agreed that the diagram showing the Village Green does not have a turn lane.

Dan Schaefer, Principal at BKF Engineers, stated that section 1c is mislabeled so there is no turn lane or bus stop at section 1c. He mentioned turn lanes are included in areas where sections are signalized. The Village Green area is not a signalized intersection, so cars would wait for a gap then go.

Board member Zuppan stated that the development through the village would most likely have bicyclists ride in and out of the area.

Mr. Schaefer explained to Board member Zuppan that the section would be stop controlled with a stop sign going eastbound.

Board member Burton mentioned that the intersection was spoken about in the last meeting and the fact there is no turning lane is a problem. He doesn't believe people will be driving from the main street that is being created in the middle of the project to get to the Target store. So, for the plan to not have a turning lane on 5th Street at the intersection by the entrance of the Target store will cause traffic problems.

Board member Kohlstrand asked Board member Burton where he would add a turn lane.

Board member Burton exclaimed that drivers heading down Mitchell Avenue going from east to west and would turn down onto 5th Street and then turn into the Target store.

Board member Kohlstrand stated that the Mariner Square Loop and coming along Stargell Avenue and then all the way up to the axis point would be the main traffic issues. She asked Mr. Shaver if his numbers showed that.

Matthew Ridgway, Fehr and Peers, stated that it is exactly what the numbers are suggesting and people would prefer to come in at Mariner Square Loop and Stargell Avenue because that is the most direct path of travel.

Board member Zuppan asked Mr. Ridgway if they estimated the traffic volume of drivers turning from 5th Street at that intersection into the residential development in the future.

Mr. Ridgway replied there were 65 left hand turns into the residential area on the other side of 5th Street during the PM peak hours and the volumes didn't represent a problem in terms of service.

Board member Zuppan referred to page 6a with the examples of the plaque inserts she asked if the markings were suggestions of what the treatments could be.

Mr. Thomas replied yes that is right.

Board member Kohlstrand also referred to page 6a in section b on the right hand side. She wanted clarification on why it stated private sidewalk and public sidewalk.

Mr. Thomas stated the dimensions are correct, but the labels between private and public are reversed.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred page 8 of 15 under the Bicycle Circulation and Facilities. There are three bullet points and the first bullet point under the last sentence states "All bicycle lanes are 5' feet wide and parallel parking spaces are 8' feet wide. When she last talked to Mr. Thomas, she wanted to know what the two have to do with each other.

Mr. Thomas replied there is an 8' foot-parking lane and a 5' foot bike lane with a total of 13' feet. The real issue was brought up by *Lucy Gigli*, President of BikeAlameda regarding bicyclists encroaching into the door zone.

Obaid Khan, City of Alameda Supervising Civil Engineer, stated in a commercial area like 5th Street staff recommends not using wide edge line usually seen as a bike lane by itself and a stripe with an edge line running parallel that defines the parking lane. One of the ideas staff is promoting under Alameda's Bicycle Design Guidelines is to extend the T's along the parking area into the bike lane to define the door zone. The practice has been implemented in the city of Oakland and has been helpful. He included the design into the Design Guidelines and the Board will be able to review the guidelines soon.

Board member Burton stated he is glad to see the Board's comments incorporated into the new plan. He referred to page 3 the Pedestrian Circulation Plan where the pedestrian can access Buildings F to Building A on the east edge of the property. The illustration shows the secondary pedestrian circulation hugging the property, but he suggested flipping the secondary circulation on to the other side of the major axis along there. So, instead of pedestrians coming out of Building F and coming down the row of compact parking spaces, there should be a walkway along there in order to eliminate the pedestrian trying to cross in front of the loading zone and reduce pedestrians coming in off of Stargell Avenue. Regarding the Bicycle Circulation section, he was pleased to see bicycles going through the center or main street of the project, but he would like to get a bike lane to the front of the Target or Building A. He suggested a condition to the bike-parking plan, which would state that secure and well-lit bike parking, shall be required within visual proximity to the entrance of all buildings. Furthermore, he suggested that deliveries to the loading zone in Building A be limited for to non-store hours.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that the building has the potential to be divided into three different spaces and the loading zone illustrated would cross the pedestrian pathway.

Mr. Thomas stated that staff and design team looked at the loading zone conflict and some debated whether to remove the crosswalks altogether. However, Alameda South Shore Center's loading does occur off hours and Board member Burton's suggestion of

moving the sidewalk over helps eliminate the issue. So, the Board should condition staff to continue working on that issue.

Board member Burton stated that he would like the building images in the staff report to be more progressive. He also discouraged including a large entry element at the entrance of the Target store, which was discussed at last meeting by the design team.

Board member Henneberry stated that Article 14 of the City Charter remands the improvement and beautification of the City to the Planning Board and that is something the Board should keep in mind. He believes they failed to discuss the store's scale and the grocery aspect, which he believes will impact Alameda grocers. He would support a motion for Target to operate under conditional use, which they can sell 0 percent groceries with the exception of pharmaceutical products.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to page 11 of 15 under the Building Design section and she is happy that the builders are attempting some type of LEED status. She asked the team whether they talked about incorporating photovoltaic materials in the building. She also referred to page 11 of 15, the Parking Design section to which she needed clarification about the rideshare spaces.

Mr. Thomas said the rideshare spaces are designated for carpool or vanpool parking.

President Ezzy Ashcraft acknowledged the project's overall economic benefits to the City and called Board member Henneberry to phrase the motion.

Board member Henneberry called a motion for the new Target store to operate under conditional use where they can sell zero percent of nontaxable goods with the exception of pharmaceutical products.

President Ezzy Ashcraft explained the motion failed for lack of a second.

Board member Kohlstrand recommended creating a condition to require Target to sell either less than 10% non-taxable goods or up to 10% of nontaxable goods per the store's total square footage. She asked Mr. Thomas to see if that was feasible.

Margo Bradish, Partner of Cox, Castle and Nicholson LLP and Council to Catellus, explained that the Alameda Landing Development Agreement states that anything you cannot do by ordinance you cannot do by condition. Thus, the Board could not restrict Target from selling 10% of nontaxable goods.

Mr. Dewes replied that Target was under 10% of nontaxable goods and the company came into the City because they knew they would have the retail flexibility under the City's ordinance. However, he would be willing to make a concession to cap the sale of nontaxable goods to 10% for up to 5 years.

President Ezzy Ashcraft questioned whether Target store would consider increasing the amount of nontaxable goods after the 5-year cap.

Mr. Dewes replied that a fair compromise would be to have a cap of up to 3 to 5 years because after 5 years the market and state regulations may have changed, and that compromises Target's retail flexibility.

Mr. Thomas replied to Board member Kohlstrand's question about the Board's ability to condition the project. The current City/Catellus agreement says that the City doesn't want a grocery store on this site, so the condition could be imposed.

Board member Zuppan raised a need to include a condition regarding lighting on the site plan to protect wildlife at night.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked Mr. Thomas to list the conditions.

Mr. Thomas reported on the resolution of approval, which contains 78 conditions on attachment 3. Based on the Board's comments, the following conditions were added: (1) add bike racks to Buildings G and H, including Board member Burton comment about visible bicycle facilities near the buildings' entrances; (2) widen the pedestrian path that leads from building G to Building K; (3) relook at the sidewalk crossings with the loading dock as part of the design review for Building A and review Board member Burton's suggestion to improve the sidewalk from Building A to F; (4) relook at the design review for Building K to see if there are options for redesigning the parking options along 5th Street and increase the aesthetics; (5) review the lighting plan and amend the language with Board member Zuppan's comments; (6) amend the typos in the staff report's illustrations.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked Mr. Dewes what would happen after Target's nontaxable goods cap expired.

Mr. Dewes replied that Target could do as they initially were proposing to do since they made a concession to cap the nontaxable goods for 5 years

Board member Henneberry stated that Target would be willing to operate under the 10% cap for up to 5 years and after that it would be business as usual. He asked if other cities cap Target's nontaxable good sales.

Mr. Dewes replied there are stores where nontaxable good sales are limited.

Board member Kohlstrand made a motion to adopt the resolution with the six amendments provided by Mr. Thomas and included the condition to cap Target's nontaxable sales floor area at 10% for up to 5 years.

Board member Henneberry seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 5-1. (Board member Henneberry opposed)

**9-C. Recommend Approval to the City Council to Remove One Three-Inch Diameter Liquidambar and Replace with One 15-gallon Japanese Maple in Conjunction with the Dublin Sewer Pump Station Backup Generator Installation Project, No. P.W. 04-10-10.**

The presentation of the staff report was not needed and the Board moved to vote on the item.

Vice-President Autorino made a motion to approve the removal of the one three-inch diameter Liquidambar and replace the item with one 15-gallon Japanese Maple in conjunction with the Dublin Sewer Pump Station Backup Generator Installation Project.

Board member Henneberry seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 6-0.

**9-D. Approval to Add Three Tree Species, from the Master Street Tree Plan's Tree List, to the Planting Palette for the Park Street Corridor North of Clinton Avenue.**

President Ezzy Ashcraft reported on the three tree species, October Glory Maple, Silver Linden, and Brisbane Box, would be added to the list.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for public comment.

Ms. Gottstein asked if the trees' removal was placed on the general agenda rather than the consent calendar because they had to be.

Mr. Spangler stated that it is ironic that the City is proposing the removal of two more trees that met the City's old guidelines after they clear cut a number of trees that made the public upset. He believes this entire project was not publically in a timely fashion prior to its most recent approval phase and it shouldn't have gone out without this review.

Matt Naclerio Alameda Public Works Director explained that the Gingko and Crape Myrtle trees were kept because they were consistent with the tree landscape. However, the new landscape architecture proposal does not include the planted trees. Although the trees could be replanted somewhere else, they may not survive.

Vice-President Autorino asked if the removal of the trees is worth the potential bad press from the result of the removal.

Mr. Naclerio stated that staff has worked with the City Manager's office and they are supportive of the tree removal. The included the potential public backlashes from the project in the staff report. So, they will speak to the public or the public can inquire about the removal.

Board member Kohlstrand stated that the item's title doesn't bring up anything about

trees being removed and there seems to be some inconsistency.

Mr. Naclerio replied that any trees on City property or private property must come to the Planning Board. So, as a plan of caution, staff brought item 9c to the Board.

Board member Kohlstrand agreed to all Board member Autorino's comments and felt the removal should be brought up in the agenda.

President Ezzy Ashcraft agreed.

Board member Zuppan supported the selection of the new trees, but she believes the City has spent enough money on removing trees.

Board member Zuppan made a motion to pass the resolution without removing the existing trees.

Board member Burton seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 5-1.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

12. ADJOURNMENT: 10:50 PM