

# APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD  
MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2012  
7: 00 p.m.

City Hall Council Chambers  
2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Third Floor  
(Corner of Santa Clara Avenue and Oak Street)  
ALAMEDA, CA

**Doors will open at 6:45 p.m.**

1. CONVENE: 7:07 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Köster
3. ROLL CALL: Present: President Zuppan, Vice-President Burton, Board members Ezzy Ashcraft, Knox White, and Köster. Board member Henneberry (arrived at 7:20 pm)
4. MINUTES

Minutes from the Regular meeting of March 12, 2012

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft motions to approve March 12, 2012 minutes as amended  
Board member Knox White seconds motion. Motion carries 5-0, no abstentions

## 5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

NONE

## 6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

### **6.A. Future Agendas**

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, reviewed future agendas.

Board member Knox White stated that several park projects have made significant changes that didn't have any of the bicycle and other infrastructure that private projects are required to have. Asked if the Zoning Administrator is forwarding projects to Public Works to confirm projects meet all required City codes.

Mr. Thomas responded that staff has been in contact with Public Works regarding this particular project. Stated that all projects whether reviewed by the Zoning Administrator or Planning Board are supposed to have a full review by every department. Clarified that the only distinction between the Planning Board and the Zoning Administrator is the Zoning Administrator reviews items that are deemed small and non-controversial. Staff will have Public Works review the plan and the bicycle provisions. This will be a design review and use permit

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft stated that there have been projects where there weren't as many bicycle parking facilities as the bike community wanted until the project was reviewed a second time. Asked if Gail Payne, Bicycle Transportation Specialist, has seen the plan

Board member Knox White asked if the HAB is notified when staff approves a demolition so HAB has an opportunity to call projects for review if there is a concern; asked what the distinctions between staff level HAB decisions and Board level decisions. Asked if there it is possible to send these design review approvals to HAB for review prior to the project date of April 26

Mr. Thomas stated that the HAB is not currently informed; staff should report to the Historical Advisory Board; affirmed that there is time to forward design review to HAB for review. Unless packaged with design review application, these should be reported to the HAB.

#### Oral Communication

Karen Bey, requested that a few items be added to the agenda: the Economic Development Commission (EDC) is scheduled to review the Developers Retail Strategy on May 17, which is an important part of the Planning Board process in terms of approving and designing. Stated that there was no site map attached to the large lot Master Map on the Master Use Permit and it is difficult to know how the area will be used, i.e. retail. If retail is included would like to see how the project fits in with the Retail Strategy. Requested that the Large Format Retail Ordinance Section 30-21.36 be amended to include how the City determines a large format and that design guidelines be included. Requested that community have more time for input and perhaps host a work session prior to the Planning Board review of Phase 2, the fifth street portion of the projects; feels that the Target design was rushed and would like to see preliminary designs in the future .

President Zuppan responded that the Sunshine Ordinance allows for over a week of review for packets and projects.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft stated that members of the community are welcome to email, call, or stop by to speak with staff to provide input and comment on projects. .

#### **6.B. Alameda Landing – Status Report on Target Store Building Design Improvements**

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired about the location of the additional doors and what the doors were for. She inquired if more brick can be added to the front building panel next to the pharmacy as well as additional brick on the west side; inquired if additional green screens can be added to the west side.

Board member Köster inquired about skylights and stated if brick is added to the west elevation it should be added to the north side so the west and north side match.

Tom Dulik, Target Design Architect, explained placement of doors and windows, clarified which doors are employee access only, and pointed out the single customer entrance; affirmed the possibility of adding more brick to the building.

#### **Public Comments:**

Karen Bey, requested that more windows be added to the design. It is a large building and having more windows would lighten and brighten the building up. She inquired if the parking lot layout was already approved, stated that if the Board cuts the parking lot into smaller lots with trees, it will look more appealing, and not seem so large.

#### **Board Comments:**

Board member Knox White stated that pedestrians walk in such a way that they will be walking through a field of cars trying to back up despite the pedestrian pathways. The only way to fix a “sidewalk to nowhere” is to make it go somewhere; public art in a place where nobody needs to walk is not an actual fix. This particular issue highlights the need that all access to the buildings needs to be prioritized at the beginning of the process, prior to the approval of parking, guaranteeing that all connections to the front door are usable.

Vice President Burton stated he hoped to see more extensive changes to the design. The public art piece at the terminus is better than employee doors; likes the trellises which have been pulled away from the building and help break down the scale of the building. Suggested that the base element at the four foot level be reviewed, it cuts through middle of doors and windows, perhaps the eight foot level would work better. Design needs to be integrated more tightly, stated that the windows and doors don't have any relationship to the overall a massing elements of the building. The edge of the building could be softened by adding more green screens. He requested to see actual

building materials; want to see how the poured form concreted looks next to the painted textured concrete, an actual brick that will be used and actual paint chips, instead of copies of paint chips.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft concurred with the request to see building samples, She stated that this Target design is the only Target out of several in the area that has pedestrian pathways through the parking fields; giving pedestrians and cyclist more options to safely get to the entrance of the building.

Board member Henneberry thanked staff and developer for their work and look forward to seeing the changes

Board member Knox White stated that if the Board wants to see building materials before going forward with then the board needs to call the design for review tonight as opposed to allowing the plans to move forward and finding out that there are concerns later.

President Zuppan stated that there was concern that the building materials were not provided at the initial approval and that she thought the building materials would be presented with the status report. Want to make sure that the direction is in accordance with what the Board anticipated.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft, concurs with President Zuppan and stated that it looks like the color has changed.

Mr. Dulik gave the Board drawings with the actual colors that will be used. Stated that the color palette has not changed; agrees to provide physical samples of the building material, and states that Target is interested in working with Board, Staff, and Catellus on tying in the poured-form concrete.

Mr. Thomas responded that the building is a very large tilt-up concrete, and brick building, and unless the Board is suggesting that the building materials change to wood, the materials will not affect the approval of the foundation permit; will provide the Board with building material samples at the next meeting. Status report continued to next meeting.

**6.C. April 9, 2012 Resolution Denying Alcohol Sales at 1716 Webster Street (76 station).**

Mr. Thomas gave brief presentation and presented the revised resolution. Applicant has filed an appeal. The City Council will receive the revised resolution along with the appeal hearing request; which will mostl likely be scheduled for the June 5 City Council meeting.

Board member Ezzy Aschraft, stated that the Board received an email from a 7-eleven representative clarifying that the owner of the 7-eleven and the applicant were in discussion regarding the convenience store at the 76 Station, but were not in contract. 7-eleven has no plans to close the store on Buena Vista.

President Zuppan requested that staff invite a representative from the Police Department to the Appeal Hearing to speak about the impact additional alcohol sales would have in that area.

## 7.ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

## 8.CONSENT CALENDAR

None

## 9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

**9.A.** College of Alameda-555 Ralph Appezato Parkway-A Public Hearing to Consider a Use Permit for a Flea Market located on the campus of the College of Alameda weekly on Saturdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas gave a brief presentation.

Board member Henneberry stated that this it is not without precedence that venues of this nature are at that end of town. It is a good use and seems to be a good fit. He states his support of the Use Permit.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft asked how the Flea Market benefits the Community College, if the City collects sales tax revenue, if the Use Permit allowed for the sale of alcohol, and bathroom facilities are portable. She suggested that the Use Permit specify that it does not include the sale of alcohol.

Vice President Burton stated that the single use plastic bag ban only affects retailers of a certain size and wouldn't apply to vendors of this scale, He supports the restrictions on amplified noise, trash pick up, and a six month review of the permit. He inquired if any reports, good or bad, had been filed. Concurs with Board member conditions that resale license for vendors and prohibition of alcohol sales be included in the motion.

Lori Taylor, Community Development Director, stated that the City is collecting sales tax revenue; regular flea market vendors have to pay sales tax an exception to the rule is the

once a year vendor. An incidental benefit is that many people who attend these events will dine in Alameda and it puts the City on the map

Mr. Thomas stated that the college is being paid for the use of their property. Antiques by the Bay had a condition of approval on the resale license for each vendor. The permit does not entitle anyone to sell alcohol, and a clause can be added to the permit. Attendees have access to the college's permanent bathrooms. With the exception of the one neighbors email, no additional reports have been received. Originally the permit proposed an early start time in addition to a Saturday and Sunday use. Staff requested that the flea market operators move their event to Saturday only due to the traffic caused by Antiques by the Bay, and requested a later start time to accommodate for residential neighbors.

Board member Knox White asked for clarification on condition number 10 requiring a traffic contingency plan in the event of an emergency Tube closure. He asked if a second traffic study is required prior to the six month review.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft stated that the Abrams Plan indicates that the College will coordinate with WABA and Caltrans to develop a traffic control plan in the event of street or Tube closure.

Mr. Thomas clarified that at the six month review if the City finds that the Flea Market operators have not provided an adequate contingency plan then the City can request that certain actions stated in the staff report occur. The operators and Public Works are still working with the College to come up with a final traffic circulation plan for people trying to enter/exit the college during the event.

Board member Köster asked why the operators are using Parking lot A, which is closer to the residential area, than combining the use of parking lots B, C, and D; if there is space to park bicycles that are towing wagons; does the Abram's Report include traffic studies for the Target Store; and if the report does not include Target traffic study will one be done later and how do these conflict with each other.

Flea Market Operator responded that Parking lot A is one large asphalt space, with no puddles, it is also the lot with the best and safest access the other three lots only have one entrance/exit. Parking lots B, C, and D are separate lots with irregular surfaces that are muddy when it rains. Parking lot D is also used by parents who have children playing baseball or soccer, traffic and noise would be endless during the event if it was hosted in Parking Lot B, C, and D. Parking lot A is very quiet. Responded that they can accommodate bicycles with trailers/wagons, and thus far very few people traveling by bicycle have attended the event. .

Mr. Thomas responded that the traffic studies do not incorporate the opening of Target. Staff will continue to monitor the traffic.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft motions to approve the Use Permit to allow a Flea Market locating on the College of Alameda Campus with the amendments as discussed.

Vice President Burton seconds the motion; motion carries 6-0. No abstentions

**9.B. Review and Comment on Staff's Responses to the Regional Sustainable Communities Strategy – Jobs Housing Connection Scenario.**

Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas gave brief presentation

Board member Knox White stated that the City needs to state the goal of the letter and be more specific with what is being asked of the regional agencies. He disagrees with the letter's statement that the proposal will further increase Alameda's job-housing imbalance, the ratio of jobs to housing will get better by about 20%. Stated that there should be discussion on how the City is asking the region to prioritize the transportation projects. List seems to throw all the transportation projects the City wants is into a letter to the region. Stated he would like to see the City encourage MTC to put together an effective Climate Policy Initiative, which is what the SB 375 asks the City to do and their analysis shows that what they are proposing doesn't really get them closer to their goal. Wants City to encouraging MTC and the County to identifying best practices for reduce green house gas reduction, so they can work with cities to make sure we are all working towards that goal. Stated he would like to see the City argue for geographic equity in regional funding.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft, commended staff on a very good letter. Concerned about job creation and believes if more employment opportunities in addition to more housing then the City can help reduce the commute and therefore reduce the carbon foot print. Stated if there are unfunded mandates then there needs to be some sort of hold-harmless protection. Concurs with Board member Knox White to choose a few achievable goals to work towards

Board member Henneberry commended staff for their hard work.

President Zuppan stated she does not see credible evidence that the broad assumptions made by ABAG and MTC actually work. She would like to see better proof that this is not just incremental impact that would otherwise occur from the same type of growth governed in a different way. She would like to see MTC and ABAG provide factual information to support the requests that are being made.

Mr. Thomas will revise letter based on comments and resubmit to ABAG and MTC.

#### 10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

#### 11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board member Knox White stated that the Target status report was confusing and not clear on Board's purpose with this item. It seemed like a public hearing on the design. Not clear on how to give direction to staff on a status report when the direction is coming from one person not the entire body.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft stated that in the future design review should not be approved until it has met all the Board's standard. Suggested that staff review the pedestrian past at the shopping district on Bay Street in Emeryville, which may give guidance on pedestrian pathway protection. .

President Zuppan stated that the piecemeal approach is sometimes too isolated and the Board needs to have all the context in order to make decisions. Requests that guidelines for status report be drafted so the Board better understands of what the expectations are.

Vice President Burton concurs that bringing items to the Board earlier is the best solution so the Board has a chance to review and change as necessary. Developers and designers would want issues identified as early as possible to help keep projects on track.

Board member Köster asked if the Board will review the final site plan that was approved with conditions

Mr. Thomas affirmed that the Board will be presented with a final site plan review. Will take Board comments to staff for review to come up with the best approach to receive final approval but keep the project on task.

#### 12. ADJOURNMENT: 9:33 p.m.