

**Minutes of the Special Planning Board Meeting
Monday, May 29, 2007**

1. CONVENE: 7:08 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Mariani
3. ROLL CALL: Acting President Cook, Cunningham, Ezzy Ashcraft, Kohlstrand, Mariani and McNamara.

President Lynch was absent from roll call.

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

4. MINUTES:
 - a. Minutes for the Special meeting of April 18, 2007.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that on page 8, paragraph 2, the discussion about regarding traffic levels at Island Drive and Doolittle, read, "...which often backed up at Lincoln School so that traffic could not pass through the intersection." She would like it to state that "the traffic at Island Drive and Doolittle backs up as a result of people trying to get off of Harbor Bay going to Lincoln School and the high school, but it did not back up at Lincoln at that point."

Board member Kohlstrand noted that page 9, paragraph 2, should be changed to read, "~~Member Ezzy Ashcraft~~ ~~Member Kohlstrand~~ understood that the private high school is not such a viable option, and inquired whether it was still in the running."

Member Ezzy Ashcraft moved approval of the minutes as amended.

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Lynch). The motion passed.

- b. Minutes for the meeting of May 14, 2007.

Board member Kohlstrand moved approval of the minutes as presented.

Board member McNamara seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Lynch). The motion passed.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION: None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

a. Future Agendas

Mr. Thomas provided an update on future agenda items.

b. Zoning Administrator Report

Mr. Thomas provided an update on Zoning Administrator actions.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION: None.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR: None.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A. **DP07-0002 & DR07-0044 Development Plan and Design Review - Applicant: Catellus Development Corporation – Alameda Landing Mixed Use Development Project.** The applicant requests Development Plan approval for a Site-Wide Master Landscape Development Plan and a Waterfront Promenade Plan, and Development Plan and Design Review approval for the Clif Bar & Co. Headquarters commercial project, parking shed, off-street parking, landscaping, and associated improvements on an approximately 8.69 acre site. The site is located along the northern end of the former FISC Site (Tract 7884) within the M-X Mixed Use Planned Development Zoning District. (AT/DV)

Mr. Thomas summarized the staff report. Staff recommended approval of the items being considered: the Site-Wide Master Landscape Development Plan Amendment, the Waterfront Promenade Plan, and the Development Plan and Design Review. He thanked David Tierman of Catellus for bringing an excellent team of designers and consultants to this project.

Acting President Cook disclosed that she had met with Mr. Tierman and several other consultants on-site the previous week in order to walk around with the plans.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft disclosed that she visited the site, and noted that she was very pleased to see this area of the waterfront that she had never seen before.

Board member Kohlstrand disclosed that she visited the site, and found the on-site examination of the plans to be very helpful.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. David Tierman, Vice President, Catellus Development Group, introduced the development team.

Mr. Mike Engelhart, Development Project Management Team, Catellus Development Group, noted that their focus in attaining a sustainable design was adaptive reuse of the existing facility.

Mr. Bruce Lymburn, Wendel Rosen Black & Dean, project manager, detailed the history and corporate culture of Clif Bar. He noted that Clif Bar demonstrated a commitment to sustainability in their brands, business, people, the community and the planet, as well as ethical business practices.

Mr. Rene Behan, SWA, provided an overview of the Landscape Master Plan and displayed a detailed PowerPoint presentation of the Master Plan.

Ms. Martina Goodman, SMWM Architects, described and displayed the adaptive reuse of parking behind the Clif Bar building.

Ms. Kathy Berg, project architect, Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca Architects, described and displayed the design and site plan for the Clif Bar headquarters facility. She detailed how the project would support Clif Bar's commitment to both the financial and community bottom lines.

Acting President Cook called for a five-minute recess.

Mr. Bruce Reeves, 2527 Santa Clara Avenue, noted that he supported the arrival of Clif Bar to Alameda, and that it would be a benefit to the community.

Mr. Gail Wetzork, 3452 Capella Lane, spoke in support of this project, and noted that he had been involved with it since its inception. He supported the use of as much existing property and material as possible, and looked forward to seeing the Northern Waterfront open up.

Ms. Melody Marr, 1416 Park Avenue, noted that the President of the Alameda Chamber of Commerce could not attend, and noted that the officers and directors supported this project. She complimented Catellus for all the work and community outreach they had performed, and added that they performed their due diligence and used the suggestions they had received. The Chamber was very pleased with what they had seen over the past year, and supported parking sheds.

Mr. Dick Lyons, 18 Shannon Circle, spoke in support of this project as a resident and as a past president of the Alameda Chamber of Commerce.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Acting President Cook suggested addressing the landscape plan first.

Board member Mariani noted that she was very pleased with the plan.

Board member Cunningham believed this was the most exciting project he had seen during this tenure on the Planning Board, and complimented the excellent work performed by the team. He inquired whether vehicle access would be available down to the waterfront for people carrying kayaks and similar watercraft down to the waterfront.

Mr. Behan believed there would be access to the waterfront, and that a gateway entry would be necessary to gain access to the floating dock. The structural studies would determine whether vehicle access would be possible.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham whether any consideration had been given to the screening of the recreation zone at the turning basin area, Mr. Behan replied that was the most picturesque piece of the waterfront and noted that it was a balancing act. He noted that there were not many opportunities to screen it because it was fully open to the waterfront.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham regarding other amenities, Mr. Engelhart replied that the Master Plan contained a requirement that public access to restrooms be available in the facilities. He noted that an office building was also planned, with the possibility of a restaurant in the last office building. He described the overall vision of the office building, which would anchor the project and capture the views to the waterfront.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Master Plan limited this project to 400,000 square feet of office.

Mr. Behan noted that the Clif Bar building will highlight sustainable features, identifying design elements through graphics that talk about how the bioswales filter water and treat storm drain runoff. They have been working in conjunction with Alameda Power & Telecom regarding the project design in order to maximize the impact of renewable energy sources, produced on-site as well as produced by AP&T. They have discussed putting a kiosk on the waterfront to exhibit different sources of energy coming to the project both on-site and from the renewable energy sources from AP&T. He noted that the entire project was designed to be a discovery center, both in the buildings and the site development for sustainable development.

Board member McNamara inquired about the children's water garden identified on the village green. Mr. Engelhart noted that it was intended to be an interactive water piece, possibly with environmental graphics, that would also be fun for children to play with on a warm day. He noted that it would be specifically scaled for children.

Board member McNamara expressed concern about filtering requirements for chlorine, which could become very involved and possibly cost-prohibitive. She suggested a different kind of educational water element.

Mr. Behan noted that the new health standards require that the pieces be treated not as a fountain, but as a pool, and brought up to pool standards.

In response to an inquiry by Board member McNamara, Mr. Thomas noted that the comparison of the green space to a soccer field was to illustrate its comparative size. He added that it was not designed to be a formal recreational soccer field. He noted that it would be an informal space for gathering, kite flying, and events, and that the western end of the promenade would have more programmed facilities and spaces.

Board member Kohlstrand believed this project was like a dream come true for the City of Alameda, and she believed that overall, Catellus has put considerable effort into this project. She wished to discuss the street lighting on the waterfront, which was to have several different fixtures with higher standards to attain better coverage. She requested a discussion of the pedestrian-level scale standard as well, and inquired whether a lower fixture could be added.

Mr. Engelhart noted that a single-pole/multiheaded fixture was shown as being approximately 35 feet high, which came with multiple heads that could be oriented in a number of different ways. He noted that a lower level light could easily be used, and he noted that the elevation was extremely flat, and they intended to get an emphasis at the end of the tree rows so that there was a hierarchy to the lights themselves.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Kohlstrand regarding public art, Mr. Thomas noted that would be addressed at another time. He noted that the development agreement establishes that the project actually has two public art requirements, \$150,000 each. He noted that the Public Art Commission reviewed those proposals, and the first piece would be included as part of the first phase of the development. He noted that staff could brief the Planning Board as the pieces came forward.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that in San Francisco, the public art was well-integrated into the facilities and the public infrastructure.

Board member Kohlstrand wished to ensure that if the landscape plan was adopted, that the Planning Board did not preclude the discussions about better development of the street system, particularly in the retail area as well as the warehouse area. She noted that they had discussed a strong sense of a public space going between the warehouses, parking sheds and the actual buildings and would like a little more conventional treatment of the retail area.

With respect to the public feel, Mr. Thomas noted that the east-west public access was a unique situation, as well as all the parking surrounding the sheds. Staff concluded that the team's design was a unique place in Alameda and elsewhere.

Board member Kohlstrand believed the idea of 90-degree parking made the most sense.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she loved the project and complimented Catellus and Clif Bar for their hard work and inspiration. She was pleased to read that Clif Bar was helping businesses adopt green practices, as well as StopWaste.org. She was concerned about the project's contribution to Bay-friendly landscaping. Mr. Behan replied that it was a balance between creating a landscape that was functional and sustainable. He added that it was not a suburban lawn that used a lot of resources. The soil and polymer palette would help retain the soil and prevent runoff; the landscaping was also designed to be drought-tolerant. The plant palette on the Master Plan was native and drought-tolerant. He described the irrigation system, and noted that the infrastructure would accept the reclaimed water system. He noted that products would be used that would have minimum impact on the Bay.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft regarding the Field of Dreams playground, Mr. Thomas replied that it would return to the Board with the design review of the final phase of the Promenade.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that because the Field of Dreams would be a very positive addition to the City's children, that any playground also be universally accessible to accommodate differing physical abilities.

Acting President Cook noted that she was excited to see this project, which met the caliber of what she hoped to see in a waterfront development, and commended the developers. She noted that this site was being changed to become an environmentally sensitive project. She expressed some discomfort with the bioswale/cottonwood tree usage, as opposed to a more urban treatment.

Mr. Behan believed that the site's uniqueness was a strength, and brought up Crissy Field as an urban park. He noted that the circulation brought people out to the water, and that the wind rows and agricultural landscape was appropriate for the area. He noted that the site was restricted with respect to how much retail would be allowed. He believed the landscape responded to the existing structures.

Acting President Cook noted that how the landscape connected back to the residential arm of this project was of interest to her, and would like to see more of a visual connection straight through to the waterfront, as detailed on Drawing L1. She noted that the City had control over the water retention basin, and was concerned that the wind rows may impact that in the future.

Mr. Behan noted that that the greenway did not necessarily have to be a wind row, although they would like the linear orientation to connect to the waterfront. The property line was not orthogonal to the waterfront, but there was a clear and strong pedestrian connection at that point, which attempted to connect to the waterfront. As that is developed, they intended to further the clear and direct connection as much as possible.

Acting President Cook suggested using interpretive signage to help people make their way onto the site, and to make it clear that they have a right to be there. She would like to discuss that issue with City Council going forward.

Board member Cunningham believed that BCDC would be strong advocates for that program.

Mr. Engelhart noted that they submitted that plan to BCDC and applied their comments to this plan. They also planned to make a connection of the Bay Trail along the waterfront, and that the bike path would be signaled and striped.

Mr. Thomas noted that Condition 3 of the Clif Bar resolution stated that all signs would be reviewed and approved by the City, which was a standard condition. In this case, the signage would be very important so that people understood that this was a public area. He noted that easements will be in place, and the public parking will be shared, and the signage will be appropriate and will emphasize that.

Acting President Cook wanted to ensure that the interpretive signage would not only describe the site but also the company, while being respectful of the private nature of the company. She also believed the interactive fountains would be very welcoming and exciting, and loved that addition.

She echoed Board member Cunningham's concern about wind screening by the baseball field so that it would be comfortable.

Acting President Cook believed there should be public restrooms separate from those in the building. Mr. Thomas replied that staff would return on June 25 with the first piece of details for the promenade, and that would be a good opportunity to discuss bathroom facilities.

Mr. Behan noted that this was an extraordinary project for BCDC, and that they were very favorable toward it.

Board member Mariani noted that she had some concern about the simplicity of this design being loaded down with interpretative signage and educational features; she did not want it to be overplanned. She acknowledged the baseball field would be windy, and did not want people to be overwhelmed to the point of not being able to discover what was intended to be a simple project.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft recalled some national parks in Hawaii that had self-guided tours with signs that educated but did not mar the natural beauty of the site. She believed that the signs would be educational and creative in that manner.

Mr. Thomas noted that an overall sign program was required of the project in the Master Plan, and he recommended that the Planning Board include a condition that the required sign program include the plans for interpretive signage and wayfinding, as well as a requirement that it be brought back to the Planning Board prior to occupancy of the Clif Bar project.

Board member Kohlstrand moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. 07-17 to approve the Landscape Master Plan Amendment as proposed, with the condition that the retail landscape plan may vary from the Master Landscape Plan.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Lynch). The motion passed.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she felt favorably about the entire concept, and noted that when she visited the site, she felt the view was very accessible. She expressed concern about the guardrail for the promenade, and did not want children to climb on the railings. She noted that her husband had taken photos of the guardrail at the Embarcadero in San Francisco, which had vertical rather than horizontal rungs; the design work at the top was attractive but was not something a child could get a foot into. She noted that the view should be maximized with an eye towards safety. She inquired whether there would

be intervals of ladders to climb if someone got to the wrong side of the railing, or fell in. She noted that there were flotation devices at the Embarcadero.

Mr. Behan did not have information on the life safety issue, and noted that there were two options for the guardrail. He noted that it was not uncommon to see the horizontal rail, and that a nonclimbable mesh could also be used. They would like to stay away from the Victorian-era rails, which became ornamental and would be out of character and nontransparent.

Mr. Thomas suggested that those elements be brought back with the Phase I design review for the promenade.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Kohlstrand, Mr. Behan described and displayed the access to the floating docks.

A discussion of the floating dock ensued.

Board member Mariani noted that she was extremely pleased with the plan, and she looked forward to seeing more details at the next hearing.

Acting President Cook noted that she was very happy with the simplicity of the plan, and would like the applicant to keep the notion of guest docks on mind so people could sail to a destination to access restaurants.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. 07-18 to approve the Waterfront Promenade Development Plan.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Lynch). The motion passed.

Regarding the Clif Bar design review proposal, Board member Mariani did not like the parking sign because it did not blend with the aesthetics of the restored warehouse. She inquired whether the Clif Bar doors would be red in the final design.

Ms. Goodman noted that the area was vast, and a great deal of signage would be required to direct people into the parking garage. They believed that the large sign would be the easiest way to accomplish that, and she added that the orange door may end up being white in the final design.

Board member Cunningham noted that he liked the supergraphics associated with the garage, and may support making them bigger. He suggested the wording on the sign just say “Parking” rather than “Parking Garage.” He inquired whether there was any consideration of harvesting gray water from the very large roof. Ms. Goodman noted that they had not explored that option, but that solar panels would be explored.

Mr. Engelhart noted that they would not want to harvest more water than they could use, but they would find the amount of water to balance the system.

Board member Cunningham liked the idea of the beacons coming through the doors. He requested more information on activating the waterfront with respect to the light wells, and would like to see a way to blur the line of the north façade of the building relative to the waterfront promenade.

Ms. Berg noted that there would be openings in the front that would bring people directly into the building, and that will provide the indoor/outdoor connection. They were looking at a way to incorporate planters and seating areas up towards the face of the building, so that Clif Bar can spill out, and the public can come up towards the edge of the building and sit there. She noted that one of the gardens moved out towards the edge, and that it will also be used for stretching and aerobics, as well as some gathering near the wellness facility. She noted that the spine at the water's edge was the circulation path and there will be seating areas near the edge of the glass.

In response to an inquiry by Board member McNamara, Ms. Berg confirmed that the water tower would be approximately 27 feet tall, and it would be about 25-27 feet above grade.

Board member McNamara understood the functionality of the water tower, and inquired whether there was any way to design it with additional screening. Ms. Berg believed the water tower was within the character of the maritime environment. She added that there were different options for materials and shaping that would enable it to fit in very well, and that it would serve as an iconic element.

Mr. Engelhart noted that they would probably bring a precast concrete system into the site.

Board member Cunningham noted that because of concrete's fluid nature, it could be used in a very creative manner.

Board member McNamara inquired where the accessible ramp was designed to go. Ms. Berg replied that there was a 2% slope from the center of the Clif Bar building, within the building, and that the inside of the building must be flattened to accommodate furniture systems. She noted that one of the ramps would be used to address the grade transition between the north-south elevations and the entries on the east and west.

Regarding the red doors, Board member Kohlstrand believed it was important for people coming through the parking garage and the central spine know where the main entrance to Clif Bar was. She did not believe people should have to walk around trying to find the main entrance.

Board member Kohlstrand expressed concern about the wind turbines on the roof.

Acting President Cook did not believe the wind turbine issue should be decided at this time because it was a major issue.

Mr. Thomas understood that Clif Bar and Catellus were still working out the details on the wind turbine system, and noted that the Planning Board could condition this item so the turbines come back for approval with more details and information.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she liked the graphics on the parking shed, as well as the red door. She inquired whether there would be bike racks in the parking garage; Ms. Goodman confirmed that there would be bike racks, and that they had not been drawn in yet. Board member Ezzy Ashcraft wanted to ensure that energy would come from clean resources.

Ms. Berg noted that they had extensive conversations about telling the stories of how various projects, such as the wind turbines, contribute to green power. She noted that this could be done through interpretive signage, or simply through the observation of the feature itself.

Acting President Cook wanted to ensure there would be sufficient parking not only for the employees, but also for any members of the public who would visit the site. Mr. Thomas confirmed there would be sufficient parking, and added that they had made an effort to put in much more parking than Clif Bar needed, even when it expanded.

Acting President Cook wanted to ensure the parking in the shed was well-lit, and that it would feel safe. Ms. Goodman replied that they intended to light it well, as well as install CCTV cameras. She noted that the parking garage will be open 24 hours a day.

Mr. Engelhart noted that using the shared parking concept, the restaurants would use the parking as well during non-office hours. Acting President Cook emphasized that security would be a priority in the garage.

In response to an inquiry by Acting President Cook, Mr. Engelhart noted that the Master Plan included a provision that there will always be a waterfront restaurant use on-site, although the restaurant use was not controlled by the development; it was a tenant request.

Mr. Thomas noted that the design review for the waterfront plaza, the design review and development plan for the waterfront retail, as well as the configuration of the design.

In response to an inquiry by Acting President Cook regarding the difference in language between the staff report and the resolution, Ms. Mooney noted that the Planning Board should focus on the language in the resolution and the findings. She added that there were some findings listed in the staff report that did not appear in the resolution, and that the Board did not have to address.

Board member Mariani moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-16 to approve the Waterfront Promenade Development Plan.

1. Finding 8 (comprehensive coordinated information and directional signage) should be modified to read, "The development will provide a comprehensive, controlled and coordinated system of informational and directional graphic signage throughout the development" because a sign program is required of this project, and will be subject to review and approval by the Planning Board.
2. Condition 7 on page 4 of the resolution should be modified to read, "*Prior to certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall submit a comprehensive sign program for the Alameda Landing project for Planning Board review. Assigned programs shall provide a comprehensive and coordinated and controlled system of informational and directional graphic signage throughout the development; include descriptions of wayfinding, public access, graphic signage and tenant signage for the project.*" The following language shall be stricken from the Condition: "The City shall review and approve all building, parking lot and internal circulation signage for the project."
3. Prior to issuance of building permits for the wind turbines, the design review should return to the Planning Board for review and approval (new Condition 12).

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Lynch). The motion passed.

9-B. **Design Review DR06-0104 - Applicant: Community Improvement Commission and Alameda Entertainment Associates, 1416 Oak Street and 2305 Central Avenue.** Consideration of a landscaping, signage and exterior lighting plan for the cineplex and parking garage and a queuing plan for the Alameda Theater Complex. The review of the landscaping, signage and exterior lighting plans by the Planning Board are requirements of Design Reviews DR05-0041 and DR05-0028. The site is located within a C-C-T, Community Commercial - Theater Combining Zoning District. (CE/JO)

Ms. Jennifer Ott, Redevelopment Manager, Development Services Department, summarized the staff report for this project.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Christopher Buckley, 1017 San Antonio Avenue, submitted a letter to the Planning Board encouraging the continuance of the sycamores along Central Avenue within the Park Street Business District. He believed they would enhance the streetscape, and gave the street a distinct identity. He did not believe having different street trees for different projects would be beneficial to the continuity of the streetscape. He noted that the arborist's report stated that the infrastructure impacts for sycamores were low with respect to damage. He did not believe the impact of sycamores on signage would not be an issue because they had relatively transparent canopies, reached higher, and would provide clearance for storefront signage. He believed the choice of a chanticleer pear would be good for Oak Street. He recommended 4X4 foot cutouts, and that tree guards should be used for the streetscape planning to protect the trees from vandals. He would like to see sidewalk treatments along the frontage of the theatre, and believed the historic frontage of the theatre should be unobstructed.

Mr. Kyle Conner, applicant, noted that his studies indicated that the sycamores stopped at the high school, and that there were no particular trees that stood out at Park Street. He was concerned about the size of sycamores, and that it would be difficult to control the growth of those trees. They had proposed the pear trees because they were more vertical. He believed they would be a more appropriate tree for Central Avenue.

Mr. Buckley displayed a photograph of sycamores on a narrow sidewalk, and noted that they could be adapted for narrow sidewalks.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to extend the meeting to 11:20 p.m.

Board member Kohlstrand seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Lynch). The motion passed.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft favored the staff choice of chanticleer pear, and believed they would add variety, color and would define the project well. She believed that Oak

Street sorely needed some trees, and she was happy to see these trees being added. She inquired about the tree grates and tree guards.

Ms. Ott noted that the tree grates were kept to 3x3 feet on the 10-foot sidewalk, and was concerned about narrowing that space further so that sidewalk seating and potential queuing outside for a blockbuster movie may be accommodated. She believed the omission of tree guards was an oversight, and noted that they would be included.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft echoed a concern raised by a landscape architect friend that the trees on Park Street would be tied down and bound, which may reduce their strength and growth. Ms. Ott noted that staff would be amenable to investigating that issue.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft supported staggering the showtimes to mitigate queuing, and inquired about the intermission length to support exit of the audience. Mr. Conner replied that referred to the time period between movies, rather than intermission in the middle of the movie.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired about queuing for blockbuster customers inside the theatre during inclement weather, and asked whether the Art Deco railing would be of sufficient height to accommodate those customers. Ms. Ott noted that the railing was subject to the California Historic Building Code, and would not be altered as such; it was approved as part of the building permit.

Mr. Conner noted that would concern him as well, and that he could use ropes and stanchions to keep people away from the historic railing.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Kohlstrand whether reversing the queuing line and purchase line might provide better flow and less crowding, Mr. Conner replied that may create more traffic with people crossing the ticket holders line to purchase the tickets, and then return to the ticket holders line. Board member Kohlstrand noted that it may keep the crowd in front of their facility. Mr. Conner noted that their policies were geared to not have ticket holder lines that queue for very long, as opposed to what is found at Jack London Square.

Board member Kohlstrand expressed concern about some of the standards for the Downtown Vision Plan not being applied to this project. She had further concerns about trees having too wide of a canopy over a commercial area without a setback for the building. Mr. Conner agreed with that concern.

Mr. Thomas acknowledged that the Tree Master Plan needed to be updated. He noted that the Planning staff who were landscape architects felt this was an appropriate recommendation.

Acting President Cook suggested having the Tree Master Plan updated. Mr. Thomas noted that the City Council had put that on their “to do” list as a result of some issues that occurred at South Shore.

Board member McNamara expressed her ongoing concern about the line queuing issues about accommodation for blockbuster movies, and inquired how overnight queuing could be monitored and prevented.

Board member McNamara noted that the diagram showed a queue going down the adjacent alleyway, which she felt was a dark and inhospitable environment for their customers. Mr. Conner noted that the alley was not his first choice, and he would support not using the alleyway at all.

Board member McNamara would not support using the area in front of the taqueria because they were not a tenant of the applicant's building, and she did not feel it would be fair to the taqueria's owners and customers.

Board member Cunningham noted Mr. Buckley's comments about the framework and continuation of a theme with respect to the street trees. He believed that there was a precedent in not continuing the sycamores down the street, and added that it was important to have the understanding of a framework of design that continued through the street. He inquired about the driver of the spacing of the trees, and suggested adding one more tree to get the feeling of a green line that he would like to maintain.

Mr. Conner noted that the driver for the tree space was the utilities, and added that there was a culvert at the west end that they were trying to work around. He noted that there was a very large grease interceptor from the restaurant, as well as a number of utilities vaults that must be avoided by the trees and their roots.

Acting President Cook believed the lighting design was much more Art Deco and supported the architectural details very well. She noted that she was swayed by Mr. Buckley's letter until she drove down Central Avenue. She was concerned that the amount of pruning that would make the sycamores work would detract from the natural form of that tree. She believed the canopy could be more defined, and suggested adding more trees or choose a similar tree to fill in the tree scheme.

Mr. Conner noted that the pear tree did have a canopy, which would spread to 20 to 25 feet. He noted that they were easier to control than a sycamore. He did not oppose fitting in another tree, and would be amenable to studying that possibility.

Board member McNamara suggested that because the signage and exterior lighting plans were not an issue, that the landscaping and queuing issues be revisited.

Acting President Cook suggested adding a condition stating that queuing in the alley be not recommended, and that the queuing be switched if the lines got too long; also, the addition of one more tree should be studied.

Board member Cunningham moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution Nos. 07-19 and 07-20 to approve a landscaping, signage and exterior lighting plan for the cineplex and

parking garage and a queuing plan for the Alameda Theater Complex. The review of the landscaping, signage and exterior lighting plans by the Planning Board are requirements of Design Reviews DR05-0041 and DR05-0028. The following modifications will be added:

1. Queuing in the alley will not be recommended as part of the queuing plan; if the lines become too long, the queuing direction will be reversed;
2. The addition of one more tree will be studied by staff.

Acting President Cook seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 5. Absent: 2 (Lynch, Mariani). The motion passed.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

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

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

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

Board member Kohlstrand advised there was nothing new to report.

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

Board member Cunningham noted that the previous meeting had been cancelled, and the next meeting would be held in mid-June.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary
City Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the June 25, 2007, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.