

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting  
May 23, 2005 – 7:00 p.m.**

1. CONVENE: 7:03 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Vice President Cook
3. ROLL CALL: President Cunningham, Vice President Cook, Kohlstrand, Lynch, McNamara, and Piziali.

Board member Mariani was absent from roll call and arrived during Oral Communications.

Also present were Deputy City Attorney Julie Harryman, Supervising Planner Cynthia Eliason, Supervising Planner Andrew Thomas, Planner III Douglas Garrison, Planner III Allen Tai.

4. MINUTES: Minutes for the meeting of May 9, 2005.

Mr. Piziali advised that page 6, paragraph 1, should be changed to read, “Mr. Piziali suggested the use of dark anodized *aluminum glass*.”

Mr. Piziali advised that page 6, bullet 2, should be changed to read, “2. The aluminum storefront would have dark anodized *frames glazing*.”

Vice President Cook advised that on page 1, regarding the minutes for April 25, 2005, she did not believe she seconded the minutes, and indicated that she abstained.

Ms. Eliason advised that staff would confirm that item.

M/S Piziali/Cook to approve the minutes for the meeting of May 9, 2005, as amended.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 1 (Kohlstrand)

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

President Cunningham advised that staff had received a letter regarding Items 8-B and 8-C, and that while public comment would be taken, there would be no Board discussion or action on the item until staff had a chance to address the issues raised by the letter. Board discussion would be continued until the Planning Board meeting of June 13, 2005.

6. ORAL COMMUNICATION:

Ms. Barbara Nemer expressed concern about a sign to be erected at Donald Lum School on Otis Drive, and that the sign is to be over eight feet tall. She noted that it was larger than any other sign in Alameda schools, and expressed concern that it would be plastic and illuminated. She believed it would be a safety hazard because of its location at a crosswalk and a corner, and believed it would be hideous. She would like to see a wooden sign, illuminated by plant lights. She noted that this school was one of the nicest on the Island.

Mr. Piziali noted that this sign was not the purview of the Planning Board, and that the Board of Education would be the property entity to address. The Planning Board has no control over this sign.

Mr. Lynch advised that the designs, plans, building inspections and contracts for schools go through the school board of the local jurisdiction, including design review.

Ms. Diane Voss, 1815 Otis Drive, expressed concern about the Donald Lum School sign, which would cost over \$8,000, and the monthly cost would also be at taxpayer expense. She would consider a "No" vote on the taxpayer-funded school assistance if her money were to be spent this way.

Ms. Liz Cleves, 1815 Otis Drive, spoke in opposition to this sign, and expressed concern about safety at the corner and the crosswalk with respect to the proximity of the sign.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 7-A. **Use Permit, UP05-005; John Kienoski, John's Bargain Imports, 1770 Viking Street, Alameda, CA. (Alameda Point) (ATh).** The applicant requests a Use Permit modification to allow retail sales at an existing wholesale facility. The site is located in the M-2-G, General Industry/Manufacturing Zoning District/Government Combining District.

M/S Cook/McNamara and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-05-15 to approve a Use Permit modification to allow retail sales at an existing wholesale facility.

AYES – 7; NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

7-B. **Interim Use Permit UP05-0004: Alameda Point Collaborative/Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority, 2580/2700 Barbera Point Road Near Main Street at Singleton Avenue, Parcel 99, Alameda Point (ATh).** The applicant requests an Interim Use Permit to allow establishment of a 4-acre retail plant nursery. The site is located in the M-2-G General Industry/Manufacturing Zoning District/Government Combining District.

M/S Cook/McNamara and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-05-16 to approve an Interim Use Permit to allow establishment of a 4-acre retail plant nursery.

AYES – 7; NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

8. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 8-A. **Variance V05-0003.Major Design Review DR04-0109 – KDArchitects, Inc. for Kwan Li – 2411 Webb Avenue (AT).** Applicants request a Major Design Review and two Variances to construct a two-story residential/commercial mixed use building on a vacant parcel. The project proposes two ground floor retail spaces approximately 800-860 square feet in size and two residential units on the second floor with approximately 700-1,000 square feet of floor area for a total gross floor area of 3,383 square feet. The design of the building resembles a streamlined moderne appearance with a combination of stucco exterior siding and clear anodized aluminum trim. Access to parking located at the rear of the building is through a driveway located along the right side of the building under a portion of the second story. The project requires a total of twelve parking spaces, and the plans provide eight total spaces with residential parking in the form of stacked parking lifts. Two variances are requested for the deficiency of four parking spaces and a reduced landscaping separation between one parking space and the north and east property lines, where three feet is required. The site is located at 2411 Webb Avenue, within the Park Street C-C, Community Commercial Zoning District.

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

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Kohlstrand whether this site would qualify for the in lieu parking fee, Ms. Eliason confirmed that it would.

Ms. Kohlstrand liked the traditional, old-downtown look of Park Street, which provided a continuous street frontage. She expressed concern about providing required parking on-site, particularly when there was public parking available across the street at the Bank of America site. The possibility of stacked parking concerned her, and would rather see a Variance for six parking spaces.

President Cunningham inquired how much the stacking devices cost, and whether it would be better to put the money into the in lieu fund instead.

Mr. Piziali noted that he liked the stacking device at first, given the Board discussion of open space and tandem parking. He agreed with the idea of putting the money intended for the lifts into the in lieu fund instead, and to grant the applicant a Variance.

Mr. Lynch complimented the applicant on a beautiful architectural design and layout.

President Cunningham did not want the lifts to be used all over the City as an unintended consequence.

Ms. Kohlstrand noted that she would normally prefer continuous store frontage, but she would accept a driveway through the building. She agreed that the design was very nice, and was a positive mixed-use proposal.

Mr. Piziali noted that he would not object to stacked parking if it were inside a structure elsewhere in the City.

Mr. Lynch would be willing to entertain the Variance that reflects the withdrawal of the lift, and those funds being placed into the City in-lieu fund.

Ms. Harryman suggested that the Board give direction to staff as to what it would like to see, and continue the item to the next meeting so it may be placed on the Consent Calendar.

At Vice President Cook's request, Mr. Tai summarized the changes in the design.

President Cunningham suggested that taller landscaping be planted in the back, instead of the boxwood. She noted that several other buildings had a view to the back of the site.

Ms. McNamara expressed concern about the architectural design of this building that seemed to have been designed without regard for the adjacent building.

President Cunningham noted that the trashcans as illustrated were shown to be half the size of real trash cans, and suggested that the space under the stairs be used to house the trash containers.

Ms. Eliason summarized the Board's direction: a Variance for six spaces rather than providing the stacked units and payment of an in lieu. Four parking spaces would be for the residential units, and would be dedicated for residential use.

Mr. Tai noted that there may be required handicapped accessible spaces for the commercial spaces, and added that two spaces each may be for the residential units; the remaining two spaces may be devoted to handicapped accessible parking for the commercial use.

M/S Cook/Piziali and unanimous to continue this item to the Planning Board meeting of June 13, 2005.

AYES – 7; NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

8-B. **Zoning Text Amendment ZA05-0002, Applicant: Alameda Theatre Project Inc., - All Neighborhood Business Districts (C-1) within the City of Alameda (DG/CE).** The applicant requests an Amendment to Alameda Municipal Code Section 30-4.8(c) to add “Boutique Theater” as an allowable use in the C-1 zoning district, subject to Use Permit approval. “Boutique Theater” would be defined as “A theater with audiences of 49 persons or less for live performances or for the screening of motion pictures where there is only one screen in the theater.” **(Continued from the meeting of April 11, 2005.)**

Mr. Piziali noted that many speaker slips were for both Items 8-B and 8-C.

Mr. Lynch requested that staff clarify the distinctions between Items 8-B and 8-C for the public; Ms. Eliason explained the difference for the audience.

Mr. Garrison summarized the staff report.

President Cunningham advised that public comment would be taken, but that no Board discussion or action would be taken.

President Cunningham advised that more than five speaker slips had been received

M/S Piziali/Cook and unanimous to limit the speakers’ time to three minutes.

AYES – 7; NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Mark Haskett, applicant, noted that he had acutely aware of the absence of a movie theater in Alameda; he described the background of this application and noted that his intent was to create a positive influence on the community. He noted that this theater was the smallest commercial movie theater in the country. He presented a petition in opposition to closing the theater which was signed by 1,500 people; he noted that he did not initiate the petition.

Mr. Peter MacDonald, attorney for the applicant, noted that he would like to present the response regarding CEQA at the next meeting. He noted that the General Plan presented the ideal of a less automobile-oriented city with mixed uses and a traditional ambience, also known as the “new urbanism.” He noted that included pedestrian orientation with places worth patronizing within the city, as opposed to megaplexes at the edge of the city center or further. He noted that the seats were low-density seating featuring couches and easy chairs, as opposed to airline-type seating. He did not believe that many boutique theaters would be created, and that this zoning amendment would indicate the City’s commitment to entrepreneurs. He noted that the applicant often found available parking space in the vicinity when his theater has sold out. He surveyed his customers, and found that only 15 cars were driven by customers on a Friday night, and 13 cars on a Saturday night, which was less than

projected by staff. On both nights, about 40% of his customers walked to the theater. He believed this theater was an asset to the community. He noted that the movie could not be heard from the neighbor's fence. He noted that he would respond to Ms. Barbara Thomas' comments in opposition to the theater at the next meeting. He expressed concern about the condition requiring a 20-minute gap between movies, and did not believe it was necessary during the day when there were seldom more than 15 people during those showings. He suggested that that condition be applicable only after 6 p.m.

Mr. David Penney, 1620 San Antonio Avenue, spoke in support of this application, and noted that he lived a half mile away from the theater. He believed this business was a good fit for the neighborhood, and would like to see a few more throughout the City.

Mr. David Hart, 712 Taylor, spoke in support of this application, and believed that the cinema was an unqualified positive feature for the neighborhood. He liked the family-friendly atmosphere of the theater, and had never found parking to be a problem. He noted that most of the patrons walked to the theater.

Mr. Jon Spangler, 1037 San Antonio Avenue, spoke in support of this application, and noted that he lived within walking distance of the theater. He believed this was an excellent and creative solution to the conflicts that arose earlier, and supported local ownership. He believed this size and type of business ownership should be encouraged.

Ms. Chantal Currid, 834 Taylor Avenue, spoke in support of this application, and would like to see the City encourage this type of business.

Mr. Richard Archuleta, 1406 9<sup>th</sup> Street, spoke in support of this application. He noted that he had seen many people walking and riding their bicycles, which has brought a good atmosphere to the neighborhood. He would like to see a stop light near the cinema for safety. He believed this use would be a good activity for families and children in a small-town atmosphere, and would not cause any spending leakage to off-island cities.

Mr. Matthew Callahan, 1822½ Clinton Avenue, spoke in support of this application, and believed that the Central Cinema was a jewel in the City. He would like to see more boutique theaters in Alameda. He supported the zoning change, and noted that there were many members of the audience who supported it as well.

Ms. Eve Abrahams Shutt, 927 San Antonio Avenue, spoke in support of this application, and enjoyed walking to the theater. She liked the friendly atmosphere of the theater, and added that there had never been any parking problems.

Mr. Ethan Rafferty, 1217 Central Avenue, spoke in support of this application. He discussed the economic benefit of this theater to other small businesses in the surrounding neighborhoods. He noted



that the small theaters often showed family-friendly movies that may not be supported by the megaplex theaters.

Ms. Nancy Sewell, 1170 9<sup>th</sup> Street, #23, spoke in support of this application, and noted that she lived three blocks away from the theater.

Ms. Allison Martin, 1519 St. Charles, spoke in support of this application. She noted that there had been a lot more traffic when the site housed a mortuary. She noted that she had been able to bring her elderly father to the theater easily. She agreed that a crosswalk would be a good addition for safety.

Ms. Barbara Thomas, PO Box 1381, spoke in opposition to this item. She noted that she represented clients in opposition to the application, and that she would reserve her specific comments until after the Planning Board has been able to review her letter. She believed that the theater was a wonderful idea, but that it was in the wrong place. She recalled several permitted Alameda theaters that had closed, and that they all had sufficient parking. She asked the Board to look at this application from a macro view, rather than from a micro view. She noted that the General Plan and the Alameda Municipal Code encourage businesses that draw traffic to go to the major C-C zones, such as Webster Street. She noted that the transportation plans also support those goals, and believed lack of parking had contributed to failure on Webster Street and Park Street. She noted that good businesses were spread out in that zone and that they bought parking lots for their clientele, which she believed should be dissuaded under the General Plan.

Mr. Allen Rawl, 48 Invincible Court, spoke in support of this application, and had moved here because of the small-town character of Alameda. He agreed with the other speakers who supported this application. He hoped the residents did not take the ability to walk to the theater for granted.

Mr. Don Coughlan, 2008B Clinton, spoke in support of this application and noted that he grew up in the West End; he appreciated the small-town neighborhood feel and businesses. He noted that when he worked at the mortuary as a young man, there were many cars parked in the neighborhood without complaint.

Ms. Holly Ackley, 3015 San Jose Avenue, spoke in support of this application, and appreciated being able to stay on the Island for dinner and a movie. She noted that she often walked there, but never had trouble finding a parking space even when the movie was sold out. She liked the non-rowdy nature of the patrons.

Ms. Louise Elsea, 470 Lincoln Avenue, spoke in support of this application, and noted that Alameda's small-town atmosphere was very different than the rest of the Bay Area. She believed this theater helped neighbors get to know each other.

Mr. Robert Lundy Paine, 2056 Pacific, spoke in support of this application and introduced his daughters Bridget and Jessica. He believed that Central Cinema was a small and comfortable addition

to a unique community.

Mr. Richard Archuleta, 1406 9<sup>th</sup> Street, spoke again in support of this application. He did not believe this theater could be compared to the theater on Alameda Point, and that this was a neighborhood theater that people could walk to. He noted that there was sufficient parking for theater patrons.

Mr. Robert Todd spoke in opposition to this item. He expressed concern that this business may expand its services as it became more successful, and would not want to see additional uses, such as a restaurant that may serve alcohol. He expressed concern about the actions of patrons as they leave, causing noise or hazards on the road. He inquired whether this use would have the same noise restrictions as residential districts, and was concerned that it would become a nuisance in the future. He expressed concern about the operation of the Building Department.

Dr. Carol Gerdes noted that she was an obstetrician and spoke in support of this application. She noted that the theater held a Baby Brigade evening on Tuesdays. She appreciated Alameda's family community, and believed it was important to support this use. She noted that the mortuary use was more intense.

Ms. Karya Lustig, 838 Central Avenue, spoke in support of this application and noted that she lived next door to the theater. She and her family appreciated the family atmosphere, and added that their initial noise and traffic concerns had not been borne out. She complimented the applicant on the way in which he kept the property up.

Mr. Kevin Frederick, 1282 Caroline Street, spoke in support of this application and believed this was a good use of the site. He liked the design of the theater.

Ms. Michele Bealhimier, PO Box 2933, noted that she lived three blocks away from the theater, and liked the small-town feel that was particular to Alameda. She added that there was no adverse noise impact from the theater.

Mr. Ronald Pineda, 748 Lincoln, noted that he liked the theater, but was concerned that Alameda might emulate the character from other towns rather than be a unique community. He believed Central Cinema was an important component of Alameda's character.

The public hearing was closed.

There was no Board discussion.

M/S Kohlstrand/Piziali and unanimous to continue this item to the Planning Board meeting of June 13, 2005.

AYES – 7; NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0



**8-C. Use Permit UP05-0009, Applicant: Mark Haskett (Alameda Theatre Project Inc.), - 842 Central Ave. (DG/CE).** The applicant requests the granting of a Use Permit allowing the operation of a Boutique Theater located in a C-1 Zoning District. **(Continued from the meeting of April 11, 2005.)**

Mr. Garrison summarized the staff report, and recommended that this item be continued to the Planning Board meeting of June 13, 2005.

President Cunningham advised that public comment would be taken, but that no Board discussion or action would be taken.

President Cunningham advised that more than five speaker slips had been received

M/S Kohlstrand/Piziali and unanimous to limit the speakers' time to three minutes.

AYES – 7; NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Mark Haskett, applicant, declined to speak again.

Ms. Mallory Penney, 1620 San Antonio Avenue, spoke in support of this application. She stated that she often walked to the theater with her friends, and often saw people at the theater that she knew. She liked the welcoming atmosphere of the theater. She liked the theater on Alameda Point, but preferred the smaller theater.

Mr. Jon Spangler, 1037 San Antonio Avenue, spoke in support of this application. He recalled the amount of emotional opposition to the Multicultural Center, which had turned out to be a valuable addition to the community. He believed this use was a good response to local needs, and that it would be more widely use. He believed that every request by the Building Department for Code upgrades to the building should be met as soon as possible. He worked on the pilot program for the Safe Routes to School program at Franklin Elementary School, and noted that the crosswalk in question would be included in that program for Washington Elementary at Taylor and 8<sup>th</sup>, as well as Grand Avenue and other intersections.

Ms. Darnell Arniola, 3039 Fernside, spoke in support of this application, and complimented the applicant's service to the community.

Mr. David Little, 2046 San Antonio, spoke in support of this application, and noted that Alameda has had very few theaters to choose from. He believed the Central Theater had enhanced the cultural atmosphere in Alameda. He did not want to spend his film dollars off the Island.

Mr. Dean Ironside, 1206 Ninth Street, spoke in support of this application. He had not noticed any change in the traffic patterns in the 43 years he had lived in the neighborhood.

Ms. Barbara Thomas, PO Box 1381, spoke in opposition to this item. She believed that the applicant took it upon himself to open this business, obtained a business license that did not construe Use Permits. She stated that the applicant was cited by Planning Staff on December 17, 2004, as committing a misdemeanor for operating an illegal use. She noted that on January 18, 2005, the Building Official and the Fire Marshall posted a notice on the door that the building was unsafe, and recorded that notice with the County Recorder. She noted that Mr. MacDonald, the applicant's attorney, removed the sign. She inquired whether the applicant had liability insurance. She believed there would have been no opposition to the use had he appeared before the Planning Board at the beginning of the process. She noted that the patrons parked in the residents' parking spaces.

Ms. Nancy Sewell, 1170 9<sup>th</sup> Street, #23, spoke in support of this application, and noted that the Alameda Cultural Club did not have any parking for five blocks away. She noted that the noise, traffic and harassment from that use had been difficult to bear. She noted that this use did not cause noise, parking problems or harassment, and that the neighborhood was generally supported.

Mr. Dren McDonald, 740 Santa Clara, spoke in support of this application and noted that there were not many movie theaters that a toddler could attend. He added that this theater was very different from the average multiplex, and did not believe it was comparable to other theaters that had been in Alameda in the past. He did not find the building to be unsafe, and did not believe the applicant would bring his own children to the building if it were.

Ms. Antoinette Lajoie, 1170 9<sup>th</sup> Street, #18, spoke in support of this application, and added that she walked to the theater from her home, as do her neighbors. She liked the friendly atmosphere of the theater, and believed it was child-friendly. She had never noticed any traffic problems.

The public hearing was closed.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Mariani regarding other courses of action regarding this application, Ms. Harryman advised that there were two ways that this particular business could be allowed in the Alameda Municipal Code: as of right, and with a Use Permit. The Zoning Code currently only allowed theaters in the Central Business District (C-C). The Use Permit would be the more restrictive of the two methods, and there was no means of getting a Variance for this use.

M/S Mariani/Cook and unanimous to continue this item to the Planning Board meeting of June 13, 2005.

AYES – 7; NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

9. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

10. BOARD COMMUNICATION:

- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Point Advisory Committee APAC (Vice President Cook).

Vice President Cook advised that she had requested regular updates on the APAC's work (see Item 11-A).

- b. Oral Status Report regarding Northern Waterfront Specific Plan (Vice President Cook).

Vice President Cook advised that there was nothing new to report since the last meeting.

- c. Oral Status Report regarding the Golf Course Committee (Board Member Piziali).

Board Member Piziali advised that there was nothing new to report since the last meeting..

- d. Oral Status Report regarding the Golf Course Committee (Board Member Mariani).

Board Member Mariani advised that Mr. Thomas had made a presentation, which she would defer until the next meeting. The Chinatown group was very pleased with the planning so far, resulting from the Alameda Point proposed development.

11. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Staff update on status of Planning for Alameda Point.

Mr. Andrew Thomas advised that he had distributed a flier for the sixth and final workshop regarding the preliminary development concept. The final draft of the preliminary development concept and transportation program would be presented at the June 8 community workshop, and the written documents would be presented at that time. The land use plans and the associated development principles would be presented, as would the transportation program and all its phases, and the historic preservation program. An infrastructure plan that supported the preliminary development concept would be presented, as well as other documents. Staff would take community comment on June 8, and would get a sense from the community in terms of work to date, and what would need further work. Those comments would be brought to the ARRA Board on July 14, 2005. Mr. Lynch expressed concern about the type of partners sought by the City as build out approaches. He inquired whether the agreement structure was such that the Master Developer reserves the right to move forward with the development, whether they can request an extension, and what the triggers in the agreement were. Mr. Thomas recalled the background of the project, and noted that a Conditional

Acquisition Agreement was signed, which stated that the City would fund the current 18-month period for the planning effort. The goal was to have a preliminary development concept, with significant community buy-in, an important piece for the developer. The agreement stated that as of June 2005, the Master Developer must make a decision, which was similar to right of first refusal. If they chose to proceed, they would start funding the planning, predevelopment process and entitlements. If they did not proceed, they would walk away from the money they had invested to date, and the City may explore other development options to step in. He strongly suggested that there be no time extension, and that action be taken, regardless of whether the ARRA Board took action or not. He noted that part of the development business was to own the right, and to see whether the deal has been shopped around with other development teams. He believed it was in the City's best interest to go through the planning process, for the ARRA Board to take a position, and the recirculate an RFP for development if this development team was not ready to move forward in June.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Master Developers have been very involved in the planning process and have been providing input at every opportunity. He had never heard any discussion of an extension from the Master Developer, and understood that everything came down to the Navy conveyance plan.

Mr. Lynch differed with Mr. Thomas' assessment, and did not believe it was not up to the conveyance. He believed that the decision to move forward with the business plan was an internal decision of the organization.

Vice President Cook commended staff on an excellent job in conducting the workshops, which have been very informative. She asked the Planning Board to become more involved in the community workshops. She noted that transportation on/off and within the Island was a critical issue, and there was expertise on the Board regarding that issue. She noted that Measure A was a critical issue as well, and believed that staff had been given the direction to look at only Measure A-compliant alternatives. Many members of the community believed that Measure A should be examined more carefully, and that non-Measure A-compliant alternatives should be examined as well. She believed that the community wanted Alameda Point to "look like Alameda," but there may not be consensus about what that means, especially with respect to single-family homes or a fine-grained mixed use seen throughout Alameda. She believed there was a tendency to not look at both alternatives in an equal capacity.

President Cunningham requested the City Attorney's perspective on the possibility of a non-Measure A-compliant alternative being preferred. Ms. Harryman advised that Mr. Brandt and Mr. Thomas were the most knowledgeable about that issue.

Mr. Thomas noted that they had started the workshop process 12 months ago, and staff had been very straight-forward detailing the constraints, including Measure A. Because Measure A is in the City Charter, it would require a ballot measure to change; staff would not spend an excess amount of time exploring a non-Measure A-compliant alternative. He noted that the City, through the Chinatown agreement, had agreed to look at a higher density alternative in the EIR, and to give it a

full analysis.

Mr. Lynch noted that a number of communities have gone forward with the environmental documents first, then the plan. The voters would then be provided with the alternatives and an idea of the general concept as it related to the baseline data.

Ms. Kohlstrand believed that Alameda Point provided the perfect opportunity to have a meaningful community debate about whether Measure A should prevail, or whether another development approach should be considered for that area.

Mr. Thomas believed that the last meeting would be productive if it could be devoted to evaluating the two plans that had been developed through the process. He added that this would not be the end of the planning process.

Mr. Lynch noted that he would be out of the country on June 8, but suggested that the City election schedule be presented to the public at that time; a special election would be very costly. He noted that would help structure the planning timeline so that any possible ballot issues may be considered.

Mr. Piziali suggested that issue be considered at a separate meeting.

Ms. Eliason noted that it may be best to hold the discussion after the Navy's decision was known.

- b. Staff update on current staff levels in the Planning Division of the Planning & Building Department.

Ms. Eliason advised that Mr. Cormack would retire in mid-June, and his position was slated to be frozen. In the next budget cycle, Ms. Altschuler's position would be eliminated. She noted that staffing would be thin for the time being, and that the recruitment effort for a Planning & Building Director was underway. Greg McFann and Jerry Cormack shared the Interim Planning & Building Director position.

The entire Planning & Building Department was in the process of conducting a fee study and evaluation of staffing. Those results will be available in the next month or two; it was hoped that it would show that the staffing levels were too low, given the volume of work on both the Planning & Building sides, allowing the Development Review Manager position to be unfrozen.

Mr. Lynch noted that because of the time lags involved, some of the fees may not be recovered during the current fiscal year. He noted that the expectations of processing applications must be considered. Mr. Lynch inquired how many city and county jurisdictions in the State were fully funded and staffed.

Ms. Mariani suggested that point be brought before City Council.



12. ADJOURNMENT:

9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry Cormack, Interim Secretary  
City Planning & Building Department

These minutes were approved at the June 13, 2005, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.

G:\PLANNING\PB\Agendas\_Minutes\Minutes.05\May 23\_Minutes.DOC