

APPROVED MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2022

1. CONVENE

President Teresa Ruiz convened the \*meeting at 7:00 p.m.

*\*Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, codified at Government Code Section 54953, Planning Board members can attend the meeting via teleconference.*

*\*There was an ASL Interpreter available for this meeting and is on the video.*

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Diana Ariza led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: President Ruiz and Vice President Hom, and Board Members Saheba, Cisneros, Ariza, and Teague.

Absent: Board Member Ron Curtis

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

None.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Karen Lee discussed her concerns for traffic on Grand Street.

President Ruiz informed her that she would be able to make the comments during the Public Comment section since this was an Agenda Item.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

**6-A 2022-2654**

*2023 Planning Board Regular Meeting Schedule*

Schedule can be seen here:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5952763&GUID=DB63DF33-46B3-45F8-9262-37CB3D43B97C>.

**Board Member Alan Teague made a motion approve the consent calendar and Vice President Hanson Hom seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.**

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

**7-A 2022-2658**

*PLN22-0127 - 2015 Grand Street - Vesting Tentative Map, Design Review, Development Plan, & Density Bonus - Applicant: Garrett Hinds on behalf Trumark Homes. Public hearing to consider an application for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 8654, Planned Development, Design Review, and Density Bonus to develop 90 townhomes units with 5 accessory dwelling units on a 4.14 acre parcel. The project will extend both Clement Avenue and the Cross Alameda Trail west of Grand Street to Hibbard Street. This project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Sections 15332, In-Fill Development and 15183, projects consistent with a General Plan.*

David Sablan, Planner II, gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5952764&GUID=724A6E8F-4147-4923-A5DC-ED125150DAC7&FullText=1>.

Board Member Teague asked for clarification on the 30 day timeframe for the SB330 application.

Staff Member Sablan explained it was 90 days from when they deemed it complete. He further explained that in July it was incomplete and it was resubmitted in October and deemed complete in November.

Garrett Hinds, Vice President of TruMark Homes, spoke briefly and then introduced David Burton from KTG Architects who explained the project in detail.

President Ruiz opened board clarifying questions.

Board Member Asheshh Saheba asked about the landscaping plan and was curious about the street trees south of Clement, they were smaller and sparse. He wanted to know why they weren't spaced out. He wanted to know if there was a plan to address that.

Mr. Burton said that section was due to high voltage lines and that was a limitation to having trees in that area. For the Clement section they would look into continuing the pattern of the trees.

Heide Antonescu, CBG Firm, also gave information about the tree spacing on Clement.

Board Member Teague questioned why the A Street section with the hammerhead had no sidewalks. He felt that people would still be walking there and was concerned for safety.

Angelo Obertello, CBG Firm, explained since there were no front doors in that section that's why there were no sidewalks. He further explained where the sidewalks would be.

Board Member Xiomara Cisneros discussed her concerns about the traffic and was curious about what research had determined that traffic lights weren't needed. She also discussed the City Tree masterplan and what lead to the tree selection. She also wanted information on the public open space and gathering spaces.

Staff Member Sablan gave information on the traffic control at Clement and Grand St. The four way stop sign was recommended by the traffic engineer due to the bike path. He further explained the traffic engineer's findings.

Sherry Van Dorn, Van Dorn Abed Landscape Architects, discussed the tree selection/locations and where the gathering areas would be located. They were open and not blocked off to the public.

Board Member Ariza asked about the bio retention areas and wanted to make sure they were off limits. She wanted to know what the plan was for that area. She suggested they create variations in the design to break up the overall look of the buildings.

Mr. Hinds said that those areas (bio retention areas) would be a landscaped element and not part of the gathering areas. He then discussed the design and how they wanted to have consistency throughout design but were open to some variations.

Board Member Hom discussed the Design Guidelines and asked about the A and B style and wanted clarification on each. He then asked about the Design Standards regarding façades and had questions about the B style and if it was in line with those standards. He also had questions about landscaping and the stone façade. He also asked about plans for the community room.

Mr. Burton clarified the designs. He added that they focused on the street facing elevation for the elevated material.

Staff Member Sablan broke down the design and the materials of the B Style.

Staff Member Tai also provided intent and staff interpretation for the Design Standards.

Mr. Hinds clarified that there was no community room and apologized if something was mislabeled.

President Ruiz had questions about the Objective Standard Checklist. She wanted to make sure the façade office meet the 25%, the 30% street transparency, and that the recesses meet the 5ft dimension.

Staff Member Sablan discussed those calculations and that he had done those measurements during his review.

President Ruiz opened public comments.

Karen Lee had issues that there wasn't an area for kids to go outside and play and it was overall a very small area surrounded by buildings. She wished there was more open spaces.

Alcatel Joy Tab wanted clarification about the new truck route.

President Ruiz informed the speaker that the truck route was Agenda Item 7-B and they would take public comment at that point.

Christopher Buckley thanked the Planning Board and applicant on the responses for his questions about the street trees. He discussed his recommendations for the street trees for both Clement and Grand St that were consistent with the City's Street Tree Masterplan. He discussed the high voltage lines and how the City didn't need to follow PG&E regulation but instead AMP.

Pamela Meluh, who lived near the site, discussed her experiences of having terrible smells coming from the site on a regular basis. She was concerned that the site had not been properly remediated. She did not believe that the site was as safe as the developer stated. She also agreed with Speaker Lee that the site was very dense with no green spaces and didn't fit in with the surrounding neighborhood.

President closed public comment and asked if the applicant wanted to respond.

Mr. Hinds discussed the challenges of meeting the high density goals in this urban intersection. He was curious about the bad odor and then discussed all the work they done to clear the site but he would be looking into it.

Ms. Antonescu agreed that the London Plane (tree) was missing from the legend, the plan is to have it on Clement. They were happy to add some Brisbane Box (tree) if that is what the city wanted. She also pointed out that the odd spacing on Clement was also due to water treatment and trees could not get there.

President Ruiz opened up board discussion.

Board Member Teague said that since this was a SB330 project it had to comply with the Objective Standards. He then broke down the design and how it still needed to be brought into compliance, he discussed page A2-1.0 the front left perspective and how there wasn't a change in the ground floor and upper. He discussed adding a condition about a change in material.

Staff Member Sablan discussed that it was the interpretation and feel of the design.

Staff Member Tai added that the board had the purview to call out to staff where they made an interpretation that may not be correct.

Board Member Saheba he wanted a more consistence reading for these buildings, particularly around the base. He said there needed to be consistency, “wrap-around” design, not just on which side of the building would be viewed. He believed the Object Standards would provide consistency with these buildings.

Vice President Hom addressed the constraints these buildings were working under, density being one. He also discussed the façade treatment and wanted to set the precedent that there needed to be a change in material from the ground floor. He agreed with the “wrap-around” design concept.

Board Member Cisneros agreed with having the design and materials consistent with the Object Design Standards. She also discussed policy H14, which requires Universal Design in all new housing to ensure equality for people with disabilities and how they might want to amend their ODS.

President Ruiz was a bit disappointed in the design, she described it as a “value” version of other designs that TruMark had done. She was in support of adding the London Plan tree and having the applicant incorporate a different material at the base of building type A other than stucco. For building style B, the material needed to wrap around.

Board Member Teague asked for clarification from Staff Member Tai about what conditions they could add to the motion.

**Board Member Teague made a motion to approve with requirements of adding street trees (London Plane and Brisbane Box) that had been mention, the project must be brought into compliance with the Objective Standard of 2A-5 building type A (different material at base) and deal with the left elevation of building type B (address the one inch change in building material – material must be brought into compliance with the Objective Standards). \*Also, the building type B must be consistent as they wrap around. Vice President Hom seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.**

*\*Board Member Saheba asked for additional requirement of the wrap of the building.*

#### **7-B 2022-2659**

*Recommendation to Adopt Street Classification Mobility Element Appendix General Plan Amendment. CEQA Determination: The Alameda General Plan 2040 Final Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse #2021030563, certified by the City Council on November 30, 2021, evaluated the environmental impacts of the General Plan update and subsequent actions to implement the General Plan policies, including the adoption of the*

*Street Classification Appendix. None of the circumstances requiring further CEQA review are present.*

Andrew Thomas, Director of Planning Building and Transportation, introduced this item and gave a presentation. He also introduced Susie Huffstader from Fehr & Peers who also presented. The staff report and attachments can be found at:  
<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5952765&GUID=8FC711FD-9D7E-4ECB-8AD8-57DCFEB3DA70&FullText=1>.

President Ruiz opened board clarifying questions.

Vice President Hom asked about minimum sidewalk width and bike facilities, he did not see that in the report and thought he had missed it. He thought the report was very vehicle centric. He also wanted to know crosswalk treatments and what the city was considering.

Director Thomas discussed bike standards and how the Active Transportation Plan addressed that, it was cross referenced here. He further explained how this report offered general guidance.

President Ruiz discussed gateway streets and the speed limits, she read that speed limits could be higher than 25mph.

Ms. Huffstader discussed speed limits and what findings they looked for in raising the speed limits. She further discussed speed calming techniques and what type of traffic they typically see on gateway streets.

President Ruiz opened public comment.

Sandra Wong who lived on Clement Ave, felt that the road was too narrow for a truck route, she wanted to know how that would work. She felt that it was very unsafe for children or anyone to cross the street.

President Ruiz closed public comment and opened board discussion.

President Ruiz acknowledge that even though Clement Ave had been designated as a truck route for it awhile she agreed with the speaker that it was unsafe and it should be evaluated for stop signs and other traffic calming techniques. She also wanted the width of the street looked at to make sure it complied with requirements for a truck route.

**Vice President Hom made a motion that the Planning Board recommends approval of the Street Classification Mobility Element Appendix to the City Council with the suggestion of adding a paragraph describing the pedestrian/sidewalk standards referencing the Active Transportation Plan. Board Member Cisneros seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.**

8. MINUTES

**8-A 2022-2653** - *Draft Meeting Minutes - September 26, 2022*

Minutes can be found here:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5952762&GUID=3A8E1D31-D63A-446E-9CFC-63BD8F764A2F&FullText=1>.

President Ruiz opened board comments.

Board Member Teague pointed out that changes to the ADUs was lacking some information and he called into the City Council and added it.

President Ruiz gave a correction on page 5 of her comments, it should say *Housing Element*.

President Ruiz opened public comments.

There were no speakers.

**Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Board Member Cisneros seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.**

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

**9-A 2022-2651**

*Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions*

Recent actions and decisions can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5952760&GUID=5B96BD88-B284-4B95-88E6-C2A4BD9E1BCD&FullText=1>.

**9-B 2022-2652**

*Oral Report - Future Public Meetings and Upcoming Planning, Building and Transportation Department Projects*

Staff Member Tai thanked the board for their hard work since this was the last meeting of the year.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

Board Member Teague reiterated his request to bring the Objective Standards back for review and the possibility of adding options.

Board Member Saheba discussed 300 Mosely and the challenges of the project. He discussed his conflicting thoughts that had stayed with him, he was concerned they were creating severe conditions for the folks who would live there.

Vice President Hom also agreed they should review the Objective Design Standards. He also wanted an update on going back to in person meeting.

Staff Member Tai explained that in person meeting would be decided after the new City Manager, Jennifer Ott, was brought on board.

Board Member Ariza also wanted to see the Objective Design Standards and she concurred with Board Member Saheba's thoughts. She discussed ideas on how they could incentivize good design.

Board Member Cisneros concurred with Board Member Ariza.

President Ruiz echoed everyone's sentiments. She also discussed the Housing Element and how proud she was about it.

## 12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Christopher Buckley also discussed the Objective Design Standards and the 300 Mosely project and how more projects like that could happen due to the new Housing Element and density bonuses.

## 13. ADJOURNMENT

President Ruiz adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.