

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD MONDAY, JUNE 11, 2012

1. CONVENE: 7:03 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Knox White
3. ROLL CALL: Present: President Zuppan, Vice-President Burton, Board members Ezzy Ashcraft, Henneberry, Knox White, and Köster (arrived at 7:05)
4. MINUTES: Minutes from the Regular meeting of May 14, 2012 (Pending)
Minutes from the Regular meeting of May 30, 2012 (Pending)

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

6-A. Future Agendas

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, gave brief presentation

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Philip Gravem, resident on Sherman Street, speaking on behalf of himself and his neighbors, requested that the board carefully review the Valero Gas Station Application to extend hours including the history of the applicant.

David Eck, President of Crown Harbor Home Owners Association, wanted to inform the board that the fence on the Neptune Point property was built without a survey and is off by 10-20 feet. He stated that the fence on the property that is being sold has not been corrected and the HOA would like to work with the Developer in relocating it. He also requested that the landscaped area between the two properties be preserved and maintained.

Barbara Kerr stated that the free standing signs at the corner of Buena Vista and Sherman violate Code 30-16 (D) and (G). According to code free standing signs are not allowed on City property, nor are they allowed to face residential properties closer than 1000 feet. She requested that the signs be removed.

Board member Knox White motioned to call the Valero Gas Station Application for review and discussion at a future Board meeting.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion.

Motion carried 6-0

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved or adopted by one motion unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from the Planning Board or a member of the public by submitting a speaker slip for that item.

NONE

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A. Draft General Plan Housing Element, Land Use Diagram, accompanying Zoning Ordinance Amendments and Addendum.** - A public hearing to consider draft amendments to the General Plan and Alameda Municipal Code to comply with State of California Government Code requirements related to the provision and regulation of housing.

Board member Köster recused himself.

Andrew Thomas gave a brief presentation of the proposed amendments.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft asked if surplus units can be applied to future requirements.

Jennifer Gastelum, PMC consultant, stated that up to 25% of previously built units can be applied to current requirements.

Board member Henneberry asked about the consequences for not passing the plan at this meeting.

Mr. Thomas replied that if the City Council does not approve the amendments, there will not be a certified Housing Element, which means the General Plan is incomplete. If the General Plan is incomplete then the City is not eligible for state funding, the City can be sued, and potentially all decisions and permit approval authority can be taken away until the General Plan is complete.

President Zuppan opened the public comment period.

Angela Fawcett, representing Park Webster Home Owners Association, stated that additional housing will affect traffic and wants to know what plans are in place to repave and widen McKay Street.

Mr. Thomas acknowledged that the City is aware of the problems with McKay Street, which is actually owned by the State.

Barbara Kerr stated she is concerned about the Multi-family district overlay and said that a

separate Public Hearing should have been held for such a drastic new zoning district. She expressed concern about not requiring open space (yards, decks, and usable rooftops), not requiring setbacks, the increase in traffic, and inadequate parking.

Mr. Thomas stated that every property/home owner within 300 feet of every property being rezoned received notice as required by state and local law and notices were posted at all sites.

Farimah Faiz, Assistant City Attorney, stated that the City met and exceeded state law in terms of notification.

Darin Lounds, Executive Director of the Housing Consortium of the East Bay and President of East Bay Housing Organizations, spoke in support of the multi-family housing overlay.

Diane Lichtenstein, Vice President of H.O.M.E.S, concurred with Mr. Lounds. She requested that as much flexibility as possible be built into every phase to allow for flexibility in future years.

Kristoffer Köster, resident, stated he supports the Housing Element but would like to see the Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) site developed in a sustainable way. He said the site is not maintained and serves as a dumping ground for AUSD. He said he would like to see the site developed in such a way to repair some of the zoning issues. He concluded stating that he would like to see open/green space developed in the neighborhood.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft said she sent photos of the AUSD site to Public Works and The City Manager's Office and was told by the Deputy City Manager that Public works will clear the weeds this week, and will contact AUSD to better maintain the property.

Helen Sause, President of HOMES, spoke in favor of the Housing Element, stating that the many will benefit from the approved Housing Element, including tax revenue and eligibility for state funding. She said that this provides a map for future housing development and protect the vulnerability of the City from potential law suits.

Laura Thomas, President of Renewed Hope Housing Advocates, spoke in favor of the Housing Element and expressed the importance of building new, comfortable, efficient and affordable housing.

Bill Smith, Vice President of Renewed Hope Housing Advocates, spoke in favor of the Housing Element stating that passing of the Housing Element will jump start the redevelopment of Alameda Point which will directly affect the budget crisis, citing Bay Farm Island development.

Lynette Lee spoke in favor of the Housing Element. She addressed comment regarding additional traffic impact on the City stating that flexibility and possibility to require less parking will encourage more people to walk and bike while reducing the carbon footprint. She stated that it is a great opportunity to ensure different types of housing for a variety of incomes.

Deni Adaniya, member of East Bay Housing Organizations and resident, spoke in support of the Housing Element. She stated that affordable housing units are very well designed and enriches the lives of all Alameda residents.

Gary Struthers, member of East Bay Housing Organization and resident, spoke in favor of the Housing Element and encouraged the Board to make this a priority to the benefit of the community.

Sean Svendsen, owner of Alameda Marina, spoke in favor of the Housing Element, stating that a change from M2 to MU with multi family overlay will allow maximum flexibility for future land use planning. He expressed the importance of maintaining eligibility for state transportation funding.

Lois Pryor, East Bay Housing Organization, spoke in favor of the Housing Element and urged the Board to approve the plans.

President Zuppan closed the public comment period.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft commented favorably on the proposed amendments.

Board member Henneberry stated he will support the plans.

Vice President Burton, concurred with previous Board member comments. He asked if the plan needs to be revised to exclude the reference to the use of redevelopment funds because of recent State actions regarding redevelopment agencies.

Mr. Thomas clarified that staff was addressing specific HCD comments from 2009 and will present a new Housing Element in 2014.

Board member Knox White stated that the placement of the Land Availability Chart within the report is confusing and pointed out inconsistencies in the references to locations within the Zoning Ordinances Map Amendments and the Housing Element; one refers by site number and the other by name. He suggested that the CVS description should include the address number to minimize confusion surrounding their possible relocation. He stated that the word "new" should be removed from the titles, because of the confusion the word will generate once the plans are adopted. He said that the site description of the Good Toyota location should be revised to focus on the location, not the owner of the building.

President Zuppan commended staff on proposed amendments and echoed Board comments.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft motioned to adopt the draft resolution recommending the proposed general plan and AMC amendments exhibit 2 and 3.

Board member Henneberry seconded the motion.

Motion carries 5-0 (Köster recused himself)

9-B. Alameda Landing Retail Center Sign Program - Applicant: Catellus LLC- A public hearing to consider a Sign Program for the future Alameda Landing Retail Center. Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt pursuant to CEQA Section 15301(g) new copy on and off premise signs.

Scott Cuyler, Square Peg Design, gave brief presentation

President Zuppan opened the public comment period.

Diane Lichtenstein, resident, objected to the tenant signs stating that they are not welcoming.

President Zuppan closed the public comment period.

Board member Köster spoke in overall favor of the signs and likes the use of recycled materials. He stated that the Target Sign in the square box is not attractive.

Board member Knox White echoed the previous comments and expressed concerns with the tenant signs stating they detract from the building and he questioned their necessity.

Vice President Burton stated that he is pleased with the overall sign program and the composition of the signs work well. He expressed concern with the readability of the Alameda Landing sign as well as the illumination of the signs. He inquired about the brightness of the signs and if there would be a limit on the hours per day that the signs will be illuminated.

Mr. Cuyler, responded that the signs are sized appropriately according to site lines and that the graphic is the only part of the sign that will be illuminated.

Mr. Thomas responded that a diagram showing the range of illumination the sign will cast can be required as part of the building permit application. He also stated that the Board can attach a condition regarding nighttime illumination to the permit.

Sean Whiskeman, Catellus, stated that the signs illumination is adjustable and suggested that they be turn down to “security level” lighting, when the shopping center closes for the night. He said the store hours change during holiday and the hours of operation differ between retail and restaurant.

Vice President Burton suggested that a condition of approval be drafted, directing staff to work with the developer to refine light levels and develop a light schedule so lights are not on 24/7.

Mr. Whiskeman clarified that the tenant signs, with the exception of Target, are representative images and could look a little different. He clarified that the size of the “entry” signs has been modified to be more subtle.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that since residential units on 5th Street will not be completed for at least a year, that the Board approve the plans and revisit the lighting at a

later date. She stated that she is generally pleased with the plans and likes the seagull. She questioned the placement of the Alameda Landing text stating it seem illogical to read from bottom to top, and suggested that it be changed to read from top to bottom. She requested a materials board.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Board can approve the plans with a condition that the materials board is presented prior to approval of the building permit.

Board member Henneberry said he likes the design of the Alameda Landing Shopping Center signs but does not like the tenant signs, stating the additional Target signs are excessive and unnecessary. He suggested that the 67 square foot sign is large and should be reduced in size or completely removed.

Board member Knox White concurred with Board member Henneberry regarding the size of the sign and suggested smaller or narrower signs.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she doesn't have a problem with advertising the stores by the signs. She stated that the signs are directional and will assist people in directing them into the shopping center.

President Zuppan stated that she finds the sizes of the signs acceptable and the signs appear to her to be proportional.

Board member Knox White clarified with the Assistant City Attorney that the directional sign at the corner of Stargell and Mariner's Square Loop is off site and therefore requires a Use Permit.

Assistant City Attorney Farimah Faiz, stated that for the time being the directional sign at the corner of Stargell and Mariners Square Loop should be severed from the discussion.

Board member Henneberry clarified that the sign is generic and similar signs can be viewed anywhere. He stated that the city does not want a generic sign of that magnitude.

Board member Knox White motioned to exclude the off-site sign from the program and approve the sign design with a condition that staff work with Catellus on the lighting issues, specifically the brightness, light cast, and hours of operation, and the materials board with correct colors be brought back to the Board for design review, and the primary tenant sign be reduced in size to no more than 50 square feet.

Board member Henneberry seconded the motion.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that since the size of the sign is changing perhaps the Board should just ask for new designs.

Vice President Burton suggested that the motion be worded to state that as long as the sign does not exceed 50 square feet and then the Board would not have to review the changes.

Board member Knox White stated that the Board is approving the "massing" of the signs

and that the motion only requires that the “massing” of the largest sign be reduced.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft stated that the Board is approving the sign program. She stated that she is concerned with how the sign proportions will be affected by limiting the signs surface area and not the height. She stated of the sign is going to be redesigned then she would like to review the materials board and color samples at the same time. She reiterated her hesitancy to limit the lighting until the Board and City are aware of those impacts on residential areas. She asked how critical the time is.

Mr. Thomas stated that this sign is for Target and time is of the essence. He said the materials board and lighting can be brought back prior to the sign’s actual construction. President Zuppan stated she has concerns with limiting the size of on-premise signs

Vice President Burton stated that there is only one sign of this magnitude on site, that the sign’s target audience is people driving in from the tube, and that the sign is actually proportional and appropriate for its context. He stated he is ok with the size of the sign. Board member Ezzy Aschraft inquired about the City’s billboard ban.

Mr. Thomas clarified that the signs under discussion are all on site and are not considered billboards.

Motion carried, 4-2; AYES: Köster, Knox White, Burton, Henneberry; NOES: Zuppan, Ezzy Ashcraft

9-C. I-880/Broadway/Jackson Multimodal Transportation and Circulation Improvements for Alameda Point, Oakland Chinatown, Downtown Oakland and Jack London Square.

Obaid Khan, Public Works Engineer, gave brief presentation.

Board member Knox White asked how the traffic exiting the 880 North at Webster will get to Broadway and the traffic signals.

Mr. Khan replied that drivers can make a right turn from the main street. He stated that the signal operations are still under discussion; however they would be separate traffic signals.

President Zuppan asked what process was used to determine that the travel time from additional “jump lanes” minimal compared to the cost and therefore deemed not worthwhile. She asked how traffic in the Tube would be affected by the elimination of the right turn lane for drivers on Atlantic.

Mr. Khan answered that a computer model was used to determine travel time. He stated that Public Works found in 2009 while working on the Transportation Element that the right turn lane is not critical.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft asked how many automobiles use the Broadway Exit, how traffic will be directed onto the surface streets, and what the realistic speeds will be. She expressed concern regarding the amount of traffic and the speed that the automobiles are

traveling at.

Mr. Khan answered that a lot of traffic exiting from Broadway are making several turns to get back onto Webster Street. He stated that he will forward that information to the Board.

Vice President Burton stated the Market Street on-ramp access via 6th Street is a weakness in the plan, and asked how drivers are going to be enticed to utilize that on-ramp. He stated that the slow street concept is in direct opposition of the people trying to access the freeway.

Board member Knox White clarified with Mr. Khan that Alameda is the project sponsor for ACTC which means the City directs ACTC when to move forward with projects.

Board member Köster asked about the BRT timing.

Mr. Khan answered that BRT is scheduled for FY 2017-18 and the development of Alameda Point is critical to BRT.

President Zuppan opened the public comment period.

Jim Strehlow, expressed confusion why the project is not being presented in a joint special meeting with the Planning Board and the Transportation Commission. He stated that the plan fails the goal of the Deficiency Plan and said that the shorter ramp will cause back up on the freeway.

Randy Rentschler, resident, stated that this is a great project and very much needed especially for the development of the base. He encouraged the Board to support the plan.

Tony Daysog, stated that the plan disperses traffic which helps alleviate traffic. He suggested that staff consider the feasibility of a road be constructed that immediately links drivers turning left onto 6th Street to the 880.

President Zuppan closed the public comment period.

Board member Knox White commented that Deficiency Plan was based on 1950 freeway design engineering and part of the Transportation Master Plan includes changing the way project benefits are reviewed/proposed. He suggested that an analysis be performed to determine that the benefits are worth the cost of the project.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft motioned to extend the meeting to 11:15

Board member Henneberry seconded the motion.

Motion carried 6-0

Vice President Burton concurred with Board member Knox White regarding the benefits and cost. He cited the 6th Street projected and stated that it doesn't appear to provide enough benefits to Alameda and further cuts off Chinatown from Jack London Square.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft cited the settlement agreement between the City and the Oakland-Chinatown Chamber and Asian Health Services, and stated that traffic heading through Chinatown from the Tube is Alameda's problem. She expressed concern for pedestrian safety in Chinatown.

Board member Henneberry stated that Alameda should not benefit to the detriment of Oakland and that projects should be agreed upon by both cities. He stated that reconfiguring 6th Street to mimic Octavia and Fell in San Francisco would work well.

President Zuppan concurred with Board member Knox White, stating she has concerns with the lack of close connection to the freeway; the lack of data based analysis of the impact of costs, and would like to ensure that an analysis is performed.

Board member Knox White addressed Mr. Strehlow's comments stating that the Transportation Commission was scheduled to review the plan in May, but the item was pulled due to an illness. He reiterated that there is a commitment to building a project that solves the problems.

Mr. Khan confirmed that the plans will be presented to the Transportation Commission on June 27, 2012.

9-D. Grand Marina Village Sidewalks – A report by City staff recommending a change to a Planning Board recommendation of approval for the Grand Marina Village development related to the width of the existing pedestrian path along the waterfront.

Andrew Thomas Planning Services Manager gave brief presentation.

Board member Henneberry asked why the Board required a 10 foot wide path

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft responded that at the time, a board member was concerned with access for all pedestrians and bicycles. She stated that she has no qualms leaving the path at its existing width as long as the trash receptacles are moved and no longer impede the path.

Board member Köster asked if the path's width remains at 9 feet if it will still be considered part of the Bay Trail. He stated that he has found the trail to be adequate in size.

Mr. Thomas replied that it will still be part of the Bay Trail.

Board member Knox White motioned to modify the width of the path with the condition that the trash receptacles be moved so as not to impede traffic.

Vice President Burton reiterated concern with the placement of the trash receptacles. He stated that the path is not continuous and is interrupted by a curb at Grand Street and needs to be conditioned.

Board member Knox White amended his motion to include the condition that continuity be provided between the two sections of trail.

Board member Köster seconded the motion.

Motion carried 6-0, no abstentions.

9-E. Update on 1700 Park Street Project. A status report the retail building under construction at 1700 Park Street at the corner of Buena Vista.

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, gave brief presentation.

Board member Köster asked when the mock-ups for the stucco banding around windows in the rear of the building would be provided.

Mr. Thomas replied that he will notify the board of a projected date.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft stated that this situation is a teachable moment. She suggested that a discussion take place at a future meeting to ensure that this situation does not happen again. She recommends that a color board come back to the Board for review.

10. **WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

11. **BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:**

Board member Knox White design review provided copies of the Fresno's Downtown Vision Plan as an example of how Alameda should pursue and present their plans for Alameda Point. He stated that in developing Alameda Point that the City first define their goals and explain their goals then pursue issues such as zoning. He stated that design review was confusing with the speakers addressing the Board during public comment. He proposed that all design reviews be moved to the consent calendar where they can be pulled if someone wishes to discuss a particular item.

12. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

13. **ADJOURNMENT:** 11:13 p.m.