

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, JULY 11, 2022

1. CONVENE

President Asheshh Saheba 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.*

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Xiomara Cisneros led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None.

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

Allen Tai, City Planner, noted that for Agenda item **9-A 2022-2196**, the proposed wireless facility at 916 Union St had not been acted on due to public comment. They were working with the applicant to address those issues and it would be re-noticed at a later date.

Board Member Alan Teague asked to defer Board Elections until the next meeting when a new board member would be able to join.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6-A 2022-2204

Annual Review of Alameda Landing Commercial Project Development Agreement and Alameda Landing Residential Project Development Agreement. Applicant: Catellus Alameda Development, LLC. An Annual Review of the Development Agreements between City of Alameda and Catellus Alameda Development, LLC related to the Alameda Landing Mixed Use Residential Project and the Alameda Landing Mixed Use Commercial Project. (Item Continued to the July 25, 2022 Planning Board Meeting)

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7-A 2022-2199

Public Workshop to Review and Comment on the draft Zoning Amendments to implement the May 2022 Draft Housing Element to address State Fair Housing Law and Accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the Period 2023-2031.

Andrew Thomas, Planning Building & Transportation Director, introduced this item and gave a brief presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at: <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5713130&GUID=CAD0A896-918B-45D6-B2DB-A1830CB64ED9&FullText=1>.

President Saheba opened board clarifying questions.

Board Member Curtis discussed low cost housing and the challenge to developers to keep expenses low. He was concerned that constraints would hurt the completion of these units and encouraged any flexibility that could to help developers and the people wanting to buy these homes.

Director Thomas discussed the dangers of over regulating/managing and instead they would focus important items like height and density and then let the Market decide the rest. He discussed how the Transit District would affect homeowners mostly and would allow them to have more flexibly in adding units.

Board Member Rona Rothenberg pointed out that there wasn't a definition of affordable and wanted to know if the State did. Was there one that would be productive?

Director Thomas discussed what had been considered affordable over the years, "affordable by design" is the terminology that had been used. He added that the State did have legislation on the books and he further explained what that was.

Board Member Cisneros asked about Bridgeside Shopping Center and wanted to know what it wasn't considered as part of the Community Mix Use Space.

Director Thomas said they addressed Bridgeside Shopping Center in the North Park Street Zoning changes. They would go back and look at retaining the retail spaces.

Board Member Hanson Hom asked about the letter from AAPS (Alameda Architectural Preservation Society) and the concern that the Bridgestone shopping center didn't allow residential and wanted to know if that was a mistake. He also asked about ADU height limit being 25 feet if they meet certain requirements.

Director Thomas said that didn't sound right about Bridgestone and would look into it.

Staff Member Tai said that yes that ADU could be 25ft if it met certain requirements and it was following a pending State Bill.

President Saheba asked how the height limit of 65 feet was established for the proposed Community Mix Use District.

Director Thomas explained that the height was established after talking with developers and a 5 story building was the minimum they could do and maintain financial viability.

Staff Member Tai added that they started by looking at the height limit on Park Street, and this would help establish commercial spaces on the bottom floor.

President Saheba opened Public Comment.

Karen Bey discussed the importance of implementing the “Retail Gains” from the General Plan 2040 Documents into these zoning changes. She wanted to distinguish between ground floor retail and ground floor commercial. She discussed ways to achieve this goal. She was also concerned about creating large scale shopping centers.

Christopher Buckley, AAPS, restated the society’s comments and concerns that the proposed upzoning in the residential zones and historic commercial areas were unnecessary to meet the RHNA (Reginal Housing Needs Allocation) numbers and State Fair Housing Requirements. He gave suggestions on what staff should focus on.

Nancy Manos did not understand what the Density Value Waiver was and wanted someone to explain it. She hoped that they would not satiate the area since traffic was already so bad and it was not safe to walk or drive.

Zac Bowling thanked staff for their work. He discussed the need for upzoning residential, HCDC had written a letter saying they needed to follow their guidance which is prescribed in that letter. He also agreed with the proposed height limits, anything less could be seen as a barrier to housing. He supported the staff report as it was.

Kevis Brownson advocated for increase height and density in all the transit corridors, especially on Park and Webster. The increase density would help the merchants at these locations. She also discussed the benefits to the environment and how some cities had even discussed height bonus for those who provide housing.

Carmen Reid advocated for smaller units that would be affordable by design and could accommodate younger employees and teachers. She also endorsed AAPS’s thoughts on height limits and wanted to keep Park St at around 2-3 stories.

President Saheba closed public comments and opened board discussion.

Board Member Teague gave suggestions on definitions that were needed and ones that needed to be more defined, “dwelling unit” was an important one. He went into detail on the definitions on the different types of housing. He did not agree with not allowing condos in an R1 zone and had questions about “residential care” changes and wanted that clarified. He discussed places that he wanted to see struck out and wanted to keep coin operated laundry mats in C1. He discussed restrictions for ADUs and wanted to see some

requirements removed. He then discussed retail spaces and said he agreed with Karen Bey. He then discussed in detail the Transit Overlay district and his concerns.

Director Thomas asked questions about definitions the discussed State Law for Residential Care. He also agreed that retail spaces needed to be retained.

Board Member Cisneros wanted to make sure that the wording for the new retail designation would attract the type of retail they wanted. She also discussed the opportunity site at Bridgeside Shopping Center, residential and retail for the benefit of the community.

Director Thomas added that they did have a Superstore/Large Format Store provision that did discourage and required an extra review process. He discussed how staff was going to think about Bridgeside.

Vice President Ruiz gave suggestions on definitions and pointed out places where definitions could be cross referenced for clarity. She was supportive of Board Member Teague's recommendation about the Transit Overlay District, that many factors would be market driven. She also discussed graphics that needed to be edited or completely removed and pointed out areas that needed clarification. She also gave suggestions on how to clarify the regulations around shopping centers and discussed the changing retail landscape.

Director Thomas explained in detail the thought process behind the Transit Overlay District. He also discussed how it would work with future public transportation options.

Board Member Hom discussed shopping centers and the issues brought up by Karen Bey. He went into detail about the changes to retail and what developers needed. He discussed permitted uses for hotels and asked that they activate the ground floor of the hotel for retail if they were looking at Park or Webster St. He then discussed the comments and concerns brought up by AAPS. He also discussed his struggles with the Transit Zone. He discussed the benefits of affordable housing in the transit corridor. He was struggling with the 1000ft standard, he believed it didn't promote affordable units. He gave suggestions on what he thought would be more beneficial.

President Saheba also discussed the proposed Transit Zone housing and how to address traffic as density was increased. He wanted it to be made clear that increased density would mean decreased parking.

Director Thomas thanked everyone for their comments and discussed the next steps.

7-B 2022-2202

RESHAP Development Agreement Annual Review - Applicant: MidPen Housing Corporation and Alameda Point Collaborative, Building Future, and Operation Dignity (the

Collaborating Partners). The applicant is requesting a periodic review of the RESHAP Development Agreement. The consideration of an Annual Report is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No further environmental review is required.

Director Thomas introduced this agenda item and gave a brief discussion. The staff report and attachments can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5713131&GUID=7A4BC76A-27CE-4ABA-9B9D-AF06E503718C&FullText=1>.

President Saheba opened clarifying questions.

There were no questions.

President Saheba opened public comments.

There were no speakers.

President Saheba closed public comment and opened board discussion.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the RESHAP Development Agreement Annual Review, the applicant is in compliance with good faith effort of the agreement. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0.

7-C 2022-2203

Board Elections

This item has been moved to the next meeting.

8. MINUTES

8-A 2022-2198 - Draft Meeting Minutes - April 11, 2022 *

*This item was brought back due a quorum being needed.

President Saheba opened public comment.

There were no speakers.

Board Member Curtis made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted and Vice President Ruiz seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0. Board Members Cisneros and President Saheba abstained due to their absence at the April 11th meeting.

8-B 2022-2207 - Draft Meeting Minutes - May 9, 2022

Board Member Teague wanted clarification on Staff Planning Counsel Celena Chen's comments about Measure A.

President Ruiz pointed out a correction for her comments.

Board Member Teague also pointed out a correction and asked for clarification on his comments about retro-fitting for existing construction.

President Saheba opened public comments.

There were no public speakers.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve as corrected and Vice President Ruiz seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0, Board Member Hom abstained due to his absence at the meeting.

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

9-A 2022-2196

Planning, Building and Transportation Department Recent Actions and Decisions

Recent actions and decisions can be found at:

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5713127&GUID=390879A2-D755-4BF6-8015-5187999C5BE7&FullText=1>.

Staff Member Tai reminded the board that PLN22-0226 had been pulled due to public comment and would be re-noticed in the future.

9-B 2022-2197

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

Staff Member Tai said that at the next meeting that would have the annual report for Alameda Landing. Also they would be bringing back the Site A Development Plan and Development Agreement at the July 25th meeting. Then the board would be recessed for the month of August and would be back in September.

Board Member Teague wanted 916 Union St PLN22-0226 to come to the board due to the public comments and to address any misunderstanding. He also pointed out some issues with the Building Eye.

Staff Member Tai said he would verify that there was no Shot Clock requirements and explained how the Building Eye got its information.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

President Saheba and all of the board thanked Rona Rothenberg for all her hard work and guidance for the Planning Board over the last 4 years.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

President Saheba adjourned the meeting at 9:24 p.m.