

APPROVED MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD  
MONDAY, MARCH 28, 2022

1. CONVENE

Vice 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.*

2. FLAG SALUTE

Board Member Ron Curtis led the flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: President Asheshh Saheba

4. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION

Vice President Ruiz announced that she had a hard stop at 8:30pm due to a prior commitment.

**Vice President Ruiz made a motion to continue item 7-C to the next meeting and to make Board Member Hanson Hom Chair Pro Tem if needed, Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. A vote was taken by a raise of hands and the motion passed 6-0.**

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

**7-A 2022-1863**

*PLN21-0587 - 2350 Saratoga Street - Tentative Map - Applicant: Jonah Hendrickson on behalf of Alameda Point Redevelopers LLC. Public hearing to consider recommending approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 8468 and a Condominium Plan for an existing 4-story building currently under renovation to create 250 Work/Live units. The Condominium Plan will create three commercial condominium units that each occupy approximately one-third of the building. CEQA Determination: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Section 15315 - Minor Land Divisions*

David Sablan, Planner II, introduced the item and gave a brief presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at <https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5532058&GUID=0BE24216-8536-4F4A-BA09-C380827BF18F&FullText=1>.

Vice President Ruiz opened the board clarifying questions.

Board Member Hom asked about Fire Wall/Door requirements and other Building Code questions.

Staff Member Sablan discussed that the Building Official had reviewed these plans and worked with the Engineer on this to make ensure the Building Code was met.

Board Member Rona Rothenberg asked about the total number of units and what was approved. She had questions on the Staff Analysis and if the units could be sold individually.

Staff Member Sablan explained what the City's Ordinance allowed, how the building was divided and how those units could potentially be sold.

Vice President Ruiz opened public comment.

There were no public speakers on this item.

Vice President Ruiz closed public comment and opened board discussion.

**Board Member Alan Teague pointed out a typo on the Tentative Map he then made a motion to recommend to the City Council to move forward as indicated in the Draft Resolution, Board Member Curtis seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.**

#### **7-B 2022-1864**

*PLN21-0438 - 1245 McKay Avenue - Design Review Amendment - Applicant: Alameda Point Collaborative. Public hearing to consider an amendment to the City Council's Design Review Approval PLN20-0047 to allow the construction of an approximately 61,300-square-foot, two-story senior convalescent living facility. General Plan designation: Medium Density Residential. Zoning: A-P, Administrative Professional Zoning District. CEQA Determination: Design Review approval for a permitted use is not subject to CEQA. McCorkle Eastside Neighborhood Group v. City of St. Helena (2018) 31 Cal.App.5th 80, Public Resources Code Section 21080. As a separate and independent basis, the City of Alameda adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration and an Addendum thereto in compliance with CEQA and no further environmental review is required.*

Henry Dong, Planner III, introduced the item and gave a presentation. The staff report and attachments can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5532059&GUID=4941D5FB-FE4C-48B5-898E-F0E22307AD33&FullText=1>.

Doug Biggs, the applicant, also presented on the process and design changes of the project.

Gary Struthers, the architect, presented on the design details.

Vice President Ruiz opened the board clarifying questions.

Board Member Teague asked about laundry facilities and trash rooms. He also wanted to know if an applicant could amend their design without any requirements.

Mr. Struthers showed where the laundry facilities and trash rooms were located and stated that they were sufficient for the 50 units.

Staff Member Tai said that was correct about amendments to the design. He further explained what the board's role was.

Board Member Xiomara Cisneros wanted to know about funding and constructive costs. She wanted to know if the applicant foresaw any issues that would keep this project from being completed.

Mr. Biggs discussed in detail how they had been diligent at looking at the cost impact of every decision they had made for this project.

Board Member Hom asked about specific design choices and how they worked with Design Regulations. He also had questions about the site plan, mainly the lighting plan. He noted that the Planning Board had asked for the lighting plan on previous projects. He wanted to know if new street lights were proposed on McKay Ave.

Mr. Struthers discussed in detail design choices. He added that there was a lighting plan and that it would evolve, he said there would be landscaping lighting. He showed on the plans where additional lighting was planned. He apologized for the lighting plan not being included in the presentation. He said that any work they did on McKay would require coordination with many other organizations.

Allen Tai, City Planner, clarified that the street was owned by the state of California but managed by the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). He added that the city had ongoing conversations with the Park District about improvements on the street but it was a few years down the road.

Board Member Hom appreciated that the street trees were being saved and wanted to know if there had been a study done if the site trees could be saved.

Mr. Struthers said they had been working closely with the landscaper to see what trees could be saved. He did not which trees were being saved but that had been part of the design submittal but it was not in the presentation.

Mr. Biggs noted which trees he knew would be saved and which ones were beyond saving.

Board Member Hom asked if a more decorative gate had been discussed.

Mr. Struthers discussed what type of gate was needed but they were open to other designs.

Board Member Rothenberg also urged the preservation of trees due to the number of birds in the area. She also urged against the use of white stucco since they weather badly in the ocean side environment. She also had questions about security features and that the fence was an excellent opportunity to address the public art requirement.

Vice President Ruiz wanted to know if there was buffer between McKay streets and the residents on the ground floor units.

Mr. Struthers discussed the setbacks and that the buffer for now was the landscaping. He added that there would be staff on site.

Vice President Ruiz opened public comment.

Carmen Reid believed that a new environmental report needed to be done and that a plan for complete demolition had been created before the election. She also wanted to wait until a decision had been made at the state level about adding the location to the National Historic Registry of Historic Places before demolition started, she felt that was what the public deserved.

Josh Geyer addressed that as a member of the public this had already been voted on, twice, to have this property be devoted to those in need. He was very happy to see the thought that had gone into this project and saw it as a win for dignity in the community. He added that the community was in favor of this project.

Vice President Ruiz closed public comment and opened board discussion.

Board Member Teague echoed Board Member Hom's question to see the lighting plan. He was supportive of moving this project forward provided they provide a lighting plan to the staff.

Board Member Curtis discussed the controversy around the project, and those who objected had their say and this had been voted on and approved. He was fully in support of this project.

Board Member Hom said the project was acceptable for the site. He did ask about the report that Ms. Reid had brought up.

Staff Member Dong discussed what reports had already been done.

Vice President Ruiz recommended to provide heavier planting on the ground level around windows to provide more privacy. She also cautioned against the use of bright colors and gave design recommendations for the front entryway.

Board Member Teague made a motion to approve the design review amendment with the addition of the requirement for the applicant to provide an approved, by the staff, lighting plan for the site. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion.

Board Member Hon suggested the amendments of seeing if any of the trees on the site could be preserved and look into a more decorative gate.

Staff Member Tai clarified where some of the lighting details were located and that staff would ask for a photometric plan that they would use to make sure it complied with the Dark Sky Ordinance.

Staff Member Dong also confirmed that the staff had an arborist report about the trees.

Board Member Teague insisted on seeing the photometric study, this was something the board had asked for in the past.

Board Member Hom did drop the requirement to see the arborist report if the staff already had it.

Vice President Ruiz added the condition to review the colors with the staff, it would still be staff approval. She wanted the accent colors to be more muted.

**Board Member Teague motion to approve the design review amendment with the addition of the requirements for the applicant to provide an approved, by the staff, lighting photometric plan for the site, increase base landscaping along McKay, a review of the accent colors, and to look into a more decorative gate. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.**

**7-C 2022-1865**

*Public Workshop to Review and Comment on the Draft Housing Element Update and Zoning Code Amendments to Accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the Period 2023-2031 in Compliance with State Law.*

**This item was moved to the next meeting.**

8. MINUTES

**8-A 2022-1839 - Draft Meeting Minutes - January 24, 2022**

Board Member Teague made a correction to his comment under 7-B, the word needed to be preceding.

Vice President Ruiz opened public comments.

There were no speakers.

**Board Member Curtis made a motion to approve the minutes with this correction. Board Member Rothenberg seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 5-0, Board Member Hom abstained due to his absence at the meeting.**

**8-B 2022-1840 - Draft Meeting Minutes - February 14, 2022**

Vice President clarified her comments on page 6 pertaining to Webster Street.

Vice President Ruiz opened public comment.

There were no speakers.

**Board Member Hom made a motion to approve the minutes with these corrections. Board Member Teague seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 6-0.**

9. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

**9-A 2022-1837**

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

Recent actions and decisions can be found at

<https://alameda.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5532054&GUID=B4DCFFFF-9DF4-4E9F-8CC0-A5A602849DEA&FullText=1>.

No item was pulled for a review.

**9-B 2022-1838**

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

Staff Member Tai announced that at the April 11<sup>th</sup> meeting they would bring back the Housing Element discussion, a Use Permit for special events for the vacant lot on Webster St, and a request for a Development Plan Amendment for Alameda Point Site A. He added that they anticipate cancelling the April 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS

None.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Vice President Ruiz adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.