

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2009  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL  
2263 SANTA CLARA AVENUE – 7:00 PM**

President Kohlstrand called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

FLAG SALUTE: Board member Autorino

ROLL CALL:  
**PRESENT:** President Kohlstrand, Board members Autorino, Cunningham. and Cook were present upon roll call. Vice-President Ezzy Ashcraft and Board member McNamara arrived during the meeting.

**ABSENT:** Board member Lynch.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager/Secretary to the Planning Board; Assistant City Attorney Mohammed Hill; Planner Dennis Brighton; Nancy McPeak, Executive Assistant/Recording Secretary

**MINUTES:**

Minutes from the meeting of December 8, 2008 (pending)  
Minutes from the meeting of January 12, 2009 (pending)

5. **AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:**

NONE

6. **STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

**Written Report**

**6-A. Future Agendas**

Staff provided an update on upcoming Planning Board agenda items.

**6-B Zoning Administrator Report**

The Zoning Administrator meeting of January 20, 2009 was canceled.

7. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

- \* Anyone may address the Board on a topic not on the agenda under this item by submitting a speaker's information slip, subject to the 5-minute time limit.

NONE

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. Boatworks Project – 2229 Clement - Environmental Review Scoping Session** – The City of Alameda Planning Board will be holding a scoping session to provide an opportunity for the public and responsible agencies to comment on the issues that should be considered in the environmental evaluation for the proposed Boatworks Project located at 2229 Clement Avenue, Alameda California. (AT).  
**This item is for discussion purposes only. No action will be taken at this meeting.**

Staff presented a Power Point presentation outlining the major points of the project and the scoping session.

President Kohlstrand asked staff to give a brief explanation of the Density Bonus Ordinance.

Staff responded that the State of California statutes require all cities and counties to adopt density bonus ordinances. The law provides that local government shall grant density bonuses to housing developers who agree to construct units affordable to lower income households. The City of Alameda is currently drafting a Density Bonus Ordinance. The incentives or concessions are not monetary but could be exceptions to certain zoning requirements.

Board member Cook asked what incentives the City of Alameda is required to allow.

Staff responded that the developer gets to decide what the concessions will be and the City needs to grant the request although monetary payment is not available. Should the project need a height exception or set back exception those types of items could be granted.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that there are exceptions to the granting of concessions to the developer if you can show specific adverse impact upon public health and safety or physical environment. Another exception exists if the property is listed in the California Registry of Historical Resources.

Staff stated that the goal is to get the EIR process scoped out tonight and started and return to the Planning Board in early March with the Draft Density Bonus.

Board member Cunningham asked staff if the Density Bonus Ordinance would apply to this project.

Staff responded that it could.

Board member Autorino asked what area the specific site encompasses.

Staff responded that the site is on Clement Avenue between Oak Street and Elm Street and down to the estuary.

Board member Cook noticed that there are boats and docks on the site plan and wondered if that is part of the project or just added to the plan for aesthetics.

Staff responded that it was originally proposed as part of the project but was removed from the plans.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft requested staff address the issues down along the water regarding the Army Corps. of Engineers.

Staff responded that there are some issues that need to be investigated and clarified along the waterfront that will be done through the project review and EIR process. The property line is back from the waters edge and the Army Corps. of Engineers owns the waters edge and there are a number of structures and facilities that are crumbling into the water. The clean up of the waters edge is a priority. When it gets done and how it gets done and whom the responsibility lies on is an important issue.

Board member Cunningham moved and Board member McNamara seconded the motion to limit speaker time to three minutes. Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated she believed the five-minute time limit was more appropriate for this item. The motion passed with the following voice vote Ayes: 4; Noes: 2; Absent: 1 Abstain: 0 (Ezzy Ashcraft, Cook).

The public hearing was opened.

Joseph Woodard, Estuary Park Action Committee (EPAC) member, spoke against the project. He is concerned with the zoning of the area. One half of the site is zoned for housing and the other half for a park. The proposed project takes the entire site for housing. There are clean up issues at the site and a portion of the property is

contaminated by creosote work and there was once a 6,000 gallon petroleum tank on the site and no studies have been done. He is also concerned with the stability of the site in the event of an earthquake. He stated that there could be hazards in the removal of the existing buildings and the new building could possibly pollute the estuary. Mr. Woodard is concerned with the extent of traffic and pedestrian safety in the area and would like to see the site used for public recreation citing it would compliment the downtown area that is very park poor. He wonders how the project will mesh with the General Plan and the North of Lincoln Plan. The project would deny access to the shoreline and should involve the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). He mentioned that height of the structures has not been discussed. The economic impact with the loss of developer fees and concessions could total \$7.5 million dollars. He suggested that the City of Alameda contact the Bay Area Open Space Council to see about funding for a park/open space project. Mr. Woodard questioned where the \$1 million dollars set aside for the park project has gone.

Dan Smith allocated his time to Joseph Woodard.

Dorothy Freeman, Estuary Park Action Committee (EPAC) member, spoke against the project stating that she is pleased that the developer is proposing to put single family homes and duplexes on the site. Although she is not pleased that the housing plan includes the 4.5 acres zoned for the park and the over all density of the project. The City of Alameda has planned the Oak St Estuary Park since 1991 General Plan. She stated that her neighborhood is in need of a park and the parks at Alameda Point do not help the residents in this area. The park would serve all Alameda resident and is the last open space on the estuary to build a park aside from Alameda Point. She is against the developer's proposal to use the Density Bonus Ordinance to secure concessions and funding for the project and believes the City of Alameda should initiate the Quimby Law that would require the developer to donate land to the City for the park. EPAC would like to remind the City of the 2002 preliminary geotechnical investigation that reported high levels of contamination on the Fox portion of the property and there is not reason to believe that the pollution is not all over the site. She concurred with Mr. Woodard on the traffic issues in the area. Requested that the scenic view be listed as an issue and how the buildings will affect the current residents views.

Shirley Smith spoke against the project stating that the neighborhood is made up of Victorian and Craftsman style homes and this high density project would adversely affect property values in the area. She is concerned that the City of Alameda does not have adequate city services to accommodate the additional residents and suggested the City look for other uses for the site, possibly a trade school or athletic club. She would like the owner of the property to tear down the buildings and fence the property to keep vandals out.

Chris Lundeen is undecided on the project and lives in the immediate area. He believes that a housing development on the site will make the area nicer although is not certain if this project is the best choice due to the density. He mentioned that there is a lot of noise that comes from the processing plant across the estuary and hopes a disclosure

regarding that will be given to potential homeowners. He agrees that the project needs more open space and is concerned with the pollution to the estuary caused by the parking area.

Leonard Goode of Ron Goode Motors, spoke in support of the project. He is the owner of property at Park Street and Clement Avenue that he is planning on developing in to a retail business and is concerned over the lack of population density in the area and the vacant retail spaces on Part Street. He believes that approval of the project would greatly benefit in the redevelopment of the vacant properties in the area. Lastly he commended the developer for building the project.

Sue Field spoke against the project lives in the immediate area and is concerned about the traffic citing that there are only going to be two ways out of the complex, Clement Avenue and Blanding Avenue. Ms. Field mentioned that currently it takes her five minutes in the morning to get on to Clement Avenue from Elm Street and cannot imagine how the project will affect the traffic. She is concerned with the parking in the area also fearing that the proposal doesn't address the issue properly. She would like to see the site turned into an area similar to Union Point Park along the Estuary in Oakland which has walking trails and wildlife.

Woody Minor, Alameda Architectural Preservation Society member spoke against the project. He stated that the building is the oldest large industrial building still on the estuary. He suggested that the Planning Board and other interested parties tour the buildings and the site. He believes that the building is a hidden landmark and magnificent inside.

Staff responded that the building is private property and a visit would need to be cleared with the owner. Staff will contact the owner with the request.

Robert McGillis, applicant, spoke in support of the project. He stated that as the project moves forward in the EIR process will be identifying the issues and working to mitigate them. He thanked the audience for their interest in the project and made himself available for any questions.

Katie Stewart is undecided on the project although looks forward to the development of the site because it is such an eyesore. She is concerned with levels of contamination at the site and the potential for pollution during the demolition phase. She would like to see the construction site as green and sustainable as possible and that the neighbors be kept involved in the decision process for the site.

Dong Kim is undecided on the project he is glad to see the site developed as a neighbor and agrees with the previously mentioned traffic issues and is concerned with the DEIR and whether it will address the impact the project will have on the school district and the City of Alameda infrastructure. He believes that the site is technically a Brownsfield Development and should be treated as such in respect to testing and clean up. He requested that the public be keep informed of the agencies involved in the project and

provided a list so that citizens can find out first hand the test results. He would like to see a "Best Management" approach be used during construction with respect to noise and dust. He believes that design and aesthetics are key to the project and would like to see the public access change to be more inviting. Also mentioned was that the General Plan conformance calls for park use and medium density development and the developer should not be allowed to step away from that goal.

Jean Sweeney Estuary Park Action Committee (EPAC) member spoke against the project. She objects to the density of the project. She would like to find out who she should get in touch with in the City of Alameda to write a Grant to try and get funding for the Estuary Park project.

Jim Sweeney Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) member spoke against the project and agrees with the previously voiced concerns. He urges the City of Alameda to be as thorough as possible with the investigation of the contamination and make the developer follow through with the clean up.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Cook commended the public for their interest in the project. She is concerned with the circulation of the site and would like alternatives looked at that would conform better with the grid that Alameda has possibly extending Oak Street and Elm Street down to the estuary and have Blanding Avenue go through the site. The extensions would help spread the traffic and give the residents of the City a visual and physical access to the water. She stated that the site plan is very constricting and not keeping with the neighborhood. She expressed her concern about the integrity of the sea wall and the toxicity levels of the estuary water. She agrees that there is a need for a park in the civic core of Alameda. She sees a need to look into the impact of the lights at the football field down the street from the project. She commented that it is going to be difficult to analyze the impact the project will have on traffic due to the fact that it is so bad in the area already. She is concerned with the affect of the Park Street Bridge noise on the future residents. She stated that she would like to take a tour of the existing buildings and the site area.

Board member McNamara stated that she shares the concerns that the citizens and Board member Cook have voiced. She would like to see more waterfront access and open space on the site. She requested staff to address the status of the contamination on the site.

Staff responded that there would need to be a complete understanding on what the former conditions of the property are. It has been mentioned that the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) has an approved clean up plan for the site and it is substantially complete although it has not been forwarded to staff. Staff will need to go back and investigate what DTSC and the Water Quality Board have done and then go forward to complete what needs to be done such as performing soil and ground water

testing. The City of Alameda will not approve a project without all of those issues resolved.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she shares the concerns that have been previously voiced. She mentioned that even though the site is not included in the Park Street North of Lincoln Strategic Plan she would like the developer to work with that project to ensure cohesiveness with that plan. She stated that the pedestrian walkway could be better. She would like the design of the homes to fit in with the current residences in the area and not “neo moderne” as referred to in the architect’s letter. She is concerned that there are not many amenities in the immediate area, which would possibly require residents to drive more frequently. She wants the low-income exclusionary housing dispersed throughout the development and not segregated in one specific area.

Board member Cunningham agreed with the public’s concern over increased traffic in the area. He also sees the contamination and clean up as a very important issue with the site. He agrees that the property needs to be improved and would like to see alternative uses for the site with less density.

Staff responded that talks have been taking place with the developer to look at alternative ways to plan the site such as reconfiguring the open space to make it larger and orient it so there is access from Clement Avenue.

Board member Cunningham voiced concern that the City of Alameda may get restricted by their own policies concerning the density bonus and would like to see the City work with the developer to design the site so it works for everyone. He is wondering if there is a way to stay with the General Plan and put in a park and restrict the number of units thus saving the City money through a decrease in residents and a decrease in the cost of city services then that money saved could be redirected to build a park. The community wants to see items in the General Plan come to reality and the City needs to work towards that.

Staff commented that it would be very difficult to determine the cost savings.

Board member Cook asked if there could be an economic analysis included in the EIR.

President Kohlstrand responded that it doesn’t necessarily need to be done in the EIR but could be done independently and then inform the environmental process.

Staff is looking at alternatives and at least one is a no project alternative with two scenarios. The first being a no build alternative. The other is a no project meaning it develops under the current General Plan and zoning and to look at the financial feasibility of the alternative.

Board member Cunningham is also concerned with the impact on the character of the neighborhood.

Board member Autorino shares the concerns brought up by the board members. He sees this project as an opportunity to get rid of the industrial buildings and get people and houses on the water. He feels that whatever is on the property it must maximize the waterfront.

President Kohlstrand stated that the members of the public and the board members have articulated the issues that need to be addressed in the EIR. She would like to see the City work with the property owner and the community to ensure that something happens on the site. She suggested that a community workshop be held to discuss alternatives for the site. She stated that something does need to happen to the site to revitalize the neighborhood.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft mentioned that the City and residents need to realize that the property is owned by an individual and there needs to be a balance between the owners interest and the City's interest. She believes there will be a better overall outcome if everyone works together. She agreed that it would be nice if it could be parkland but the City does not have the resources at this time to make that a reality and someone other than the City owns the property.

Board member Autorino stated that he has taken a boundary tour of the site and would be very interested to see the inside of the building because it may help with suggesting alternatives for the site.

#### 10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft reported that the City of Alameda will be holding a workshop on Green Building/Bay Friendly Landscape on Tuesday, January 27, 2009 at the Library from 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

#### 11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

*Board members may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or make a brief report on his or her activities. In addition, the Board may provide a referral to staff or other resources for factual information, request staff to report back to the body at a subsequent meeting concerning a City matter or, through the chair, direct staff to place a request to agendaize a matter of business on a future agenda.*

Board member Cook asked if anyone knew what was going to be build on the property in Oakland just over the High Street Bridge. The site was once covered with large containers, which have been removed. Board member McNamara stated that she had heard that it was a restaurant supply distribution center. Staff will look into the question.

President Kohlstrand mentioned she has the brochure for the upcoming 2009 National Planners Conference if anyone is interested. She also acknowledged the passing of former Planning Board President Mel Sanderson for his contributions to the City of Alameda.



12. ADJOURNMENT:

8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary  
City Planning Board

This meeting was audio and video taped.