

# **APPROVED MEETING MINUTES**

REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD  
MONDAY FEBRUARY 13, 2012  
7: 00 p.m.

1. CONVENE: 7:05 P.M.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board Member Burton
3. ROLL CALL: President Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice-President Autorino, Board members Burton, Henneberry, Knox White and Zuppan.  
  
Absent: Köster

## 4. MINUTES:

Minutes from the Regular meeting of October 24, 2011

Board member Burton explained that on page 5 of 8, the paraphrased sentences within the fourth or fifth paragraph which states, “ Mr. Thomas responded that one of the unanswered questions.... he reported that all studies would be paid for all outside studies and staff expenses” is not a full sentence. Therefore, the board would need to clarify the sentence. Also, Board member Burton stated that the sentence found on page 8 of 8 in the 2nd paragraph “President Ezzy Ashcraft mentioned to read the following summary of the three emails received supporting the project into the record.” He needed further clarification of what the summary meant.

President Ezzy Ashcraft replied that the sentence meant that the following summary of three emails received in support of the Golf Course proposal. She further stated that the Board only needs to omit “mentioned that” and then direct development, 130 homes and please vote yes were the three comments.

Board member Zuppan stated that a number of good comments were made at the meeting about the wildlife and trees planted in memoriam to which compensation was paid and it was not brought out in the minutes. She would like to see those points included in the minutes if possible.

President Ezzy Ashcraft explained that due to the fact that the meetings are recorded and made available by audio the written minutes should express the most important points and themes.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called a motion to approve the minutes. Board member Henneberry moved the October 24th minutes to be accepted as amended. 2nd by Board member Burton

and approved 4-0. 2 abstentions (Autorino and Knox White).

Minutes from the Regular meeting of November 28. 2011. (Pending)

Minutes from the Regular meeting of December 12. 2011. (Pending)

Minutes from the Regular meeting of January 9. 2012. (Pending)

Minutes from the Special Joint meeting of January 23, 2012. (Pending)

## **5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:**

None.

## **6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

### **Written Report**

#### **6-A Future Agendas**

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, addressed the Board about future agenda items. The major items discussed for the February 27th meeting will be a design review application of the Target store including the site landscape and open space plan and secondly a use permit for office use at 1830 Lincoln Avenue. The March 12th meeting will hold a workshop regarding the update on the Housing Element and a discussion on the Alameda Point Zoning Plan. On March 26th, the Board will have a hearing on the Park Street Streetscape Plan and a subdivision map on Versailles. April's meeting will discuss the Alameda Point zoning amendment and Bicycle Guidelines, the six-month review for 1051 Pacific Marina, and the final hearing on the North Park Street Code and North Park Street Code Environmental Impact Report. Mr. Thomas also stated that he would include the zoning administrator's upcoming agendas on the items.

Board member Knox White acknowledged that next meeting would include the prioritized list of city recommended transportation projects.

President Ezzy Ashcraft replied that the Alameda Countywide Transportation Project submittals for the Regional Transportation Plan are not usually available to the public and this is a perfect time to present them.

Obaid Khan, City of Alameda Supervising Civil Engineer, stated that a list will be presented at the next meeting and will include all projects submitted to the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan

#### **6-B. Report on Planning Director action on Administrative Amendment of January 9, 2012 Planning Board Condition of Approval 8.1 for Alameda Landing Retail Center Development Plan and Street Plan Amendments (PLN11-0328).**

The Administrative Amendment revised Condition 8.1 to extend the term of the restriction on sales floor area devoted to non-taxable merchandise and to clarify the circumstances under which the Condition is subject to elimination or amendment.

Mr. Thomas reported on an action taken on February 1, 2012, that came out of the January 9th hearing where the Board considered a site plan for Catellus Retail Plan and condition of approval.

Board member Autorino asked whether the Planning Director had the authority to change a decision the Board made as long as he communicated the change to the Board.

Mr. Thomas answered yes for the most part.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that the particular development agreement is not necessarily made for all developments.

Mr. Thomas replied yes that is true, this process taken is outlined in our development agreement with Catellus and the Alameda Landing Project.

Vice President Autorino replied how would changes to the regulations relative to big box development become null and void.

Mr. Thomas explained that the way it works is that Catellus agreed to establish these prohibitions on the site for a number of years and this reflects the citywide prohibition on big box stores. If the City at any point decides to amend the ordinance based on recommendations from the Planning Board and City Council, then the prohibition would not longer be in effect.

Vice President Autorino asked if there were options that the Board could take if they were not satisfied with the policy change.

Mr. Thomas stated there are two options: (1) accept the report and do nothing, in case this appeal automatically goes away and the condition replaces the one opposed; and (2) the Board can call the item for a hearing. He also stated that if the Board called for a hearing under this development, which brings together the union, Target, and Catellus. Then the union will simply keep their appeal in play because they have a hearing scheduled for February 21st before the City Council. If the Board is comfortable with the decision then all activity is done for tonight and if they are not then they will discuss the issue on February 21st.

Vice President Autorino asked if Target was ok with the change.

Mr. Thomas replied yes.

Sean Whiskerman, First VP of Catellus Development Corporation, stated that since the last meeting, the company met with the union and Target and they collectively agree with the wording and the overall results.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked the Board if they were aware of provisions that say Target can come back before the Board if at some point in the future they felt there was cause for

an adjustment to be made.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that the item was for public notice; no vote is necessary.

**7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None.

**8. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**8-A. Change to Order of Agenda**

Mr. Thomas stated that the Board must comply with the Sunshine Ordinance, which means the Board must amend their rules and procedures to include public comment at the end of the agenda whereas public comment is already noted at the beginning.

Vice President Autorino asked whether the public could comment on any topic.

Mr. Thomas replied the public could make a comment that is not on the meeting's agenda.

President Ezzy Ashcraft brought a motion to adopt an amendment to Section D of the Planning Board Rules and Procedures where the Board would add a second oral communication agenda item after the board communications and before the meeting's adjournment.

The motion was moved by Board member Burton. 2nd by Board member Autorino. Approved 5-1.

Mr. Thomas stated that this is the last opportunity for the public to raise issues regarding Alameda Landing.

**9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:**

**9-A. PLN11-0310- 2004 Clinton Avenue** -The project consists of the construction of a two-story, duplex with approximately 3,638-square feet of conditioned floor area and an attached 4-car garage. The project is located on a vacant lot within an R-4 (Neighborhood Residential) zoning district.

Mr. Thomas gave an overview of the project's design proposal along with a Power Point Presentation. He gave the Board four options to act upon based on staff's recommendations: (1) the Board can accept the staff's recommendation; (2) the Board can approve the project with additional conditions; (3) the Board can deny the project; and (4) the board can continue the hearing and direct staff to work with the applicant to modify the plans, then bring the revised plans back for review.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for questions and comments from the Board.

Vice President Autorino stated that he went to visit the property and he asked if the back end of the house is up to the grassy area or over the grassy area. Mr. Thomas stated that the back end of the house goes to the edge of the grass.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked whether the house that burned down on the site had a unit at the back of the building.

Leslie Shubin, resident of 2000 Clinton Avenue, explained that there was no unit behind the house.

Board member Henneberry asked about the difference in square footage from the old house to the new proposed development.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal is substantially larger since the older house was a 2-bedroom unit and the new proposal is a 3-bedroom unit.

Board member Knox White asked about the parcel's history.

Mr. Thomas replied that the new owner purchased the property after the original house burned. The new owner approached the City and explained that he wanted to build in the same configuration as the previous home. The Planning Department then told him that he would not be able to build in the desired configuration because there was an easement on the seawall. The property owner then came back with a different configuration where both units would be under one building, the house would be narrower, and parking would be provided on either side of the house. Under that configuration, the house would require two curb cuts, but the City couldn't allow two curb cuts for a single property.

Dick Rutter, Alameda based architect and resident of 2205 Clinton Avenue, stated that he disagreed with the design proposal and more thought should go into the revision, especially with the parking design.

Christopher Buckley, VP of the Alameda Architectural Preservation Society, presented a letter on behalf of the organization. He explained that the organization believed that the design needs major revision and the building proposal is not compatible with the rest of the neighboring buildings and does not comply with the City Council's design review manual, the Guide for Residential Design. He also explained that the drawings lacked sufficient details and the two floor plans need further clarification.

Leslie Shubin, neighbor to the project applicant, stated that her residence's dimensions are 30' feet wide by 45' feet deep and the 2004 Clinton Avenue proposal goes back 63' feet. Thus, the proposed house will block her sunlight and view of the lagoon towards the East. She explained that there is a way to modify the proposal without interfering with her house and she does not believe that the proposed design will fit well with the neighborhood.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for the Board to comment and asked the Board to call for a motion to continue the discussion about the proposal.

Board member Burton stated that he appreciated staff's design alternatives and the public's comments on the design analysis. He believed the design must comply with the scale of the neighborhood stating the difference in the relative depth in comparison to the neighboring properties. He feels that the parking spaces do not comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Vice President Autorino questioned how the project met the design review parameters based on staffs' findings.

Mr. Thomas stated the planning department reviewed the design and mistakes were made, that is why it is so important to have a hearing called.

Board member Henneberry stated that the square footage looks about 2x as large as the new design proposal and he called for the proposal to go back for review and modification.

Board member Knox White asked why the applicant didn't come tonight.

Mr. Thomas stated that the applicant didn't come because he was quite frustrated with the process and he was willing to make changes, but he wants to construct at least 2-3-bedroom units.

Board member Knox White asked if there is a reason for the Board to continue to review the project and have staff work with the applicant without denying the entire application and having him resubmit the application.

Mr. Thomas stated the Board's best option was to not take action on the project that night, but continue with the item along with directions similar to what Board member Burton and staff suggested.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked if there is a psychological affect of having the project denied. She was ultimately aware of how sensitive the project was to the applicant, community members, and neighbors.

Board member Knox White suggested that the Board discuss the design review process in the summer and see if the process could be streamlined. He also would like to see the board member who called the project for review included in the staff report. Furthermore, he would like the staff report to include the project's history and the original footprint.

Vice President Autorino stated that in the past the City brought in architectural assistance to help applicants. He wanted to know if staff had enough bandwidth to assist applicants with the redesign proposal.

Mr. Thomas replied that staff has the expertise and time to improve the plan and they can use the material and advice of qualified volunteers in Alameda. He went on to explain that staff worked with an architect that was known from a previous Park Street project to help an applicant that was having design issues. The staff used the applicant's money that was deposited to the Planning Department to assist with the design.

President Ezzy Ashcraft replied that it is important to have a one-on-one meeting with the applicant and walk the property with him. She asked Farimah Faiz, City Deputy Attorney, to describe the call for review process.

Ms. Faiz stated that their practice hasn't been to include more detail when a board member calls a project for review, but she will go back and look at the City's code in order to incorporate more detail.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that for the record the City asked the Planning Board to approve the project without attachments, she then went to city hall to review the plans and she explained to staff that she couldn't sign off on the project and the project should come to the Board for review.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for the Board to make a motion to continue reviewing the project and require staff to help the applicant make revisions.

Motion called by Board member Knox White. 2nd by Board member Henneberry. Approved 6-0.

**9-B. A Public Hearing to Take Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the North Park Street Code and the Draft North Park Street Code.**

Mr. Thomas gave a brief report about the North Park Street Code Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and Draft North Park Street Code. He explained that the meeting was for noting public comments on both the DEIR and code and staff would be taking public comments on the DEIR until February 20th. By April, the Board would be able to review the Final Environmental Impact Report, which would include the public comments and the final version of the North Park Street Code.

Board member Knox White asked if the code would streamline the entitlement process, basically if the applicant met the guidelines then it would be significantly cheaper and simpler to develop, but if the applicant were to go outside of the guidelines it would be much more difficult.

Mr. Thomas agreed and explained that the idea of the code is for someone to be able to look at it and apply the code to their property by knowing exactly what the City is looking for such as the type of building, shape of building and architectural treatments. The guidelines are more of a form-based code unlike a traditional zoning code that tells applicants what the City does not want.

Board member Knox White asked whether the proposed process of approval is easier for applicants.

Mr. Thomas stated the process will make it easier for the applicants by: (1) giving the applicants so much detail about how to design the building to where the review should be straight forward; (2) requiring zoning uses, where the planning department won't review applicants based on permitted uses, but staff will try to limit the conditionally permitted uses

as much as possible.

Board member Knox White referred to page 9 of the North Park Street Environmental Impact Report, under the Land Use Assumption section and asked if that was based on the number of employees.

Mr. Thomas stated no that is the estimated job growth for that area that is consistent with the City's General Plan.

Vincent Wu, business and property owner of Oak Street and Pacific Avenue, fully supports staff's recommendation.

Karen Bey, Alameda resident, approved the project and she believes it will help the City of Alameda attract more visitors. She would like to see this code expanded throughout the community and wondered whether the historic train stations and Neptune Beach District will go through the same process. She also stated that it would be great to find grant money to install markers in the districts once they are established. Furthermore, she asked how the properties were selected and how the properties were determined for mixed-use or live/work. Finally, she asked about parking requirements, especially since some of the existing homes in the communities are in the historical listing and have physical constraints.

Lisa Sweet, certified sustainable building adviser, recommended that the City make planning decisions based on sustainability. She also mentioned that the Clinton Avenue project should employ professional assistance in a sustainable point of view. Lastly, she asked Mr. Thomas if the City adopted the CalGreen Tier 1 provision and she suggested that staff hand out the Green point rated checklist to the Clinton Avenue property owner.

Christopher Buckley stated that his organization submitted comments to the draft code in the middle of March and June of last year. He noticed that the latest draft reflects very little of his organization's comments, so he asked staff to clarify whether they are still reviewing the comments. He wished to schedule a meeting with staff to discuss the comments before the final draft comes before the Board.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked staff to answer Karen Bey's questions.

Andrew Thomas stated that the Alameda Architectural Preservation Society and the community reviewed the City's map and presented comments on recommended sites. He explained the last Board meeting went through the map areas. There was an issue regarding the residential developments since a lot of the area behind Park Street is zoned R-4 and R-5, which allows businesses in that district and there is a lot of land that is zoned for manufacturing and are nonconforming uses. So, staff created two zone classifications: (1) classic residential; and (2) mixed-use and there are two types of mixed-use districts based on building form. He further stated that based on the City's parking requirements, new residential construction will refer to the zoning code. However, many residential units don't have two required parking spots, so if a property owner doesn't have a two car garage today, that makes the property a legal nonconforming use and there is no penalty.

Margaret Kavanaugh-Lynch, Planning Services Manager, stated that if a property owner had



a change of use and staff would need to reconsider the parking for whatever reason, then staff would look at the building type. If the building were a 100-year-old building, then staff would apply discretion to address the parking standards.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for the Board to make comments on the North Park Street Code Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Board member Knox White stated that one of the things that the environmental impact report has to do is fit into the regional planning framework. He explained that in regards to the housing portion for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments' (ABAG) Sustainable Community Strategy, the Environmental Impact Report doesn't seem to address how housing will be constructed in the Priority Development Areas. Also, the housing numbers seemed to be quite low and based on historical growth. He also commented on the document's overall format, where the findings are highlighted in some sections and in other sections it is not and he found the document difficult to read. He referred to section D6, the Mitigation for Storm Water Utilities, where it says the plan will result in a reduction of storm water runoff, but if development exceeds the assumptions, meaning if a development which is bigger than noted in the document is built then that would be trigger new thresholds and the City would have to write a new EIR.

Mr. Thomas replied that if he essentially took all the development projections on page 9 and build all of that out staff would have done enough analysis that they believe the City's sewer and storm water systems could handle that and staff has it broken down essentially by block. Also, staff has setup a system where a developer can submit an application and staff can immediately see the capacity assumed for the block and know if the applicant is fine in terms of sewer and storm water. If the applicant jeopardizes the sewer and storm water capacity, then staff would study the proposal.

Board member Knox White referred to the Transportation Mitigation Levels Of Service section. Based on the corridors of transit, the corridors are not defined in the level of service analysis and they do not follow the guidelines for transit corridors, which would be to look at two stops on either side of the transit area in order to expand the corridor as long as possible. Secondly, he couldn't find whether the automobile arterial segments levels of service were analyzed. Thirdly, he explained the bicycle analysis was fine, but the pedestrian portion of the analysis is incorrect because the analysis was looking at the average delay per person, in all directions at Park Street and Blanding Avenue. When referring to section IV-E21, the average pedestrian delay was 16 seconds, which seems to quick. So, there are issues with the cumulative pedestrian times. Regarding the Mitigation section, he noted that Mitigation 3 is completely out of compliance when referring to section 4.4.2.F of the General Plan. The first recommended mitigation does not have a TDM selected except unless the City does not do all the other TDMs. Fourthly, he stated the analysis that allows what is proposed for a mitigation is not in compliance with the General Plan, which says that no mitigations in an environmental impact report can be proposed if it degrades the pedestrian and bicycle levels of service. He doesn't see the level of service shown, but he knows that the mitigations will increase crossing times in the middle of the business district and it seems the plan is to propose all along Park Street what has been done at Encinal Avenue and Park Street. Furthermore, he pointed out the recommendations

that were for the Northern Waterfront EIR in order to handle capacity seems to become mitigations for this plan as well. He would like to know that this plan is triggering those needs in and of itself, or the proportion of the project costs seem to be geared towards the very large development numbers generated by the Northern Waterfront and what is being proposed on Park Street. In addition, the mitigation acknowledges that the project costs sharing whether it's TDM or whichever is not just coming out of just the North Park Street Project. Lastly, the Green House Gas Mitigations section, the transportation Mitigation 3 doesn't seem to reduce vehicle miles traveled. He continued to note under IVK-7 it's important for the City to apply a minimum number of bicycle parking spots per building for the mitigation rather than propose 1 bicycle space for every new business that has 10 car spaces.

Board member Zuppan stated that she appreciated that the cumulative impact was being taken into account, especially Caltrans work on I-880.

Board member Burton stated that he wanted to comment on the North Park Street Draft Code's transportation and the bicycle sections. He felt there were issues of bicycle assess and accommodating bicycles in the zone and staff has not addressed this aspect in the code. When referring to the Waterfront District pages 35-36, the street section is illustrated, but bicycle lanes are not shown. Also, the code does not mention the Alameda Bicycle Plan and Guidelines. He goes on to state that the pedestrian and bicycle facilities only have two lines in the parking section and parking requirements. He felt the pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be in the very beginning and should be much more expansive. Referring to the Architectural design standards and guidelines, he was encouraged by the form-based code and he felt the code should only regulate the building and circulation patterns that encourage pedestrian scale development. Regarding the Green Buildings Guidelines section of the North Park Street Code Environmental Impact Report, he was surprised that there was no reference in the section of the code to other city requirements such as CalGreen, Bay Landscaping Guidelines, Build It Green Guidelines, and the Zero Waste ordinance.

Mr. Thomas stated that staff would look at the code and come back to the Board in April with the revisions. He pointed out that Board member Knox White made important comments to the environmental impact report's traffic section and he would like the Board to look at the Green House Gas section of the report because the traffic and green house gas analyses are closely linked. He explained that staff has tried to put a finer analysis on the alternatives chapter and there are two areas in the environmental impact report where staff found significant unavoidable impacts: (1) an increase in automobile traffic and (2) an increase in green house gases due to automobile traffic. He went on to say that in the alternatives chapter, staff found ways to make the North Park Street Code more sustainable and create less of an environmental impact. Staff also looked at the pros and cons of trying to push the code further on with some of the green initiatives and they analyzed what that would mean relative to other districts in Alameda. In response to Board member Burton's comments, Mr. Thomas explained that the design review has guidelines meaning they are not code so the developer should try to match their project to the scale of the neighboring house and staff is looking at the last 40 pages of the North Park Street Code as architectural guidelines. Also, staff is determining whether the guidelines should be adopted as code or

adopted as guidelines, and whether the guidelines should be part of the citywide design guidelines.

President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to Executive Summary page II-3 in order to understand if sidewalks would be constructed on Tilden Way as part of this project.

Andrew Thomas replied this is part of the zoning code so a developer comes to find there isn't a sidewalk along the frontage must build one.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked staff if they plan to expand sustainable design and green building standards citywide. She also referred to the pedestrian plan in the Environmental Impact Report's Transportation and Circulation section IVE-2, regarding walkable sidewalks in areas. Board member Ashcraft explained that she would like to make Times Way into a pedestrian only thoroughfare. She believes many pedestrians use this as a short cut off of Park Street when the traffic is slow and the path connects the Civic Center to Park Street. In the Environmental Impact Report's Land Use and Public Policy, page IV-A4 she raised an issue about having childcare centers located on Park Street north of Lincoln Avenue. Finally, regarding policy 2.5.1 she considered the plans to be an important principal for the community.

Board member Knox White stated that the code is a great model for moving the City forward and he believed that the architectural design standards and guidelines should be held as guidelines.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated public comment could be made up until February 20th for the North Park Street Code Environmental Impact Report and comments for the North Park Street Code can be made until the next hearing, which is April.

**9-C. Review and Comment on Staff's Responses to the Regional Sustainable Communities Strategy – Alternative Scenarios.**

Mr. Thomas stated this is a status report and staff has kept the Board and City Council up to speed on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) and the Associated Bay Area Governments' (ABAG) regional planning effort. He went on to say that the plan would have long-term effects on the City's housing allocations as well as state and regional funding for transportation and housing. He felt that the Focused Growth Scenario is the City's preferred scenario, but the biggest issue in Alameda is how housing affects the City's traffic levels. Yet, all the scenarios aggressively require more housing, which exceeds the City's General Plan projections.

Board member Knox White asked whether staff is looking for feedback from the Board in order to provide the comments to ABAG and MTC before they announce the preferred scenario.

Mr. Thomas replied yes.

Board member Knox White stated that the biggest issue with the five alternative scenarios is that they don't provide any alternatives to anything because the outcomes are within a 1% difference of each other. Ultimately, the preferred scenario is the initial vision, which he believes staff should challenge. He encouraged the City to be careful about only talking about job creation and to not forget the other regional issues.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated on page 5 staff talked about Alameda Point in terms of acres and there are a lot, but when broken down to what is usable land there is not much. She would like to know if the City would be forced to comply with the scenario.

Mr. Thomas replied that under Senate Bill 375 the regional bodies would create a planning effort that cities and counties can or cannot participate in. If the city or county chose not to participate in the regional strategy then there would be limited regional money for the city or county.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked if there is any protection from this regional strategy. She illustrated a lawsuit that occurred amongst the City of Alameda and the city of Oakland in 2003. The city of Oakland sued Alameda based on the City's General Plan amendment, which would allow a large number of housing units built onto Alameda Point. The city of Oakland cited increased traffic in Oakland's Chinatown District as the main outcome from allowing housing on Alameda Point. Board member Ashcraft also inquired about the status of the Oakland Chinatown Advisory Committee, which was formed from the settlement of the lawsuit.

Mr. Thomas replied that the City couldn't meet housing numbers without financial support for their infrastructure systems. Therefore, the regional bodies would have to financially provide for transportation and housing. He goes on to say that Northern Waterfront, Alameda Point, and Alameda Landing require infrastructure improvements and the City cannot be sued by neighboring jurisdictions every time they attempt to provide housing. In terms of the Chinatown Committee, Staff Khan is the point person for that committee.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked if the City is looking island wide for building job sites.

Mr. Thomas stated this question is definitely on staff's mind and will be included in the Housing Element.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for public comment.

Bill Smith, member of Renewed Hope, stated that the City's focus is to provide housing or jobs and that causes a rift in the jobs and housing balance. Ultimately, he advocates for denser residential development.

Lisa Sweet stressed the importance of how cars dictate green house gas emissions and sustainability.

## Goals Stated in the Recent Community Process.

Jennifer Ott, Chief Operating Officer for Alameda Point, gave an update on the staff report. Currently staff is considering a zoning amendment for the entire base and they want to make sure the guiding principal is based on what the community wants. The next steps are to develop a plan for the proposed 5.5 million square feet of commercial development and 1,400 housing units. She reported that in late 2010 the City held community forums with specific topical presentations for community input. Staff consolidated the comments into a summary report. Ultimately, the community's priorities will guide staff as they begin to work development advisors or private partners in the future. She also stated that staff is looking at terms of disposition as a phase or incremental approach. Lastly, the current zoning for Alameda Point is Heavy Industrial or M-2 with a government overlay, which works in some areas, but staff should zone accordingly in other parts of the parcel in order to be more opportunistic.

Mr. Thomas stated that the 2003 General Plan amendment for Alameda Point was made specifically for the City of Alameda to integrate the reuse plan into the General Plan. He explained that staff must look at the reuse plan and General Plan or base zoning and if possible find funding to complete an environmental impact report in order to position parts of the employment areas of Alameda Point in the same way as Harbor Bay was positioned.

Ms. Ott replied that they are in the process of hiring a consultant to assist with the process but most of the work will be conducted in house. However, she explained that objective of this meeting was to introduce the concept and receive feedback from the Board.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for public comment.

Bill Smith, Alameda resident, stated that he liked the Alameda Point process and was glad to see the community's input included. He felt that the top choices found in the community survey were (1) open space; 2) affordable housing; and (3) historical preservation and housing was a big part of the project. He encouraged the Board to think big within the documents and use the Housing Element to create opportunity for Alameda Point.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that the second workshop on the Housing Element and Alameda Point would take place on March 12th and staff is working hard to get the housing element fast tracked.

Jim Strehlow, Alameda resident, stated that he wants the City to focus on economic development and the City hasn't helped with developing commercial activity. He asked if the City had any incentives to encourage business growth.

Ms. Ott replied that staff received input from perspective tenants about the City's typical practice of only allowing short-term leases and that has been the City's policy in the past given the uncertainty of the redevelopment plan. So, part of the zoning and disposition strategy is for the City and staff to discuss approving longer-term deals in certain parts of Alameda Point to incentivize investment. Currently, the City incentivizes commercial investment through rental credit.

Mr. Thomas stated there is a fundamental change in the mindset in terms of approaching Alameda Point. From 2000-2010 the City was under contract with a master developer 1 of (2) and the Master development agreement stated that the developer would have control over the base, but the developer would have to consult with the community in terms of planning. So, staff's approach in the mean time would be to enter into short-term leases, thus making it difficult for any tenant to invest money into the property. By 2010, staff and the City started to think about long-term leases and staff is trying to get the word out to the development and business communities that Alameda Point is available.

Ms. Ott stated that this is intended to be an economic development strategy to attract jobs and that process will inform the zoning amendment and disposition strategies. Ultimately, there will be an iterative process going forward.

Karen Bey stated that she was concerned that the City would lock itself into long-term agreements that would be difficult to get out of once the right businesses come along.

Ms. Ott explained that she does agree and she doesn't think long-term agreements should be applied throughout the base. She stated that the historical districts would be a point for adaptive reuse and designated for long-term leases. Overall, staff is thinking strategically on where they place the long-term leases.

President Ezzy Ashcraft called for Board comments.

Board member Henneberry stated that he agreed with the strategy, which allows the reintegration of the base with the City.

Board member Knox White asked if the findings and goals from the last public summary could be retrieved easily.

Ms. Ott replied that the summary could be found in the April 6, 2011, ARRA meeting and the meeting's link is available online.

Board member Knox White stated that it would be good to start the March 12th meeting with a discussion on the assumptions coming out of the findings.

Ms. Ott replied that staff would attach the summary to the March 12 staff report.

Board member Knox White stated while developing zoning flexibility is the absolute objective, staff should design a mix of uses that allow the City to be flexible with whatever markets occur.

#### 10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

Mr. Thomas spoke about the Sunshine ordinance. He circulated the training CD, hard copy of the ordinance, planning board rule and procedures, and provided the City of Alameda

Attendance Guidelines for Boards and Commissioners.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that an email was sent to the Board about three seminars for California planning commissioners coming up within the next few months.

Board member Knox White stated that he would like staff to conduct a presentation on the prioritized transportation projects that were submitted to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Regional Transportation Plan.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

NONE.

13. ADJOURNMENT: 10:56 PM