

City of Albany

Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes March 27, 2013 Meeting

Note: These minutes are subject to Planning and Zoning Commission approval. The minutes are not verbatim. An audiotape of the meeting is available for public review.

Regular Meeting

- 1. CALL TO ORDER-** The meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order by Chair Eisenmann in the City Council Chambers at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday March 27, 2013.

Chair Eisenmann mentioned that there were speaker cards in the back for those who wished to speak.

- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

- 3. ROLL CALL**

Present: Arkin, Donaldson, Eisenmann, Moss

Absent: Pilch

Staff present: City Planner Anne Hersch

Community Development Director Jeff Bond

- 4. NEW BUSINESS**

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted by one motion. By approval of the Consent Calendar, the staff recommendations will be adopted unless otherwise modified by the Commission. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Commission Member or a member of the audience requests removal of the items from the Consent Calendar.)

- A. General Plan Update Review & Presentation** – This is the first in a series of Planning and Zoning Commission Study Sessions on the Albany 2035 General Plan Update. This Study Session will include an overview of the General Plan Update work program and schedule, a summary of the legal requirements for the General Plan, and a recap of the existing (1992) General Plan. The Commission will be convening Study Sessions on the Plan for the next 14 months, with the goal of producing an updated General Plan and Environmental Impact Report by Summer 2014. Each meeting will include an opportunity for public comment.

Recommendation: This item is a study session and no Commission action is required.

Barry Miller, General Plan consultant- noted this would be the first of anywhere from 8-12 study sessions they will hold over the course of the next year and a half on the

1 General Plan. Miller provided an introduction to the plan and gave an overview of
2 the current plan as well as a brief history of older plans. He presented summaries of
3 the legal procedures and work program, scope, and schedule. He noted that this
4 plan has a horizon year of 2035 and is meant for long term use. He explained the
5 plan was a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and was
6 subject to EIR requirements. In addition, the plan must be up to date, internally
7 consistent, consistent with state policy, readable and accessible to the public, and
8 consistent with the zoning ordinance. He gave details regarding the goals, policies,
9 and actions of the plan. He mentioned some existing plans that would be
10 incorporated into the new General Plan, as well as ways to engage the community.
11 He presented the website: www.albany2035.org – which provides additional
12 information on the plan as well as a space for residents to offer their own input.

13
14 Commissioner Moss- suggested adding the published state guidelines to the site.

15
16 Barry Miller-went over the proposed plan structure and introduced the various
17 elements.

18
19 Commissioner Donaldson- suggested doing the scope of work as early as possible
20 and doing early work in the EIR. The commission asked in which part of general plan
21 was government code superseded by charter. They also asked about the status of
22 the website.

23
24 Barry Miller- noted that the website was in production and content would be loaded
25 in the next few days. He asked the Commission for suggestions on what would be
26 the perfect questions to start asking the community regarding Albany's future. He
27 mentioned possibly bringing in the general plan land use category and regional
28 housing allocation discussion to the next Planning and Zoning study session.

29
30 Miller- spent time describing the existing general plan. He highlighted the land-use,
31 circulation, conservation, recreation and open space, and community health and
32 safety elements and made himself available for questions.

33
34 Chair Eisenmann- asked about the University's involvement in the past with the
35 General Plan.

36
37 Jeff Bond-was not sure how involved the University was in the past but stated UC
38 Village adopted a Master Plan in 2004. The City would try to integrate and reference
39 UC Village's plan into the updated general plan.

40
41 Miller- said that they would have to check previous regional models regarding traffic
42 but would also do their own evaluations.

43
44 The commission-had questions regarding sea level rise and original noise projections
45 from BART.

46

1 Miller- responded that the sea level rise issue would likely be included in the EIR and
2 he could research and bring data regarding BART noise projections to the
3 Commission.
4

5 Chair Eisenmann- asked if the consultant would continue to work with Albany and
6 work with the plan 5 or 10 years from now.
7

8 Barry Miller-replied that that would be up to City Council.
9

10 Chair Eisenmann OPENED DISCUSSION TO THE PUBLIC.
11

12 Anne Hersch- reminded those wishing to speak to fill out a speaker card.
13

14 **Clay Larson**- commented that the speaker cards were bureaucratic and a "solution
15 in search of a problem". In response to Commissioner Donaldson's question, Larson
16 said the San Pablo Street Design guidelines were not included in the list but should
17 be. He suggested placing the latest staff report over the existing San Pablo Vision
18 Plan.
19

20 No one else wished to speak. Chair Eisenmann brought the discussion back to
21 council.
22

23 Commissioner Donaldson- commended Barry Miller's work thus far and looked
24 forward to his further presentations.
25

26 Commissioner Arkin- welcomed Barry Miller and suggested a few questions for the
27 "Albany Speaks" section of the new General Plan website: 1) "Over the next 20
28 years, I hope Albany _____" 2) In Albany, _____ needs fixing
29

30 Commissioner Moss- wanted the plan to dwell more in positive light and maybe
31 include more of what is already working in Albany and should be continued.
32

33 Chair Eisenmann- looked forward to continuing the process. She called for a break
34 until 8:00 pm when the Commission would reconvene and start their regular
35 meeting.
36

37 **5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

38 (Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted by one
39 motion. By approval of the Consent Calendar, the staff recommendations will be
40 adopted unless otherwise modified by the Commission. There will be no separate
41 discussion on these items unless a Commission Member or a member of the
42 audience requests removal of the items from the Consent Calendar.)
43

44 Chair Eisenmann- asked members of the public if any of them had any comments or
45 questions on any of the items on the consent calendar. No one wished to speak.
46

1 Commissioner Moss- requested to pull item 5A for discussion.

2
3 **Motion to Approve item 5B:** Eisenmann

4 Ayes: Arkin, Donaldson, Eisenmann, Moss

5 Nays: None.

6 Motion Passes, 4-0

7
8
9 **A. PA 13-003, Conditional Use Permit for a 2nd story addition at 1067 Curtis** - The
10 applicant is seeking Conditional Use Permit to extend a non-conforming
11 wall for an approved second story addition at 1067 Curtis. Design Review
12 and Parking Exception approval for the addition were granted by the
13 Planning & Zoning Commission on February 27, 2013. A site survey later
14 revealed that the side yard setback is slightly less than 10% of lot width at
15 3'3.5", not the required 3.75 ft. The existing home is 1,081 sq. ft. with three
16 bedrooms one bathroom home. The second story addition will include three
17 new bedrooms, two bathrooms, and a new laundry area. The first floor will
18 be reconfigured to include a remodeled kitchen, new office room, family
19 room, dining area, and living room. The new home will be 2062.4 sq. ft. on a
20 3,750 sq. ft. lot and will be 25' 6" in height.

21
22 **Recommendation: Approve project subject to findings and conditions of**
23 **approval.**

24
25 Anne Hersch- presented the staff report.

26
27 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. No one wished to speak.

28
29 Commissioner Moss- concerns were:

- 30 1) Has the applicant done an area takeoff for the windows on the sides that
31 are a little less than three and a half feet from the property line?
32 2) The flash water heater is exposed and there is a sewer vent running outside
33 of the building.

34
35 He noted that this has never been allowed before in the city of Albany. For the
36 windows, there must be protected openings. The project must also be fire
37 speculated and have 25% opening on the wall. Overall, he felt the vertical
38 extension could have been brought into setback. He said there are code
39 problems with the existing application.

40
41 Anne Hersch noted that what was sent in the packet on Friday reflected the
42 new setback.

43
44 Commissioner Arkin- asked the architect to see if the tankless water heater vent
45 and plumbing vent could be placed within the building wall and whether or
46 not the 25% limitation on glazing has been considered.

1
2 **Alexander Sheets Saikely**, architect and project applicant- said that she had
3 confirmed with an outside plan check firm that the windows had to be 3 ft from
4 prop line or greater if the building is sprinklered. She also stated that the
5 window themselves were not required to be protected using fire sprinklers just
6 the building.

7
8 Commissioner Moss- noted the code is ambiguous.

9
10 Ms. Saikely-noted that she did not believe they were near the 25% threshold for
11 glazing. She said the vent for the water heater did not need to go the roof; it
12 could just go the eve. She was not sure about the plumbing vent.

13
14 Commissioner Arkin- said the dryer vent could exhaust the wall or go into the
15 wall. He suggested making a condition that there be no exposed pipes other
16 than the downspouts.

17
18 **Motion to Approve Item 5A incorporating conditions outlined in staff report with**
19 **the additional condition that there are no exterior pipes other than downspouts:**

20 Arkin

21
22 **Seconded by:** Donaldson

23
24 Ayes: Arkin, Donaldson, Eisenmann, Moss

25 Nays: None

26 Motion passed, 4-0

27
28
29 **B. PA 11-038, Goodwill Industries Conditional Use Permit Review for the store at**
30 **501-505 San Pablo Ave.**-The Planning & Zoning Commission will review the
31 Conditional Use Permit for Goodwill Industries store located at 501-505 San
32 Pablo. The Planning & Zoning Commission approved the use permit on July
33 26, 2011. The store opened in August 2012. The conditions of approval
34 require the Commission to review the Use Permit for compliance six months
35 after retail and donations commenced. To date, the store has been
36 operating in full compliance with the project conditions.

37 ***Recommendation:* Review compliance report for the Conditional Use**
38 **Permit.**

39
40 Item passed, see above under consent calendar.

41
42 **6. PUBLIC COMMENT**

43 For persons desiring to address the Commission on an item that is not on the
44 agenda please note that each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. The Brown
45 Act limits the Commission ability to take and/or discuss items that are not on the

1 agenda; therefore, such items are normally referred to staff for comment or to a
2 future agenda.

3
4 **Anne Jennings**, resident on Kains Ave- was uncomfortable with the direction
5 of new Albany businesses such as the increase in the number of massage
6 parlors and nail salons. She wanted more information regarding the un-
7 proportional size of the front sign on the massage parlor at 919 Solano.

8
9
10 **7. DISCUSSIONS & POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS**

11
12 **A. PA 13-002, Design Review for Pets a Go-Go at 1124 Solano Ave.** -The
13 applicant is seeking Design Review approval for new business signage for
14 Pets a Go-Go located at 1124 Solano Ave. The applicant applied for and
15 received administrative approval for a new business sign with a white
16 background with black lettering. In actuality, a pink sign with black lettering,
17 which was not approved by the City, was installed instead. This discrepancy
18 was brought to the City's attention after receiving an anonymous complaint
19 about the new business signage. The business owner is seeking Commission
20 approval to keep the existing pink business sign.

21 **Recommendation: Option 1: Require the sign size to be reduced and require**
22 **that applicant install the white sign as originally proposed.**

23 **Option 2: Require the sign size to be reduced and approve the pink sign**
24 **installed by the applicant.**

25
26 Anne Hersch presented the staff report.

27
28 **Alex Shepard**, employee of Pets a Go-Go and representative for Coco Tsui
29 (applicant)- stated that when the permit was approved, there was not a
30 note about the color and so the applicant did not recognize there was a
31 problem. She said there may have been miscommunication between the
32 applicant and contractor or the applicant and the City. She noted that the
33 applicant had modeled the sign size after the adjacent hair salon's sign
34 and would be willing to reduce the size. The applicant, however, would like
35 to keep the pink color as this was her store colors. She showed a color
36 sample to the Commission.

37
38 **Carlos Ramirez**, business owner on Solano- noted one business could affect
39 the businesses around it. He felt the pink sign was awkward and out of
40 proportion. He suggested the sign be rescaled and reverted to the original
41 approved white background.

42
43 Commissioner Donaldson- did not like the pink and felt the sign should be
44 cut down to size. He suggested using the hang down banners and signs in
45 the window for visibility.
46

1 Commissioner Moss- noted the sign blocked some windows and was out of
2 proportion. He had no problems with the color but discouraged the pink. He
3 said the sign was not up to the standard of other signs on Solano and
4 proposed cutting it down as well.

5
6 Commissioner Arkin- noted there was a substantial overhang on the building
7 so the sign is hard to see. He said the size ratio should be enforced. He did
8 not have problems with the color.

9
10 Chair Eisenmann- did not like the pink and felt graphically the sign was more
11 difficult to read because there was not high contrast. She agreed the sign
12 size should be reduced.

13
14 Commissioner Moss- noted that the blade signs were part of the square
15 footage as well.

16
17 **Motion to approve item 7A with the condition that the sign be brought under**
18 **City regulations. The color scheme is acceptable as presented and the**
19 **applicant has the option to how they would like to bring the sign into**
20 **compliance:** Moss

21
22 **Seconded by:** Arkin, with the following amendments:

- 23
24 • Sign presented is okay with white or pink as long as it is under the
25 required sign regulations
26 • Recommendation of sign program with blade sign hanging from the
27 awning

28
29 Ayes: Arkin, Eisenmann, Moss

30 Nays: Donaldson

31 Motion passes, 3-1

- 32
33
34 **B. PA 10-019, Design Review & Parking Exception Variance for new**
35 **commercial building at 1600 Solano-** The applicant seeking Design Review
36 and a Parking Exception Variance for a new building at 1600 Solano Ave.
37 The applicant has proposed to demolish the existing building and construct
38 a new two-story 6,200 sq. ft. commercial building containing ground floor
39 retail space approximately 1,200 sq. ft. in area and dental offices
40 approximately 4,000 sq. ft. in area. Maximum building height is proposed to
41 be 31'9". The applicant is also seeking a Parking Exception Variance for six
42 parking spaces. The applicant is proposing to include 14 parking spaces,
43 with three accessible by vehicle lift. The subject property is a 5,127 square
44 foot lot with an existing 2,766 sq. ft. commercial building on the southeast
45 corner of Solano and Ordway near the Albany-Berkeley border. Action
46 may be taken at this hearing.

1 **Recommendation: Approve the Design Review and Variance requests**
2 **subject to the findings and conditions.**

3
4 Chair Eisenmann noted that members of the public wishing to speak were
5 limited to three minutes each. Anne Hersch noted that speakers should turn
6 in their speaker cards to staff.

7
8 Jeff Bond asked to the Commission to take comments and give direction
9 to staff and the applicant tonight but postpone making a decision for 14
10 days to avert an appeal. Supposed errors in staff analysis had been
11 reported and Mr. O'Brien had asked for a continuation. The commission did
12 a quick poll of whether they should close the hearing now or take public
13 comment tonight. The commission felt it should listen to public comment at
14 tonight's meeting before making a decision to continue this item. Anne
15 Hersch continued presenting the staff report.

16
17 Chair Eisenmann-asked why the Traffic and Safety Commission did not
18 want the drop off spots and if the shape of the bulb-out shaped has
19 changed. Jeff Bond said he would check his notes regarding the drop-off
20 spots. Anne Hersch replied that only the cross-walks changed.

21
22 Commissioner Donaldson asked about estimates of traffic demand
23 management effectiveness in reducing the number of vehicle trips. Staff
24 noted there were not any estimates of traffic demand and angle parking
25 had been discussed at Traffic and Safety Conditions. Commissioner Arkin
26 recommended looking into angled parking. Staff noted there had been
27 some discussion among the Planning and Zoning Commission on angled
28 parking. Commissioner Arkin asked about the existing speed and volume
29 survey on Ordway of 672 vehicles compared to the 1000-5000 cars on other
30 blocks in the R-1 district. Staff said that every street in Albany has been
31 measured at one time or another. The Commission expressed interest in
32 seeing this data. Staff noted the figure of 672 was recent data.
33 Commissioner Donaldson clarified the necessity for a variance. Staff gave
34 some historical context for the variance, referencing a previous project at
35 1301 Solano where the findings were different but end result is the same.
36 The project is new construction and therefore, according to the ordinance,
37 requires a variance rather than just a parking exception.

38
39 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

40
41 **Kava Massih** of Kava Massih architects- stated that he had no new
42 information to add. He mentioned the small adjustment of reducing the
43 front parking from five spaces to four and lowering the height to 35 ft to
44 meet height requirements.

45

1 Commissioner Arkin asked if there was a need for a curb on the edge of
2 the loading zone or could it be a sloped edge. Massih said he was hoping
3 to avoid curbs because the loading zone is rarely used. He mentioned that
4 2% is the max slope for the loading zone.

5
6 Jeff Bond explained the color coding of the traffic measurement map. He
7 noted it was data from the year 2000. Anne Hersch said that she will call
8 speakers to the podium in order of the speaker cards.

9
10 **April McMahon**, business owner at 1604 Solano- was concerned with traffic
11 issues, parking issues, and traffic speed of Ordway. She added that when
12 she was working by Solano Cellars- loading zones were often used. She
13 asked that the Planning and Zoning Commission make a decision that
14 benefits the entire community.

15
16 Anne Hersch- said she will be calling speakers from the speaker cards, two
17 at a time.

18
19 The following people all spoke out against the proposed parking variance:
20 **Julie Graves, Howard Graves, Allison Grinstead, Tom O' Brien, David Isler,**
21 **Miriam Kaminsky, Steve Brokken, and Peter Goldberg.**

22
23 Julie Graves appreciated the process the City was taking in regards to the
24 project. Particularly, she applauded the change in arrangement. She liked
25 the idea of an arborist coming in to look at the existing Oak tree and
26 hoped that a similar tree could be planted there in the event that the
27 project affects the current tree. She appreciated that the applicants
28 attempt to improve parking, but she still had concerns and advocated for
29 an appropriate number of standard parking spaces without the need to
30 back up. She felt this situation was not equivalent to the Orthodontics
31 project on Key Route as that project had a lot more available parking.

32
33 Howard Graves, Ordway resident- addressed the staff report section 4
34 adverse impacts. He felt the project would result in high traffic impact on
35 Ordway. He mentioned there were no hard numbers illustrating the number
36 of patients between the times of 3:00-5:00 pm each day. He mentioned
37 that the parking study done by the City was incorrect, in a separate study
38 he noted there was 90% parking occupancy.

39
40 Allison Grinstead- felt the building was not in line and out of proportion in
41 comparison with surrounding buildings.

42
43 Tim O' Brien- noted there were errors in parking dimensions staff presented
44 to the Commission. He said the neighbors had conducted a separated
45 parking study based on a 500 ft walking distance rather than the 500 ft
46 radius staff did and found there was significantly less parking than what

1 staff found. He pointed out the project was not unique should not be
2 granted a variance.

3
4 Miriam Kaminsky- noted the majority of the proposed parking spaces were
5 noncompliant.

6
7 Steve Brokken, business owner- recommended staff not grant the parking
8 variance as it seemed to be a special privilege for the property owner.

9
10 Peter Goldberg, neighbor and business owner- reiterated the difference in
11 surveys methods using 500 ft radius and 500 ft walking distance.

12
13 One speaker- said the photo distributed to the public which showed only
14 one parked car was an inaccurate representation of the current parking
15 conditions. He also requested a skin of the proposed building so neighbors
16 could get a feel for what the building would look like.

17
18 Commissioner Arkin- asked if there was discussion about the reduction of
19 the parking spaces. He mentioned the possibility of residential parking
20 permit for any block in Albany.

21
22 Jeff Bond responded that the focus of Traffic and Safety was on the public
23 right of way.

24
25 Chair Eisenmann- asked about the hours on the use-permit. She also asked
26 if the proposed parking dimensions meet Albany's standards.

27
28 Anne Hersch- noted there was not a use-permit involved as it was a
29 medical building. This meant the office could operate 5-6 days a week.
30 Jeff Bond said he would have to look into the dimensions, but he did not
31 think there was anything that made the project meet code.

32
33 Kava Massih- defended the parking and insisted it was feasible.

34
35 Commissioner Donaldson- noted that there were several findings that he
36 did not felt he could make. He said the site may be suitable for
37 underground parking like the parking for the Sunnyside Café building.

38
39 Commissioner Moss- noted that other projects have been granted
40 variances in the past. He said it was difficult to make the finding that there
41 is something unusual and different about this particular project. He was
42 concerned about the layout of the parking but not the size. He thought the
43 design was acceptable but agreed there were parking concerns. He
44 mentioned the possibility of using a divider to help with these issues.

45

1 Commissioner Arkin- said this was a commercial site and thus was designed
2 as such. He noted the floor ratio, rear setback, and lot coverage numbers
3 were off from what is required. He suggested making a "right turn only" to
4 get out of the parking lot as proposed by the Traffic and Safety
5 Commission. He has no problems with making the findings for the variance
6 at this site. He mentioned that a similar site was granted a variance the
7 past. He suggested adding bike racks to the corner. He also thought it was
8 appropriate that spots along south line were labeled as "customer parking
9 only" and staff be limited using the lifts.

10
11 Commissioner Moss- noted that the rear setback should be 0 ft for
12 commercial lots.

13
14 Chair Eisenmann- mentioned converting Ordway to a one-way street and
15 implementing angled parking. Jeff Bond said that this, however, was
16 ultimately not a recommendation Traffic and Safety wanted to pass to P&Z
17 Commission.

18
19 Commissioner Donaldson- brought up the possibility of having the property
20 owner pay for the striping and other costs for offsite parking spaces and
21 having these spaces be part of the project.

22
23 Jeff Bond suggested having a side by side comparison of a 100%
24 compliant project with this proposed project.

25
26 Commissioner Arkin- noted the difference between 500 ft radius and
27 walking distance is a good one. Jeff Bond said staff was prepared to do
28 another survey, but the implications would likely be the same. Staff
29 acknowledges this area has major parking issues.

30
31 Chair Eisenmann- said it did not make sense to remove spots from the
32 community to allow more parking for this project. She was surprised that
33 the Traffic and Safety Commission did not require additional parking for this
34 project. Eisenmann asked the applicant if most of the traffic would be after
35 school hours and weekdays and 1 day on the weekend since most of the
36 patients are likely school-aged children.

37
38 **Leila Kasrovi**, property owner- indicated the hours of operation are from 8-
39 4:45 pm (last appointment) with the most traffic likely between 3-5 pm. She
40 clarified she was open one Saturday a month between their three
41 locations.

42
43 Chair Eisenmann- asked if the six required parking spaces could be put in
44 front of the property. Jeff Bond said staff would have to look into that
45 possibility. The Commission also discussed the option of having two spots as
46 timed parking zones or drop off zones. Commissioner Donaldson

1 recommended doing a traffic management study which looks at the
2 business and seeks incentives for other modes of transportation for instance
3 biking and walking. Commissioner Moss suggested the property owner to
4 provide mass transit passes to its employees or company bike.

5 Chair Eisenmann said she felt the project should be given two more spots
6 as a drop off/loading zone. In addition, she asked that an additional four
7 slots be added from the street through restriping or finding additional
8 parking on Ordway. She felt they should mitigate traffic so everyone comes
9 and goes from Solano. She was open to recommendations on how to do
10 this but she brought up the idea of the "right turn only sign". Commissioner
11 Donaldson noted there may be overlap in the parking of the old location
12 on Ensenada and the new one.

13
14 Jeff Bond- noted the Traffic and Safety Commission did make a motion
15 directing staff to explore traffic calming measure at Ordway/Marin and
16 Tacoma/Sonoma.

17
18 Commissioner Arkin read traffic calming measures already stated in
19 conditions for the permit.

20
21 **Motion to Approve Item 7B for Design Review and a Parking Exception**
22 **Variance with the additional items as condition and mitigation measure**

- 23
24 **-Waiting spots provided in garage for drop-off and waiting and these be**
25 **striped and signed as such**
26 **-At least one additional parking space be realized on street**
27 **-Bicycle parking racks located on corner bulb-out**
28 **-Non-lift parking spaces assigned as "Patient Only": Commissioner Arkin**

29
30 No second.

31
32 **Motion to continue item 7B to date uncertain with condition that staff and**
33 **applicant make revisions to application so that it does not require a**
34 **parking variance**

- 35 **-This can be done with onsite or offsite modification with financing**
36 **agreement between applicant and City for additional studies (ex:**
37 **Transportation Demand Management study): Donaldson**

38
39 Commissioner Moss asked property owner, Leila Kasrovi, if she would
40 rather continue the item and make the modifications the Commission
41 suggested or if she would rather have the item denied and appeal it. He
42 mentioned at least six parking spaces could be added with angular
43 parking.

44

1 Jeff Bond suggested continuing the hearing to April 10th. This would
2 allow time to write up the recommendations and present them to the
3 applicant.
4

5 Chair Eisenmann clarified that they were granting two tandem spots
6 and requiring just four additional spaces. Chair Arkin suggested the
7 applicant take the recommendations from tonight's discussion.
8

9 **Motion to continue item 7B to date certain of April 10, 2013 with the**
10 **direction that the applicant find a net gain of four spaces and for the**
11 **applicant to talk to city engineer about alternative design for frontage:**
12 Moss
13

14 **Seconded by:** Donaldson
15

16 Commissioner Donaldson mentioned he was skeptical about permit
17 parking.
18

19 Ayes: Arkin, Donaldson, Eisenmann, Moss

20 Nays: None

21 Motion passed, 4-0
22

23 The Commission said there would be no further notice because the item
24 was being continued, however, the item will be continued at the next
25 meeting (April 10th) and a staff report would be available the Friday
26 before the next meeting for the public.
27

28 **8. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/DISCUSSION**

29 (Staff discussion and Commission member announcement of status of previous
30 agenda items and requests for future agenda items. No public comment will be
31 taken on requests for future agenda items).
32

- 33 1. **Wireless Ordinance Analysis**-report and summary of City Council action from
34 March 18, 2013. This will be a future study session item for the Planning &
35 Zoning Commission.
36

37 Anne Hersch presented the staff report. She said two items were discussed.
38 The first was pursuing wireless facilities on City owned property. The second
39 was considering amending the City's wireless ordinance. Jeff Bond noted
40 Council wanted specific Pros and Cons.
41

42 Commissioner Arkin asked if a second pole was being explored in the city
43 triangle. Chair Eisenmann asked if the City was exploring into repeaters. Anne
44 Hersch noted such systems were typical in areas with greater topographical
45 changes. Hersch said she did not know if it was in the interest of a carrier to
46 do that given Albany's size and topography.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The Commission asked for an update on Saint Mary's.
Jeff Bond noted it has been difficult getting all the mediation parties together
and the topic is predicted to come back to the Commission in one or two
months.

9. FUTURE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

Next Planning and Zoning Commission hearing: **Wednesday, April 10, 2013 at 7 pm.**

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11 p.m.

Next regular meeting: Wednesday, April 10, 2013, 7:00 p.m. at Albany City Hall

Submitted by: Anne Hersch, City Planner

Jeff Bond
Community Development Director