

	<i>Design Review approval, the project has also been found to meet the applicable design guidelines.</i>
<p>2. <i>Approval of project design is consistent with the purpose and intent of this section, which states "designs of projects...will result in improvements that are visually and functionally appropriate to their site conditions and harmonious with their surroundings, including natural landforms and vegetation. Additional purposes of design review include (but are not limited to): that retention and maintenance of existing buildings and landscape features are considered; and that site access and vehicular parking are sufficient."</i></p>	<p>The project design and site planning has been completed with consideration to current conditions, including existing trees and drainage patterns. The proposed temporary modular buildings are visually in keeping with existing structures located on the opposite side of Jackson St. The Apparatus Bay has been located so as to minimize impacts to neighboring residential uses due to its height.</p> <p>The proposed project will provide safe and convenient access to the property for both vehicles and pedestrians. The project will not remove any significant vegetation and will not require significant grading. The project will not create a visual detriment at the site or the neighborhood.</p>
<p>3. <i>Approval of the project is in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare.</i></p>	<p><i>The project will allow the temporary relocation of the Fire and Police Departments while the current City Hall complex is undergoing seismic retrofit work. Approving the temporary use permit for the project is directly in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare.</i></p>
<p>4. <i>The project is in substantial compliance with applicable general and specific Standards for Review stated in Subsection 20.100.050.D.</i></p>	<p><i>The project as designed is in substantial compliance with the standards as stated, including access, architecture, natural features, coordination of design details, and privacy.</i></p>

- b. 934 San Pablo. Planning Application 06-074. Design Review. Density Bonus. Affordable Housing.** Study session to discuss proposed new three-story mixed-use building with thirteen residential units and two retail units. A density bonus & other concessions, as described below, are also requested as part of the approval.
Staff recommendation: provide direction to applicant and staff.

Associate Planner Curl delivered the staff report. There was a discussion regarding density bonus and inclusionary housing. Chair Panian opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation. Hoss Azimi, the project applicant, was available to answer questions. Commissioner Gardner wondered why only half of one unit went up to the fourth floor. She wanted to see samples of parking lifts being used. She felt the facade was not in character.

Ed Fields, Albany resident, read from the state code on density bonus, and opined that 8 units would be appropriate for this site, without retail units. There should be one concession only. He felt the parking lifts would not be used for parking. Clay Larson, Albany resident, was concerned about the height. He felt the table in the zoning ordinance was not ambiguous – there should be limits on density for tiny lots. He wondered about staff’s judgment on the setback where commercial abuts residential.

Mark O’Brien, Albany resident, was concerned about the height, massing, density, and loss of parking. Jo Fox, Albany resident, was concerned by the height and size of the project. No one else wished to speak. Chair Panian closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Gardner opined eight units would be correct. Commissioner Moss was concerned about the massing, setbacks, and the calculation for density bonus. Commissioner Arkin stated that affordable housing had to be provided even if Albany residents opposed increased density. He argued that the urban streets of the city (e.g., San Pablo and Solano Avenues) were the appropriate location for these units. He would prefer multiple small projects on small lots rather than incentivization of aggregate lots.

Regarding the design, Commissioner Arkin recommended removing/revising the curved roofs, which seemed out of character with the rest of the design. He wanted to see more three-dimensional renderings and more detail. He recommended a physical model including the whole block to show relationship with neighboring structures. He would like the glass block over the stair square rather than sloped. He thought there were walls projecting into the daylight plane. He liked the horizontal shapes on the west side and recommended bringing some to the street facade.

Commissioner Maass noted the shading on the drawings looked wrong. He was not fond of the projection on the top of the building. He would like to see more wood slats and less stucco. Commissioner Gardiner noted this would be setting precedent. She could approve the size and the retail. A good transition to the residential zone would be very important. Commissioner Moss liked that the units were compact. He would like the San Pablo Avenue facade articulated at street level. He would favor a 15-foot setback at the residential transition. He would like to see gray water use.

There was a discussion of the daylight plane requirement.

There was a brief recess.

c. 701-705 Hillside. Review of Project Implementation. Planning Application 05-025.

Discussion of implementation of project originally approved in 2004 to construct two single-family homes.

Staff recommendation: for information only. No action to be taken.

Michael Wallace, resident at 715 Hillside, made a presentation on the concerns about the implementation of the project at 701-705 Hillside. The concerns include violations of building permit conditions and Cal-OSHA regulations, violations of revised plan conditions of approval, and violation of FAR regulations.