

City of Albany
Planning & Zoning Commission
Minutes September 23, 2015 Meeting

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

3
4 **Regular Meeting**

5
6 1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission was called to
7 order by Chair Donaldson in the City Council Chambers at 7:00 P.M. on
8 Wednesday, September 23, 2015.

9
10 2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

11
12 3. **ROLL CALL**

13
14 Present: Friedland, Giesen-Fields, Kent, Menotti, Donaldson
15 Absent: None
16 Staff Present: City Planner Anne Hersch

17
18 4. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
19 (Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted by one
20 motion. By approval of the Consent Calendar, the staff recommendations will
21 be adopted unless otherwise modified by the Commission. There will be no
22 separate discussion on these items unless a Commission Member or a member of
23 the audience requests removal of the items from the Consent Calendar.)

24
25 A. **PA 15-070 Design Review Amendment for a Second Story Balcony**
26 **Enclosure at 1017 Talbot Avenue.** The applicant received Design Review
27 approval to add a 930 square foot second story addition at 1017 Talbot
28 Avenue. The subject lot is 5,000 square feet with a 1,305 square foot three
29 bedroom, one bathroom home built in 1925. The applicant is proposing to
30 enclose the previously approved balcony to create a new master suite
31 closet. This adds 32 square feet of additional living space on the second
32 story. This will result in a five bedroom, two bathroom home 2,267 square
33 feet in area. The overall building height will remain at 23 feet and the
34 home will have a Monterey style architectural appearance.
35 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
36 **Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated September 23,**
37 **2015.**

1 **CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303**
2 **"New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."**

- 3
- 4 **B. PA 15-037 Design Review for a Second Story Addition at 534 Evelyn**
5 **Avenue.** The applicant is seeking Design Review approval for a second
6 story addition at 534 Evelyn Avenue. The subject site is 5,000 square feet
7 with an existing 1,139 square foot two bedroom, one and a half bathroom
8 home built in 1932. The applicant is seeking Design Review approval to
9 add a 1,135 square foot second story addition that will include three
10 bedrooms and one bathroom. The first floor will be reconfigured to
11 include a family room area and a 169 square foot addition on the north
12 side to accommodate the new stairwell. The existing enclosed porch at
13 the rear of the home will be removed. This will result in a four bedroom,
14 two and a half bathroom home 2,383 square feet in area and 23 feet 3
15 inches in height. Two off-street parking spaces are provided in the
16 detached garage. The Planning & Zoning Commission reviewed the
17 project at the June 24, 2015 Commission hearing and continued the
18 matter to a date uncertain so that the project design could be refined.
19 *(Continued from the September 9, 2015 meeting)*
20 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
21 **Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated September 23,**
22 **2015.**

23

24 **CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303**
25 **"New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."**

- 26
- 27 **C. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes June 24, 2015**
- 28
- 29 **D. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes July 8, 2015**
- 30
- 31 **E. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes July 22, 2015**
- 32
- 33 **F. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes September 9, 2015**

34

35 Chair Donaldson removed Items B, C, D, E, and F from the Consent
36 Calendar.

37

38 **Motion to approve Consent Calendar Item A, PA 15-070 for 1017 Talbot**
39 **Avenue: Giesen-Fields**

40 Seconded by: Friedland

41 AYES: Friedland, Giesen-Fields, Kent, Menotti, Donaldson

42 NAYES: None

43 **Motion passed, 5-0**

44

45 Chair Donaldson identified the 14-day appeal period.

46

1 The following items were removed from the Consent Calendar and
2 considered separately.

- 3
4 **B. PA 15-037 Design Review for a Second Story Addition at 534 Evelyn**
5 **Avenue.** The applicant is seeking Design Review approval for a second
6 story addition at 534 Evelyn Avenue. The subject site is 5,000 square feet
7 with an existing 1,139 square foot two bedroom, one and a half bathroom
8 home built in 1932. The applicant is seeking Design Review approval to
9 add a 1,135 square foot second story addition that will include three
10 bedrooms and one bathroom. The first floor will be reconfigured to
11 include a family room area and a 169 square foot addition on the north
12 side to accommodate the new stairwell. The existing enclosed porch at
13 the rear of the home will be removed. This will result in a four bedroom,
14 two and a half bathroom home 2,383 square feet in area and 23 feet 3
15 inches in height. Two off-street parking spaces are provided in the
16 detached garage. The Planning & Zoning Commission reviewed the
17 project at the June 24, 2015 Commission hearing and continued the
18 matter to a date uncertain so that the project design could be refined.
19 *(Continued from the September 9, 2015 meeting)*
20 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
21 **Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated September 23,**
22 **2015.**

23
24 **CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303**
25 **"New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."**

26
27 Commissioner Friedland left the dais due to a potential conflict of interest.

28
29 Chair Donaldson expressed his appreciation for the changes to the design for
30 534 Evelyn Avenue, and liked the design of the building, although he expressed
31 concern for the change to the front porch which would place the new entrance
32 to the building in a landscaped area. He recommended the submittal of a
33 landscape plan to show how the landscaping would change and where the
34 walkways from the driveway to the front entrance would be located. He
35 supported the approval of the design, as is, with the additional condition that a
36 landscape plan be prepared for the front landscape, to be approved by staff.

37
38 **Motion to approve Consent Calendar Item B, PA 15-037 for 534 Evelyn**
39 **Avenue, with the additional condition that a landscape plan for the front**
40 **yard shall be prepared for staff level review: Donaldson**
41 **Seconded by: Giesen-Fields**

42
43 **AYES:** Giesen-Fields, Kent, Menotti, Donaldson
44 **NAYES:** None
45 **ABSENT:** Friedland

46 **Motion passed, 4-0**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Chair Donaldson identified the 14-day appeal period.

C. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes June 24, 2015

Chair Donaldson requested amendments to each set of minutes presented, as follows:

To lines 19 and 20 on Page 8 of the June 24, 2015 minutes, requested that Strollers and Rollers be capitalized.

D. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes July 8, 2015

To lines 11, 24, and 39 on Page 4 of the July 8, 2015 minutes, requested that the spelling of Jerri *Holan's* name be corrected.

E. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes July 22, 2015

To line 9 on Page 3 of the July 22, 2015 minutes, requested a revision of the statement that *Chair Donaldson liked the modern style in terms of color and style but did not like the projecting of the big blade marque sign.*

F. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes September 9, 2015

To line 30 on Page 2 of the September 9, 2015 minutes, *Chair Donaldson said he would continue the meeting in the agendized order.*

To line 36 on Page 3, requested the elimination of the word 'regarding' to be replaced with *which was design review and signage.* Later in that sentence, requested decisions regarding *the full project plans.*

To line 25 on Page 4 having to do with street trees and lighting at 1080 Monroe, requested that line 25 read *way that will not be blocked by the trees.*

To line 33 on Page 4, requested that *Bike Links* be capitalized.

To line 37 on Page 4, requested a hyphen in *up-lighting.*

To line 42 on Page 4, requested the statement that *all parties were too discouraged to start over again.*

And to line 43 on Page 4, near the end, requested the statement: *a grocery store next to one of the most densely populated areas of the City.*

1 **Motion to approve Consent Calendar Items C, D, E, and F, approving the**
2 **minutes of June 24, July 8, July 22, and September 9, 2015, as amended:**

3 Giesen-Fields

4 Seconded by: Menotti

5 AYES: Friedland, Giesen-Fields, Kent, Menotti, Donaldson

6 NAYES: None

7 **Motion passed, 5-0**

8
9 **5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

10 For persons desiring to address the Commission on an item that is not on the
11 agenda please note that each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. The
12 Brown Act limits the Commission's ability to take and/or discuss items that are
13 not on the agenda; therefore, such items are normally referred to staff for
14 comment or to a future agenda.

15
16 No one wished to address the Commission.

17
18 **6. DISCUSSIONS & POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:**

19
20 **A. PA 15-054 Design Review & Conditional Use Permit for 833 Pomona**
21 **Avenue.** The applicant is seeking Design Review and Conditional Use
22 Permit approval to lift an existing single-story house at 833 Pomona
23 Avenue. The subject lot is 2,500 square feet with a two bedroom, one
24 bathroom home built in 1926. The applicant is proposing to lift the house
25 to create a new ground floor living space. The new second floor will
26 include three bedrooms and two bathrooms. The first floor will include a
27 living and dining area with kitchen and an office space. This will result in a
28 three bedroom, two and a half bathroom home 1,500 square feet in area
29 with a maximum height of 23 feet. A Parking Exception/Reduction was
30 granted in 2014 recognizing one off-street parking space in the front yard
31 setback. A Conditional Use Permit is required to extend the non-
32 conforming north wall which is 6 inches off of the property line. The
33 appearance of the home will change from Spanish Revival to a
34 contemporary appearance.

35 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
36 **Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated September 23,**
37 **2015.**

38
39 ***CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303***
40 ***"New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."***

41
42
43 City Planner Anne Hersch presented the staff report dated September 23, 2015.
44

1 **Jessica Coleman**, the applicant, and a Landscape Architect, described the plan
2 for the remodel that would expand the home for her family and allow an
3 indoor/outdoor connection.
4

5 **Greg Van Mechelen**, the Architect, described the home design and the modern
6 style that had been proposed. He referred to Page 5 of the staff report where
7 staff had recommended a special condition of approval for architectural
8 treatment of the first floor north wall and fire rated windows on the second floor,
9 and asked what that treatment might be. While he could install fire rated
10 windows on the north side, he explained it would be difficult to get the extra 2-
11 inch recess space required for fire rated windows.
12

13 When asked about the cantilever design, Mr. Van Mechelen explained that
14 there was a desire to pop-out that side of the home to allow more space in the
15 bedroom and bathroom to make those spaces more livable and offer a nice
16 aesthetic to provide some life and articulation, along with providing some solar
17 shading. He also explained, when asked, that one-hour fire rating was required
18 by State code for the north wall on the ground floor and the second story. Fire
19 rating was not required on any other wall. He noted that the fire rating in this
20 case was required from both the inside and the outside.
21

22 Commissioner Giesen-Fields suggested that a two-hour fire rating might be
23 preferable in this case, although Mr. Van Mechelen hesitated to pursue a two-
24 hour fire rating because that would make the situation more complicated and
25 go beyond the requirements of State law.
26

27 Mr. Van Mechelen responded to questions and explained that the reclaimed
28 wood, in this case from a barn that was 100 years old, seemed to hold out
29 reasonably well and weathered like any other wood.
30

31 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

32
33 There was no one to speak.
34

35 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
36

37 Ms. Hersch clarified that the staff recommendation for the north wall was to
38 provide something to alleviate the massing of the north wall.
39

40 Chair Donaldson agreed, suggested the north wall would not be completely
41 shielded by neighbor landscaping and trees, and suggested that the room inside
42 should have more light and air.
43

44 Commissioner Giesen-Fields had no problem with the massiveness of the north
45 wall because of the reasons related to the fire rated wall. His primary concern
46 was health, safety, and welfare and because the wall was right on the lot line,

1 which was why he had suggested a higher rated fire wall, some articulation, or a
2 layer of stucco to address the fire issue.

3
4 Commissioner Friedland clarified that the issue was not safety but aesthetics.

5
6 With respect to a requirement for a two-hour fire rating, Ms. Hersch expressed
7 concern setting a precedent by applying a standard that went beyond the
8 code minimum.

9
10 The use of fire rated windows was suggested although it was acknowledged that
11 could affect the depth of the windows.

12
13 Chair Donaldson liked the design, liked the use of reclaimed wood on the upper
14 floor, and stated the proposal would add to the variety of housing stock in the
15 City.

16
17 Commissioner Kent suggested the articulation would not actually be visible given
18 that it was on the north side and would always be in some shade. He also
19 clarified with the architect that the house was zero to 4 inches from the property
20 line. He acknowledged the nod to the historic corner windows in a modern
21 structure, was not a fan of the vertical windows, liked the modern contemporary
22 look, the fact the driveway was wide enough to accommodate a car to get to
23 the back to use the parking stall, and had no problem with the parking stall in the
24 front which had previously been authorized.

25
26 Commissioner Menotti also liked the overall design and the quality of materials,
27 had no problem with the modern design, did not support an increase in the fire
28 rating for the north wall, and while it would be nice if the wall was not a blank
29 face, he did not see a design solution given the constraints of the site and could
30 therefore accept it as proposed.

31
32 In response to the concerns, Mr. Van Mechelen noted the potential options to
33 install fire rated windows or pursue a construction fire easement from the
34 neighbor which would allow the installation of any window.

35
36 Commissioner Giesen-Fields stated in the least fire rated windows would address
37 his concerns.

38
39 **Motion to approve PA 15-054 for 833 Pomona Avenue, with the**
40 **requirement that staff review and approve a plan to add windows on the**
41 **north wall at the ground floor and waive the condition of the 2-inch**
42 **recessed windows on the second floor because of current conditions:**

43 Friedland

44 Seconded by: Menotti

45 AYES: Friedland, Giesen-Fields, Kent, Menotti, Donaldson

46 NAYES: None

1 **Motion passed, 5-0**

2
3 Chair Donaldson identified the 14-day appeal period.

4
5 **B. PA 15-050 Design Review for a 2nd Story Addition at 745 Adams Street.** The
6 applicant is seeking Design Review approval for a two-level addition at
7 the rear of the home at 745 Adams Street. The subject site is 5,000 square
8 feet with a 1,650 square foot three bedroom, two bathroom home built in
9 1938. The applicant is proposing to add 321.5 square feet to the existing
10 first floor to create family room space and accommodate a new
11 bedroom. A 431.5 square foot second story addition is also proposed and
12 will create a new master suite. The proposed plans include the removal of
13 an existing accessory structure in the rear yard. The proposed addition will
14 result in a four bedroom, three bathroom home 2,343 square feet in area
15 and 23 feet in height. Off-street parking is provided in the two-car
16 detached garage at the rear of the property. The applicant is proposing
17 to maintain the Minimal Traditional appearance.

18 **Recommendation: Provide feedback to the applicant and staff. Draft**
19 **findings and Conditions of Approval are attached to the staff report dated**
20 **September 23, 2015, should the Commission choose to take action on the**
21 **application.**

22
23 ***CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303***
24 ***“New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures.”***

25
26 City Planner Hersch presented the staff report dated September 23, 2015.

27
28 **Laura Natkins**, the Architect, presented renderings to show that the addition
29 would be at the very rear of the home and would not be very visible. She
30 reported that the entire addition would have the same wood cladding as the
31 existing home and the eave treatment would also be the same. When asked,
32 she stated that she could replicate the vertical feature underneath the eaves in
33 the back, as recommended by staff. She affirmed that the ground floor would
34 remain although the shutters would not be replicated on the addition because
35 they would not be visible.

36
37 In response to Commissioner Kent, Ms. Natkins explained that a Landscape
38 Architect would prepare a design for the front yard as part of the package.

39
40 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

41
42 There was no one to speak.

43
44 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

45

1 Commissioner Giesen-Fields did not like the two upper level windows on the
2 stairwell and recommended different sized windows to match the windows on
3 the north and rear elevation of the bedroom.
4

5 Commissioner Friedland stated she would abstain from any action given that she
6 had worked with the architect in the past, although she supported the
7 architect's assertion in her presentation that installing a larger window would add
8 light and heat into the stairwell unnecessarily. She preferred that the energy
9 efficiency of the house take precedent over the more abstract context of
10 architectural unanimity.
11

12 Commissioner Kent liked the layout and the compound feel and courtyard
13 component, but agreed that the small window at the stairwell looked a bit
14 awkward and a larger window might be a good idea. He suggested the heat
15 gain would not be significant. He liked the retention of the simple tradition style
16 and had no problem other than recommending an improvement to the public
17 landscaping.
18

19 Commissioner Menotti clarified with staff that there were no guidelines for
20 landscaping.
21

22 Chair Donaldson wanted to see more symmetrical treatment of the window
23 above the stairwell, and wanted to see the vertical element on the new
24 addition, but recognized that the addition was well set back from the street.
25

26 Ms. Natkins referred to the elevations and explained that the window was
27 centered to the addition, which would not be very visible from the street.
28

29 **Motion to approve PA 15-050 for 745 Adams Street, to include a Bay**
30 **friendly landscape plan to be approved by staff: Menotti**

31 Seconded by: Giesen-Fields

32 AYES: Giesen-Fields, Kent, Menotti, Donaldson

33 ABSTAIN: Friedland

34 NAYES: None

35 **Motion passed, 4-0-1**
36

37 Chair Donaldson asked staff to clarify with the City Attorney whether
38 Commissioner Friedland should have recused herself instead of abstaining.
39

40 Chair Donaldson identified the 14-day appeal period.
41
42

43 **C. PA 15-047 Design Review, Conditional Use Permit and Parking Exception**
44 **Reduction for 510 Evelyn Avenue.** The applicant is seeking Design Review,
45 Conditional Use Permit and Parking Exception/Reduction for a first and
46 second story addition at 510 Evelyn Avenue. The subject site is 2,500

1 square feet with an existing 989 square foot one bedroom, one bathroom
2 home built in 1931. The applicant would like to add a 593 square foot
3 second story addition that will include three bedrooms and two
4 bathrooms. The first floor addition includes 161 square feet at the rear to
5 accommodate a larger kitchen space, dining room, and new deck. This
6 will result in a four bedroom, three bathroom house 1,429 square feet in
7 area, 24 feet 8 inches in height. A Parking Exception is required due to the
8 driveway and house configuration. One parking space 7 feet by 18 feet
9 in the front yard setback is proposed. The existing garage space is
10 proposed to be removed. A Conditional Use Permit is required to extend
11 the existing nonconforming north wall located on the property line
12 vertically. The home is an original "MacGregor" and is proposed to
13 maintain the current appearance.

14 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
15 **Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated September 23,**
16 **2015.**

17
18 ***CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303***
19 ***"New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."***

20
21 Commissioner Giesen-Fields recused himself from the next two applications
22 since he lived within 500 feet of the sites. He left the meeting at this time.

23
24 City Planner Hersch presented the staff report dated September 23, 2015.

25
26 **Jerri Holan**, the Architect, read a letter into the record from the Trust family
27 related to each of the original "MacGregor" properties to explain why the
28 three-generation owners had decided to remodel and approve homes the
29 family had built which had previously been used as rentals. She explained that
30 the small homes would be improved and would probably eventually become
31 larger single-family homes. She added that the Trust was investing in the
32 community that had given much to the MacGregor family over the years.
33 Given the non-conforming small lot, the same three exceptions previously
34 requested for a similar application would also be required. She clarified that all
35 the original features of the home would be preserved and those features would
36 be replicated in the new addition. She described those features of MacGregor
37 homes as the heavy wood timber, porch roofs, double-hung divided light
38 windows, stucco texture, and Kohler plumbing fixtures.

39
40
41 When asked, Ms. Holan stated there was 18 feet from the property line to the
42 front of the home and another 2 feet from the back of the sidewalk, which
43 should accommodate two parking spaces; one in the front yard setback and
44 one next to the house.

1 Chair Donaldson objected to the location of the electric meter in the front of
2 the home, although Ms. Holan stated that when moving the meter to the side
3 PG&E would require the placement of bollards a foot in front of it, reducing a 7-
4 foot driveway to 6 feet. The electric meter could be screened and she
5 suggested a Moorish tile detail.
6

7 Chair Donaldson commented that he would have a hard time supporting a
8 parking exception for a four-bedroom home.
9

10 Ms. Holan suggested there was historically a garage on the site that had been
11 used in the past and the drive was existing. She added that Albany had a high
12 walkability index.
13

14 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED
15

16 **Kai Dong Chen**, 516 Evelyn Avenue, Albany, supported the addition and noted
17 that the size of the house would be more consistent with others in the
18 neighborhood. Given that his home was 10 feet away from the subject site and
19 his bathroom was situated directly across from the entrance to the subject site,
20 he questioned whether a six-foot privacy fence had been proposed along the
21 property line.
22

23 Ms. Holan stated that a fence had been proposed all the way around the
24 house.
25

26 Chair Donaldson urged Mr. Chen to speak to the architect and the owner to
27 address that issue.
28

29 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED
30

31 Commissioner Kent expressed concern for the parking, liked the soft driveway
32 approach, was disappointed with the fence which could make the driveway a
33 bit tighter and more oppressive, and suggested the parking could be
34 threatened. He supported other ways, such as the use of stained glass windows,
35 to address the privacy issue.
36

37 An unidentified speaker referenced the site plan and pointed out the window
38 on the Chen property, apologized for not contacting him, and advised that
39 either a fence or a lattice with Bougainvillea had been proposed to address the
40 privacy issue, which element would be installed prior to construction.
41

42 Commissioner Friedland was pleased with the design, the philosophy, and the
43 hopeful execution of the group of houses, and stated it was great to see the
44 addition of four-bedroom homes in the community along with the preservation
45 of an important architectural treasure in the community with a level of
46 investment most homeowners would not be able to do.

1
2 Commissioner Menotti also expressed his appreciation for the quality of design,
3 and had no concern with the parking exception.
4

5 **Motion to approve PA 15-047 for 510 Evelyn Avenue, as shown:** Menotti

6 Seconded by: Friedland

7 AYES: Friedland, Kent, Menotti, Donaldson

8 NAYES: None

9 ABSENT: Giesen-Fields

10 **Motion passed, 4-0**
11

12 Chair Donaldson identified the 14-day appeal period.
13

- 14 **D. PA 15-062 Design Review, Conditional Use Permit and Parking Exception**
15 **Reduction for 508 Talbot Avenue.** The applicant is seeking Design Review,
16 Conditional Use Permit, and Parking Exception/Reduction for a first and
17 second story addition at 508 Talbot Avenue. The subject site is 2,500
18 square feet with an existing 821 square foot one bedroom, one bathroom
19 home built in 1938. The applicant would like to add a 592 square foot
20 second story addition that will include three bedrooms and two
21 bathrooms.

22 The first floor addition includes 174 square feet at the rear to
23 accommodate a larger kitchen space, dining room, and new deck. This
24 will result in a four bedroom, three bathroom house 1,497 square feet in
25 area, 24 feet 5 inches in height. A Parking Exception is required due to the
26 driveway and house configuration. One parking space 7 feet by 18 feet
27 in the front yard setback is proposed. The existing garage space is
28 proposed to be removed. A Conditional Use Permit is required to extend
29 the existing nonconforming north wall located on the property line
30 vertically. The home is an original "MacGregor" and is proposed to
31 maintain the current appearance.

32 **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and**
33 **Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated September 23,**
34 **2015.**
35

36 **CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303**
37 **"New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."**
38

39 City Planner Hersch presented the staff report dated September 23, 2015.
40

41 Chair Donaldson expressed concern for the north wall and the lack of windows
42 on that wall in the middle of the house on both floors, suggesting that the
43 interior rooms would be dark without any window on the north side.
44

45 **Jerri Holan**, the Architect, commented that it was the same issue as a previous
46 applicant where the code did not allow windows on the property line. She

1 commented that the brick fireplace would be removed and a direct vent
2 heater would be installed on the front part of the house. She suggested doing
3 some kind of brick detail or tile mural façade that would go with the style of the
4 home, something decorative and ornamental that would be fire resistant that
5 would fit into the stucco since they could not go over the property line. She
6 also suggested that the Fire Inspector might be asked if he would accept
7 operable windows on the property line with sprinkler heads. If that could be
8 done, windows would be installed. She did not want to install a commercial
9 fire window since it would not go with the home.

10
11 When asked by the Chair, Ms. Holan acknowledged that the existing front
12 window had round shoulders. She commented that the stucco could be
13 rounded on the outside but the window itself would probably be a sharp
14 shoulder window.

15
16 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

17
18 There was no one to speak.

19
20 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

21
22 Commissioner Kent expressed concern for parking but since other applications
23 had been approved with similar parking, he was willing to accept it.

24
25 **Motion to approve PA 15-062 for 508 Talbot Avenue, as shown:** Menotti

26 Seconded by: Friedland

27 AYES: Friedland, Kent, Menotti, Donaldson

28 NAYES: None

29 ABSENT: Giesen-Fields

30 **Motion passed, 4-0**

31
32 Alex Rembert, trustee of the Four and Six Family trust, advised that the same
33 treatment of the blank wall would be matched in all of the homes.

34
35 Chair Donaldson identified the 14-day appeal period.

36
37 **7. NEW BUSINESS**

38
39
40 **A. Parking Management Plan & Existing Conditions.** Update to the Planning
41 & Zoning Commission on the Parking Management Plan, preliminary data
42 collection being prepared by PlaceWorks and CDM Smith through a grant
43 from the Alameda County Transportation Commission.

44 **Recommendation: The Planning & Zoning Commission to receive Report.**

45 **No action required**

1 Community Development Director Jeff Bond presented the staff report dated
2 September 23, 2015.

3
4 **David Early**, PlaceWorks, introduced Kerry Stone, PlaceWorks, Project Manager
5 and noted that they were working closely with CDM Smith with Bill Hurrell, the
6 Principal in charge, and Terry O'Connor the Project Manager.

7
8 Mr. Early presented the plan and existing conditions and reported that there
9 would be another meeting on the subject in the coming months. The project had
10 two overall goals; to help the City improve parking utilization and access and in
11 doing that identify and prioritize the type of parking available given the limited
12 parking supply. The project was ongoing and would extend over some period of
13 time to be able to fit in with other ongoing City projects, such as the update to
14 the General Plan.

15
16 Mr. Early identified the meetings being conducted with Albany businesses, Albany
17 residents, and the intercept surveys with 500 people shopping and parking in the
18 area. There would also be a series of meetings with public commissions, and
19 ultimately a meeting with the City Council when the plan had been finalized.

20
21 Mr. Early described the intercept survey, a somewhat randomized survey of those
22 who were on the street and who chose to participate. The results of the survey
23 had been included in the written report, finding that slightly more than half had
24 driven while the others had walked or taken public transportation. Of those who
25 had driven, 55 percent parked on Solano or San Pablo Avenue with 35 percent
26 parking on adjacent residential streets, five percent parking in off-street private
27 parking, and the other five percent declining to identify where they had parked.
28 Fifty five percent were able to park within one block of their destination, 57
29 percent responded that they were satisfied with the City's existing time
30 restrictions, 59 percent were satisfied with parking availability, and 59 percent
31 would not be willing to pay for parking.

32
33 A detailed parking utilization study had also been conducted in the area one
34 block deep north and south off of San Pablo Avenue and two blocks east and
35 west of San Pablo Avenue where there was a total of 4,632 on-street parking
36 spaces, including both the main street and side streets. He presented a map to
37 show the overall weekday occupancy which was 50 to 60 percent most of the
38 day, and added it never got close to what was considered to be full, or 85
39 percent.

40 Mr. Early identified the areas of higher demand and noted that many of the sites
41 without regulations had higher occupancies than those that had regulations. He
42 identified the areas of highest occupancy, highlighted parking duration, and
43 detailed weekday versus weekend parking demand.

44
45 Identifying the challenges and issues involved, Mr. Early stated there was sufficient
46 parking overall although the demand was focused in some areas. The City was

1 not charging for parking, there were no time limits everywhere, those time limits
2 were not always enforced, and where they were enforced there was still a high
3 parking demand. He recommended considering transportation alternatives and
4 suggested implementation strategies could consider streetscape and lighting
5 improvements to encourage walking, wayfinding signage to help parkers quickly
6 locate spaces, parking pricing to allocate where and how people parked,
7 additional time limits that could manage short- and long-term parking, and
8 consider residential permit parking.

9
10 Mr. Early spoke to the notion of parking construction and stated that parking was
11 very expensive to construct with the Bay Area average at \$28,000 per space for
12 surface parking spaces, and \$60,000 per space for subsurface structures. In
13 Albany there would be an additional constraint given the parking cost but there
14 was also a very constrained land supply and any land available would probably
15 be dedicated to housing and not to cars. He added that the high cost of parking
16 also affected housing cost and a separate paper had been considered to
17 address that issue.

18
19 Mr. Early presented numbers of what other cities were doing with respect to
20 pricing. He noted that parking was priced generally at \$1 to \$2 per hour, with
21 some reduction in the cost for extended periods of time although a few cities
22 charged more per hour for extended periods.

23
24 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

25
26 **Alexa Hauser**, Albany, a member of the Diverse Housing Working Group, asked if
27 there was a residential parking study. She referred to Figure 1 which showed
28 regulated and unregulated parking on the blocks around Solano Avenue and
29 stated that part of each of the side streets closest to Solano Avenue was also
30 regulated, although that had not been shown on the maps. She also referred to
31 the comment that a resource would be shared on parking regulations and
32 housing costs and asked if that was also available to the public.

33
34 Mr. Bond reported that this was the only study. He explained that there had been
35 direction from the City Council to work on placing a measure on the ballot in 2016
36 regarding Measure D and residential parking requirements. The study would
37 complement the work on Measure D and help inform it, and had also been built
38 into the update of the General Plan.

39 Mr. Early clarified that the regulated streets had not been shown correctly on the
40 map and would be corrected. Further, that the study on parking requirements for
41 study had been done in an administrative draft, would be submitted to staff
42 tomorrow, and might be publicly released in two to four weeks.

43
44 Commissioner Friedland asked about the intercept survey and how many of the
45 500 or so interviewed were residents, customers, or employees.

1 Mr. Early stated the full intercept report would be provided, but reported that 19
2 percent were working, 33 percent were there for some sort of commercial reason,
3 25 percent were there as residents or visiting, and a full 21 percent had said
4 'other,' and there was no more detailed breakdown of that category.

5 Commissioner Friedland referenced the complaints from residents about
6 employee parking taking up residential spaces and suggested data in that
7 regard would be interesting and informative.

8
9 Commissioner Menotti suggested there were many merchants who parked close
10 by and fed the meter and it would be good to know that and figure out a
11 strategy to address that issue.

12
13 Mr. Early noted that there were two different studies referenced; walking or
14 driving, workers or shoppers, without knowing where they actually parked, and
15 the survey did not ask how far the respondents had walked.

16
17 Commissioner Menotti suggested there might be a security issue for why
18 merchants were parking close to their businesses. He noted that there were
19 several proposals on Solano Avenue near Little Star and it looked as if there was
20 adequate parking most times of day. He referenced the data presented and
21 questioned some of the differentials shown. On the strategies, he expressed a
22 need to talk to the school district about a shared use similar to what occurred at
23 the middle school, and suggested considering parking benefit districts where
24 funds could feed back to the neighborhoods. He asked about current
25 enforcement, and was told that while there were times when there had been no
26 active enforcement, the last year or so it had been more effective. He also noted
27 that over the last 10 years a number of cities had considered parking policies,
28 and while revenue was an important piece he suggested it could not drive the
29 policy.

30
31 Mr. Bond concurred and explained that the City was not pursuing parking
32 regulations to generate revenue in that it was pursuing parking regulations for the
33 quality of life of Albany residents.

34
35 Commissioner Friedland questioned whether there really was a parking problem
36 and suggested the data had indicated that there was adequate parking. She
37 acknowledged that there was a perception of a parking problem.

38
39 Chair Donaldson agreed that there really wasn't a parking problem although
40 there was a perception problem and there were some isolated issues, particularly
41 with red curbing in some areas.

42
43 Commissioner Friedland questioned the objective, asked if the policies they
44 wanted to consider were an economic development problem, and suggested
45 the micro problems could be solved through public policy, particularly given that
46 the intent was not revenue generating.

1
2 Chair Donaldson referred to the micro issue and spoke to employee parking for
3 some businesses. He suggested the implementation phase should consider how
4 to educate employers, provide guidance to employees, and help direct
5 employers and employees where there was capacity to park. He reiterated that
6 there was no serious overall parking problem, had been surprised there were so
7 many people walking and biking to the shopping areas, and agreed that the
8 areas with red parking had created micro problems.

9
10 Chair Donaldson referred to the implications of metering, and emphasized that
11 Albany was not metered and was not metered by the will of the people.

12
13 Mr. Early clarified that the document would be corrected to eliminate the
14 incorrect references to metering.

15
16 Commissioner Menotti referred to infill development on Solano Avenue in the
17 future and noted that some of the parking controls had been driven by the
18 initiative and there appeared to be some capacity in some of those areas.

19
20 Mr. Early stated that the point of the report yet to be submitted was that if
21 lowering the parking rate for housing would not mean that cars would be forced
22 onto the street. It just meant that they would not be building empty parking
23 spaces.

24
25 Chair Donaldson referenced some skepticism about the license plate survey and
26 Mr. Early suggested that information could be clarified when the presentation was
27 made to the Traffic and Safety Commission.

28
29 Mr. Bond affirmed that the study would be presented to the Traffic and Safety
30 Commission and be used to develop policy and for individual projects. He noted
31 the study was generally consistent with a parking study that had been developed
32 15 years ago.

33
34 Mr. Early expressed a desire to be provided that earlier study.

35
36 **8. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/DISCUSSION**

37 (Staff discussion and Commission member announcement of status of previous
38 agenda items and requests for future agenda items. No public comment will be
39 taken on requests for future agenda items).

40
41 Mr. Bond reported that on October 6, 2015, the City Council would get a briefing
42 on the waterfront transition plan to identify steps to transfer the city-owned
43 portion of the waterfront, the Bulb, to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)
44 for implementation into the State park.

45 That process would start with the City Council to get policy direction and the
46 information would be presented to the Commission as it became available.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Mr. Bond added that while there was yet no release date, staff was proceeding to finish the update to the General Plan.

Ms. Hersch reported that a substitute meeting to the regular Commission meeting scheduled for November 11, Veterans Day, had been scheduled for Tuesday, November 17. There would be no second meeting in November given the Thanksgiving Day holiday. There would also be only one meeting in December.

Ms. Hersch also clarified that the next meeting agenda would be a big one given the number of applications that had been submitted for consideration.

9. NEXT MEETING: October 14, 2015

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 P.M.
Next regular meeting: Wednesday, October 14, 2015 7:00 P.M. at Albany City Hall.

Submitted by: Anne Hersch, City Planner

Jeff Bond, Community Development Director