

City of Albany

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes of July 27, 2016 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 regular meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission was
7 called to order by Chair Giesen-Fields in the City Council Chambers at 7:00 P.M.
8 on Wednesday, July 27, 2016.

- 9
10 2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

- 11
12 3. **ROLL CALL**

13
14 Present: Friedland, Kent, Giesen-Fields

15 Absent: Donaldson, Menotti

16 Staff Present: City Planner Anne Hersch

17 Community Development Director Jeff Bond

- 18
19 4. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

20
21 Commissioner Kent requested the removal of Items 4B and 4E, and Chair Giesen-
22 Fields requested the removal of Item 4D from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

- 23
24 A. **Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes from July 13, 2016**

- 25
26 B. **PA 16-053 Design Review and Parking Reduction for a Single-Story Addition**
27 **at 1013 Stannage Avenue. [REMOVED FOR DISCUSSION]**

- 28
29 C. **PA 16-057 Design Review for Two-Level Addition at 1010 Peralta Avenue.**

30 The applicant is seeking a Design Review approval for a 34 square foot two-
31 level addition at the rear of the home at 1010 Peralta Avenue. The subject
32 site is a 5,125 square foot lot with a four bedroom, two bathroom house built
33 in 1924. The applicant is proposing to square off an existing angled rear
34 corner at the northwest corner of the home with a 17 square foot addition
35 on the upper level which will accommodate an expanded master
36 bedroom and new bathroom on the second floor. The main floor will also
37 be expanded by 17 square feet and includes a remodeled kitchen space
38 with a larger breakfast nook on the main floor.

1
2 Exterior changes include new windows, an additional skylight, expanded
3 second story deck with painted bracket details, and French doors leading
4 into the rear yard. The existing garage is proposed to be demolished. The
5 Craftsman style of the home will remain. This will result in a four bedroom,
6 three bathroom 2,326 square foot home with a maximum height of 24 feet
7 1.5 inches. **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings
8 and Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated July 27, 2016.**
9 *CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303 "New
10 Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."*
11

12 **D. PA 16-061 Design Review for New Garage at 1028 Neilson Street. [REMOVED
13 FOR DISCUSSION]**

14
15 **E. PA 16-060 Design Review for a Front and Rear Addition at 806 Curtis Street.
16 [REMOVED FOR DISCUSSION]**
17

18 **Motion to approve Consent Items 4A, Planning & Zoning Commission
19 Meeting Minutes from July 13, 2016 with a clarification at the top of Page 4
20 for PA 16-019 for 907 Key Route Boulevard to preserve the on-street parking
21 to the maximum extent feasible; and 4C, PA16-057 for 1010 Peralta Avenue,
22 pursuant to the staff report dated July 27, 2016.** Giesen-Fields

23 Seconded by: Friedland
24 AYES: Friedland, Kent, Giesen-Fields
25 NAYES: None
26 ABSENT: Donaldson, Menotti
27 **Motion passed, 3-0-2**
28

29 Chair Giesen-Fields identified the 14-day appeal period.
30

31 The following items were removed from Consent for discussion.
32

33 **B. PA 16-053 Design Review and Parking Reduction for a Single-Story Addition
34 at 1013 Stannage Avenue.** The applicant is seeking Design Review and
35 Parking Reduction approval for a single-story addition at 1013 Stannage
36 Avenue. The subject site is 3,750 square feet with an existing 855 square
37 foot two bedroom, one bathroom home built in 1924. The proposed 557
38 square foot expansion includes a new master bedroom suite, remodel and
39 expansion of the existing kitchen and laundry room, removal of the front
40 entry porch, and the conversion of an existing bedroom to family room
41 space. This will result in a 1,413 square foot two bedroom, two bathroom
42 home with a maximum height of 22 feet 8 inches. A parking reduction is
43 required to waive the second off-street parking space due to insufficient
44 room on the property. One off-street parking space is provided in the
45 attached garage. **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the**

1 findings and Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated July
2 27, 2016.

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

5
6 Commissioner Kent asked what Floor Area Ratio (FAR) required a landscape plan, and City
7 Planner Anne Hersch advised that a .45 FAR required an exceptional design, although that
8 had not been formalized within the Design Review Guidelines.

9
10 **Howard Lasseter**, the Project Architect, explained that the landscape plan had been
11 provided as requested by staff to soften the front of the home since the covered porch
12 would be removed and the applicants had desired low maintenance landscaping.

13
14 Commissioner Kent commented that while a landscape plan had been submitted, there
15 was little information provided, and what had been proposed for landscaping was actually
16 high maintenance. He suggested the applicant speak to a nursery about the landscaping,
17 and that staff review and approve the landscape plan.

18
19 Chair Giesen-Fields expressed concern that the proposal did not create a clear path to
20 the new front entrance as encouraged by the Design Review Guidelines, and could be
21 confused with the existing stairs and walkway to the rear.

22
23 Mr. Lasseter clarified that the existing stairs and walkway would remain, trash cans would
24 be located in that area, and the gate at the front of the house would be reconstructed to
25 screen the trash cans. He also clarified, when asked, that at one point the backyard of
26 the subject home had been accessed from the neighbor's yard since the two properties
27 at one time had been owned by one family. Currently, the backyard was accessed from
28 the house.

29
30 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

31
32 There was no one to speak.

33
34 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

35
36 Commissioner Friedland characterized the design of the home as thoughtful and a huge
37 improvement over the existing condition, and better met the Design Guidelines; the new
38 design harmonized the proportion of the house, the front door, and its accessibility; and
39 the landscaping would be improved. She liked the design of the plan, and recommended
40 approval.

41
42 Chair Giesen-Fields concurred and noted that it made sense to use the existing sidewalk
43 as a trash collection area and storage.

1 **Motion to approve Consent Item 4B, PA 16-053 for 1013 Stannage Avenue,**
2 **subject to staff review and approval of the landscape plan, and pursuant to**
3 **the staff report dated July 27, 2016.** Friedland

4 Seconded by: Giesen-Fields

5 AYES: Friedland, Kent, Giesen-Fields

6 NAYES: None

7 ABSENT: Donaldson, Menotti

8 **Motion passed, 3-0-2**

9
10 Chair Giesen-Fields identified the 14-day appeal period.

11
12 **D. PA 16-061 Design Review for New Garage at 1028 Neilson Street.** The
13 applicant is seeking Design Review approval for a new garage at 1028
14 Neilson Street. The subject site is a 3,500 square foot lot with an existing 1,551
15 square foot three bedroom, two bathroom home built in 1922. The
16 applicant is proposing to demolish the existing original garage and
17 construct a 260 square foot single-car garage at the southwest corner of
18 the home. The structure will be set back six inches from the side and rear
19 property lines and will have a maximum height of 11 feet 6 inches.
20 **Recommendation. Review and approve subject to the findings and**
21 **Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated July 27, 2016.**

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

25
26 Ms. Hersch presented the staff report dated July 27, 2016.

27
28 **Marian Tangherlini**, the applicant, stated the 1922 garage was in dilapidated condition
29 and needed to be replaced; the intention was to rebuild the garage in the same design
30 and using the same materials to create a place for storage.

31
32 As to why the application required Planning & Zoning Commission approval, Ms. Hersch
33 stated that in the Zoning Code any accessory structure that exceeded 200 square feet in
34 area required Planning & Zoning Commission approval.

35
36 Chair Giesen-Fields noted that the documents to review were minimal and there were no
37 elevations to show what the exterior would look like. He sought more detail for the record.

38
39 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

40
41 There was no one to speak.

42
43 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

44
45 Chair Giesen-Fields had no objection to the project but wanted the materials to be used
46 to be memorialized for the record.

1
2 Commissioner Kent concurred and noted that only the window size had been identified
3 and no other information had been provided.

4
5 Ms. Hersch noted as part of the building permit submittal a manufacturer's cut sheet would
6 be required.

7
8 **Motion to approve Consent Item 4D, PA 16-061 for 1028 Neilson, subject to**
9 **the submittal to staff for review and confirmation of consistency with the**
10 **project application the cut sheets from the window manufacturer, the**
11 **composition shingles, and the siding materials, and pursuant to the staff**
12 **report dated July 27, 2016.** Giesen-Fields

13 Seconded by: Friedland

14 AYES: Friedland, Kent, Giesen-Fields

15 NAYES: None

16 ABSENT: Donaldson, Menotti

17 **Motion passed, 3-0-2**

18
19 Chair Giesen-Fields identified the 14-day appeal period.

20
21 **E. PA 16-060 Design Review for a Front and Rear Addition at 806 Curtis Street.**

22 The applicant is seeking Design Review approval for a 242 square foot first
23 and second story addition for an existing home at 806 Curtis Street. The
24 subject site is a 3,200 square foot lot with an existing 1,554 square foot two
25 bedroom, two bathroom house built in 1936, last remodeled in 1960. The
26 applicant is proposing a 79 square foot main floor addition to
27 accommodate a bathroom and a new study space at the rear of the
28 home. The proposed 163 square foot second floor addition at the front of
29 the home creates a third bedroom, third bathroom, and expanded closet
30 space for the master bedroom. The proposed design will result in a three
31 bedroom, three bathroom, 1,756.62 square foot home with a maximum
32 height of 20 feet 3.25 inches. Two off-street parking spaces are provided in
33 the existing driveway and attached garage. **Recommendation. Review**
34 **and approve subject to the findings and Conditions of Approval attached**
35 **to the staff report dated July 27, 2016.**

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

39
40 Ms. Hersch presented the staff report dated July 27, 2016.

41
42 Given the .55 FAR, Commissioner Kent sought a landscape plan and verified with Ms.
43 Hersch that could be done at the building permit phase.

44
45 **Jason Kaldis**, the Project Architect, described the project as similar to others in Albany
46 where there were narrow side yard entries for the pedestrian entry and narrow side yard

1 access to the driveway, and on many of those sites the space beyond the living room had
2 either a closet or angled wall to suggest traffic maneuvering. He noted the reality was that
3 hardly anyone used the garage so there was a narrow one-car garage with a narrow
4 space in front of it. He referred to a similar site that the Commission had approved to note
5 how to maintain the access, which had been done with a diagonal steel beam in the
6 basement to avoid the need to place a column at the corner. He described the
7 decorative treatments on the front and noted that the addition on the back was more
8 mundane and stepped back from the north property line to provide four feet of side yard
9 given that the culvert sliced through at that point.

10
11 Mr. Kaldis explained that work had previously been done on the property, under permit,
12 and the culvert had been located at that time with a licensed surveyor, with the outcome
13 that a condition of approval required that during construction adjustments to the
14 foundation might have to be made. He was prepared to do that in this case, if required.
15 He clarified that the house was currently landscaped and there would be no alteration to
16 that landscaping.

17
18 Chair Giesen-Fields commented that the proposal with the diagonal bracing was a good
19 idea. With respect to the garage and parking, and specifically the buttress over it, he was
20 particularly concerned the buttress seemed to make the garage inaccessible.

21
22 Mr. Kaldis emphasized that they had already checked and verified that the diagonal
23 beam would work and the beam that would cantilever over the top of the diagonal would
24 fit into the existing framework. There would be no change to the paving and no change
25 to the site improvements.

26
27 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

28
29 There was no one to speak.

30
31 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

32
33 Commissioner Friedland supported the plans and the clever solution to a tight and odd lot
34 with a weird parking arrangement. She described the plans as well done.

35
36 Chair Giesen-Fields agreed, liked the design elements, and stated the proposal
37 represented a change for the better in the design of the building.

38
39 **Motion to approve Consent Item 4E, PA 16-060 for 806 Curtis Street, pursuant**
40 **to the staff report dated July 27, 2016.** Friedland

41 Seconded by: Giesen-Fields

42 AYES: Friedland, Kent, Giesen-Fields

43 NAYES: None

44 ABSENT: Donaldson, Menotti

45 **Motion passed, 3-0-2**

46

1 Chair Giesen-Fields identified the 14-day appeal period.

2
3 **5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

4
5 There was no one to speak.

6
7 **6. DISCUSSIONS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING**
8 **ITEMS:**

9
10 **A. PA 16-059 Design Review and Conditional Use Permit for a Second Story**
11 **Addition at 922 Neilson Street.** The applicant is seeking approval for Design
12 Review and Conditional Use Permit approval for a second story addition at
13 922 Neilson Street.

14 The subject site is a 3,680 square foot lot with a three bedroom, two
15 bathroom home built in 1918, last remodeled in 1973. The applicant is
16 proposing to excavate the basement to allow for a family room area as
17 well as an additional bedroom. A first floor addition of 81 square feet is
18 proposed and will be located at the front of the home. The second story
19 addition is 660 square feet and includes two additional bedrooms, study
20 alcove, and bathroom. The bungalow style of the home will be carried
21 through in design elements of the proposed project. This will result in a five
22 bedroom, three bathroom, 2,036.66 square foot home with a maximum
23 height of 27 feet 11.25 inches. Two off-street parking spaces are provided
24 in the existing driveway. A Conditional Use Permit is required to extend the
25 existing non-conforming north and west walls. **Recommendation. Review**
26 **and approve subject to the findings and Conditions of Approval in the staff**
27 **report dated July 27, 2016.**

28
29 *CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303 "New*
30 *Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."*

31
32 Ms. Hersch presented the staff report dated July 27, 2016, and verified in response to
33 Commissioner Kent the exclusion of the basement excavation from the FAR given that the
34 average perimeter height was less than five feet.

35
36 **Jason Kaldis**, the Project Architect, stated the basic strategy of adding the second story
37 was to extend the front roof plane up to the height limit and pivot that roof plane back.
38 He referred to a project at 925 Carmel Avenue that had done something similar up to the
39 height limit and noted that it was most effective in massing the height from the street. The
40 roof deck on the upper level was largely a sun space to gain solar access for the upstairs
41 bedroom. At some time in the past there had been a garage in the back corner although
42 at some point it had been removed. There was sufficient parking in the side yard for
43 tandem parking. A gate had been established so that the tandem space would work
44 without interfering with a side yard stair in the back to gain access to the basement, and
45 a side yard stair to allow descent from the kitchen into the backyard to take out trash. The
46 front porch already had a screen and it would be enclosed to create an entry hall.

1
2 Mr. Kaldis stated that a number of window improvements had been proposed. In this case,
3 all new window casements and awnings would be divided, would fit the highest style in
4 Albany, and compositionally would still respect some of the plainness of the other houses,
5 likely to be more appreciated from the inside than from the outside. Wide casings would
6 be provided, an applied sub sill would emulate the sub sills of the old houses, no apron
7 would be shown, the front porch would have an existing wind screen, and the front door
8 would migrate out to the front porch. The back porch included a wooden railing with
9 wooden stairs and the back door would be a half-light French door to allow a connection
10 to the backyard. The main bedroom was to the back and no windows had been placed
11 towards the south for privacy purposes and the absence of a window would help privacy
12 between neighbors. The chimney would also have to be extended.

13
14 Commissioner Kent referred to the location of the gate which had been shown in two
15 different locations, and verified with Mr. Kaldis that the gate would be located in the front.
16 Commissioner Kent suggested the rear would be a better placement. He also verified that
17 the driveway width would be 9.5 feet. He expressed concern with the two smaller fixed
18 windows and verified that Windows 2 and 3 would have to be vented.

19
20 Mr. Kaldis advised that those windows would serve the utility storage area and were more
21 for daylight than for ventilation, and there might need to be some restriction to avoid
22 opening the windows into the driveway area. He also commented that he was concerned
23 with Windows 4 and 5 and potential vehicle idling that could affect the applicant's
24 property.

25
26 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

27
28 **Joe Pierre**, 915 Neilson Street, Albany, liked the design and the improvement for the
29 neighborhood, but expressed concern that the home was currently rented to students. His
30 concern was for the use of the home and the applicant's intention if able to improve the
31 property.

32
33 **Bjorn Horje**, 1461 Marin Avenue, Albany, whose home was to the south of the property,
34 stated that the proposal would be huge from his backyard and tower over his open space.
35 He suggested the structure would block sunlight from reaching his forward bedroom
36 windows, and suggested some landscaping might be able to shield the home from his
37 backyard. He was also concerned with water management and noted that water from
38 the subject property spilled over into his property. He too was concerned that the property
39 had been used as rental property and with more space suggested it could be rented to
40 twice the number of people who currently occupied the property. He suggested that
41 some of his concerns could be addressed if the structure was moved toward the front from
42 the back where it would be most invasive.

43
44 Mr. Kaldis clarified that the applicant would live on the ground floor of the home although
45 there would be a chair lift on the stair to get from the ground floor to the lower floor if that
46 should become necessary. He also clarified that as part of the excavation of the

1 basement, the City required a civil engineer to design a pump system to discharge through
2 the curb face to the street, which should provide a better situation for the neighbor, and
3 they would also have to address whether side yard drainage was sheeting towards the
4 neighbor and there was an opportunity to alter the grade if necessary. He suggested that
5 higher fences or fence posts with planting might help address the privacy issues, and with
6 respect to daylighting, it was possibly late in the day during summer where there might be
7 some effect. He suggested that Mr. Horje would get reflection from the home during the
8 day from the north façade. He added that he would work with the neighbors on whatever
9 landscaping would work best.

10
11 Mr. Horje expressed his appreciation to Mr. Kaldis to work on the landscaping to reduce
12 the loss of privacy, did not know that he would be subjected to more sunlight during the
13 day, and stated in general the project was not very desirable from his perspective.

14
15 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

16
17 Chair Giesen-Fields liked the aesthetic design of the project, suggested it was a good
18 improvement, sympathized with some of the concerns related to the massiveness of the
19 project, and appreciated the applicant's willingness to work with the neighbors to resolve
20 the issues.

21 Chair Giesen-Fields added that as presented, the property would be owner occupied. He
22 supported the applicant's willingness to adjust the grading and relocating the utility service
23 to mitigate and runoff on the neighbor's property. He expressed his hope that the
24 applicant and the neighbor could work out the privacy issues.

25
26 Commissioner Friedland suggested that those issues were generally worked out prior to this
27 time and she was disappointed that had not occurred to date. She otherwise liked the
28 thoughtful and beautiful design.

29
30 Commissioner Kent supported the design and noted that some of the privacy issues had
31 already been addressed in that the deck faced towards the street and the part of the
32 building looking down into the neighbor's yard would be the study alcove. He also noted
33 that the parking stopped prior to the neighbor's house and there was plenty of room to
34 plant landscaping that would help screen the neighbors. He did not believe the neighbor
35 would be impacted as much as he feared. He suggested there would be a bit of shadow
36 to the neighbor in late summer but he did not see that it would be detrimental. He
37 suggested the biggest concern was the water issue and he emphasized that the drainage
38 would need to be designed well and those issues should be addressed as part of the
39 process.

40
41 **Yvonne Tom**, the property owner, explained why she had moved out of the house years
42 ago and was pleased to be able to move back into the house she loved. It was her and
43 her husband's intent to live in the house.

44
45 Chair Giesen-Fields suggested that the issues expressed by the neighbors could be
46 addressed, particularly with the willingness of the applicant to work with the neighbors to

1 address potential privacy issues. He did not see a need to have the project be redesigned
2 since that could create issues for other neighbors.

3
4 In response to Mr. Horje's concern that he might be required to fund the solutions to address
5 his concerns, Ms. Hersch explained the Commission could include a condition regarding
6 landscaping but it would be up to the applicant and the property owner to work out the
7 particulars. She noted that generally neighbors worked out the issues together to come
8 up with a reasonable solution, and with respect to cost, it was generally worked out
9 between the two parties. She suggested that most of the landscaping and potential fence
10 mitigation would be occurring on the subject site so presumably the applicant would bear
11 those costs. She clarified that the requirements of the final plan would be verified as part
12 of the planning inspection final walk through.

13
14 Commissioner Kent suggested that vegetation and not a fence would have to be used to
15 mitigate the privacy concern with what he described as a simple landscape plan that did
16 not need to be returned to the Commission.

17
18 Chair Giesen-Fields requested the inclusion of a landscape plan for the project given the
19 high FAR with a condition that the landscape plan include and identify landscape
20 screening via planting on the property with the applicant and neighbor to work out the
21 details of that plan.

22
23 Ms. Hersch stated if it came back to the Planning Commission the landscape plan would
24 come back as a consent calendar item at a high level with broad language to provide
25 landscape screening and privacy.

26
27 **Motion to approve PA 16-059 for 922 Neilson Street, subject to the submittal**
28 **of a landscape plan collaborated between the applicant and the neighbor**
29 **to identify and address landscape screening to provide privacy to the south**
30 **facing neighbor subject to staff review and approval, and pursuant to the**
31 **staff report dated July 27, 2016.** Friedland

32 Seconded by: Giesen-Fields

33 AYES: Friedland, Kent, Giesen-Fields

34 NAYES: None

35 ABSENT: Donaldson, Menotti

36 **Motion passed, 3-0-2**

37
38 Chair Giesen-Fields identified the 14-day appeal period.

39
40 **7. NEW BUSINESS**

41
42 **A. Nexus Fee Study Update.** Update to the Commission on the affordable
43 housing nexus fee study. The draft reports analyze the linkages between
44 new residential and commercial development of new residential units and
45 the need for additional affordable housing in the City of Albany. The report
46 has been prepared by Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA) for the City of

1 Albany, pursuant to contracts both parties have with the Silicon Valley
2 Community Foundation. Upon completion, the nexus analysis enables the
3 City to consider enactment of affordable housing impact fees applicable
4 to residential and commercial development in the City of Albany. The
5 conclusions of the analysis represent maximum supportable or legally
6 defensible impact fee levels based on the impact of new development on
7 the need for affordable housing. Findings contained in the report are not
8 necessarily recommended fee levels.

9
10 Community Development Director Jeff Bond presented two draft reports and noted the
11 background for the reports had come from the Albany Housing Element that had been
12 approved in 2015. Among the many policies and programs that had been identified was
13 consideration and establishment of an affordable housing fee to develop affordable
14 housing in Albany. He highlighted the staff report to describe how the reports had been
15 prepared in collaboration with a variety of different cities in Santa Clara and Alameda
16 counties, and explained that the Silicon Valley Community Foundation was providing
17 financial support to hire a Project Manager which had hired KMA, which had prepared the
18 reports. He described how the affordable housing impact fees applicable to residential
19 and commercial development would be set and emphasized that the gaps between the
20 high cost of housing and the price deemed to be affordable was very large and the
21 concept behind the fee was to create some revenues to fill the gap, which would result in
22 a large fee if charged.

23
24
25
26 The purpose of the reports was to provide information to the community and a legal
27 defense for future decisions the Commission would need to consider and the City Council
28 would have to approve with respect to fee levels. There was a desire for a consistent fee
29 amongst the cities involved although there might be some differences between one
30 community and the next or for types of housing, and the implication of the fee over an
31 economic cycle would have to be considered, with a desire for a steady source of income
32 over time, and the need to avoid creating unintended consequences in the community.

33
34 As to how many units needed to be made affordable in response to Commissioner Kent,
35 Mr. Bond advised that ABAG's Regional Housing Needs Allocation for Albany had identified
36 363 units with more than half of that to be affordable to one level or another for an eight-
37 year commitment. The allocation of affordable housing between 2015 and 2023 was 188
38 units which had been projected by ABAG in order to meet the overall demand for
39 affordable housing in the region.

40
41 Commissioner Friedland was pleased that the Silicon Valley Community Foundation had
42 funded the study and stated the justification for charging a very high fee was an important
43 step but was different from setting the policy for what the fee should be, which she
44 suggested would not be what had been identified. She supported the important first step.
45

1 Chair Giesen-Fields suggested in the next review of the policy phase there should be a
2 breakdown of other housing fees imposed by other Alameda County communities.

3
4 Mr. Bond stated that the consultant was working on that now and a third report would
5 identify what other communities were doing. He noted there were about 15 other cities
6 involved in the current collaboration.

7
8 **8. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/DISCUSSION**

9
10 There were no announcements, communications, or discussion.

11
12 **9. NEXT MEETING:** September 14, 2016

13
14 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

15
16 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45 P.M.

17 Next regular meeting: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 at 7:00 P.M. at Albany City Hall.
18
19
20

21
22 _____
Submitted by: Anne Hersch, City Planner

23
24
25 _____
26 **Jeff Bond, Community Development Director**
27