

# *City of Albany*

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

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ROLL CALL**

Present: Donaldson, Friedland, Kent, Menotti, Giesen-Fields

Absent: None

Staff Present: City Planner Anne Hersch

4. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

Commissioner Friedland requested a discussion of Item C, PA 16-046 given a letter received from a neighbor; Chair Giesen-Fields requested a revision to Item B, the minutes from the May 25, 2016 meeting. Both items were removed from Consent.

A. **Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes from May 25, 2016**  
**[REMOVED FOR DISCUSSION]**

B. **PA 16-044 Design Review for Rear Yard Deck at 607 Adams Street.** The applicant is seeking Design Review approval for an upper level deck at 607 Adams Street. The subject site is a 7,500 square foot lot with an existing 2,515 square foot four bedroom, two bathroom home built in 1929. The applicant is proposing to build an upper level deck that will be accessible from the kitchen at the rear of the home. The deck will be approximately 250 square feet in area, 10 feet 11 inches above grade, and will have new stairs to access the rear yard. It will not be visible from the street. **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the findings and Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated June 8, 2016. CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303 "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."**

1           **C. PA 16-046 Conditional Use Permit and Parking Exception for Mathnasium**  
2           **Tutoring Center at 1007 Solano Avenue.** The applicant is seeking  
3           Conditional Use Permit and Parking Exception approval for a new math  
4           tutoring center at 1007 Solano Avenue. The subject site is a 3,750 square  
5           foot lot with an existing 3,779 square foot two-story mixed use building built  
6           in 1937. The applicant is proposing to occupy the 1,500 square foot ground  
7           level space and offer math tutoring services from grades 2-12. The business  
8           is proposed to be open Monday-Thursday 2:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. and  
9           Saturday 10:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. There will be up to seven instructors for the  
10          business and no more than 25 children on-site. The building has recently  
11          been upgraded and is Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.  
12          There is no off-street parking. An Exception is required for 10 off-street  
13          parking spaces. **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the**  
14          **findings and Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated June**  
15          **8, 2016. CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section**  
16          **15303 "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."**  
17          **[REMOVED FOR DISCUSSION]**

18  
19           **Motion to approve Consent Item B, PA 16-044 for 607 Adams Street, pursuant**  
20           **to the staff report dated June 8, 2016.** Menotti

21           Seconded by:           Friedland

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

23           NAYES:                 None

24           ABSENT: None

25           **Motion passed, 5-0**

26  
27           Chair Giesen-Fields identified the 14-day appeal period.

28  
29           The following items were removed from Consent for discussion.

30  
31           **A. Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes from May 25, 2016**

32  
33           Chair Giesen-Fields referred to Page 3 of the May 25, 2016 minutes and the comments from  
34           Alexa Hauser related to Affordable Housing Week, and requested that the minutes reflect  
35           that he had asked staff to follow up to schedule a meeting time for another Affordable  
36           Housing session open to the public.

37  
38           **Motion to approve the Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes from**  
39           **May 25, 2016, as amended.** Giesen-Fields

40           Seconded by:           Donaldson

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

42           NAYES:                 None

43           ABSENT: None

44           **Motion passed, 5-0**

1           **C. PA 16-046 Conditional Use Permit and Parking Exception for Mathnasium**  
2           **Tutoring Center at 1007 Solano Avenue.** The applicant is seeking  
3           Conditional Use Permit and Parking Exception approval for a new math  
4           tutoring center at 1007 Solano Avenue. The subject site is a 3,750 square  
5           foot lot with an existing 3,779 square foot two-story mixed use building built  
6           in 1937. The applicant is proposing to occupy the 1,500 square foot ground  
7           level space and offer math tutoring services from grades 2-12. The business  
8           is proposed to be open Monday-Thursday 2:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. and  
9           Saturday 10:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. There will be up to seven instructors for the  
10          business and no more than 25 children on-site. The building has recently  
11          been upgraded and is Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.  
12          There is no off-street parking. An Exception is required for 10 off-street  
13          parking spaces. **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the**  
14          **findings and Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated June**  
15          **8, 2016. CEQA:**

16  
17                   *The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303 "New*  
18                   *Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."*  
19

20          City Planner Anne Hersch presented the staff report dated June 8, 2016.

21  
22          **Andre Bertrand**, the Owner and Director of Mathnasium, explained that the operation was  
23          a franchise after school program where children would attend for one hour twice a week;  
24          parents would drop off the children and pick them up an hour later. There was a ratio of  
25          four students per instructor, with six to seven instructors present when the school was really  
26          busy. The busiest hours would be 3:00 to 4:00 P.M. and 4:00 to 5:00 P.M. He did not expect  
27          a parking problem. When asked, he stated his territory covered all of Berkeley, Albany,  
28          Kensington, and south El Cerrito with a concentration on elementary and middle school  
29          students. The center would be open until 6:00 P.M. He noted there were 700 franchises in  
30          the U.S. and Canada and fourth to seventh grades represented the peak of enrollment.  
31          Instructors would be primarily college students or college graduates in math and science,  
32          many would use public transportation, and most instructors would be scheduled for two-  
33          to four-hour shifts.

34  
35          Commissioner Donaldson asked if the students and instructors could be encouraged to  
36          ride bicycles to the site and asked if bicycles could be kept indoors. Mr. Bertrand stated  
37          that would be possible.

38  
39          When asked, Ms. Hersch advised that the site had been vacant for about two years.

40  
41          PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

42  
43          **Carl Wilmsen**, 825 Madison, Albany, had no problem with the proposed use but did have  
44          a problem with a parking variance given that there was no parking available on the street  
45          at 5:00 P.M. He too urged the City to encourage students and instructors to take public  
46          transportation or bike to the site, and recommended a white curb for drop-offs only.

1  
2 Mr. Bertrand noted there was 90-minute and 20-minute parking in front of the building  
3 although he preferred drop-offs only.

4 Ms. Hersch advised that staff would work with the applicant and explained that a white  
5 curb would have to be processed through the Traffic and Safety Commission.  
6

7 **Lindsey Maddochs** commented that she worked at the nearby Albany Sauna, had been  
8 asked to represent that business, and explained that the 90-minute parking was intended  
9 to be timed with the 90-minute massages offered at the Sauna. She commented that  
10 there were three employees at Albany Sauna and they had to park on side streets.  
11

12 **Marcy Lauer**, Albany, a next door resident to the proposed business, suggested the business  
13 would be a great fit for the building, and confirmed that parking was tight in the  
14 neighborhood. Noting that a lack of parking was generally part and parcel with city living  
15 and neighbors were flexible because of that, she asked that the City also be flexible with  
16 neighbors, particularly since the curbs in front of her garage had recently been painted  
17 red and a parking space that she had previously enjoyed in front of her home was now  
18 not available to her. She too asked that those coming to the site walk or bike when  
19 possible.  
20

21 Commissioner Friedland agreed that if the employees were primarily college students they  
22 would likely not be driving cars, would not contribute to the parking concerns, and would  
23 hopefully be walkers, bikers, and public transit riders. She supported the employment for  
24 those of college age, supported the generation of economic activity along that street,  
25 recognized that the hours of operation would be limited, and suggested the use was  
26 probably the least impactful use that could occupy the site.  
27

28 Chair Giesen-Fields noted that the parking survey conducted last year had indicated that  
29 the parking for weekday mid-day and evening occupancy showed an 85 to 95 percent  
30 occupancy rate on that block. He supported the educational facility, noted that parking  
31 issues were common in Albany, and agreed if the majority of instructors were college  
32 students that could lower the number of cars to be parked at the site.  
33

34 Commissioner Menotti supported the application, noted the special conditions for bike  
35 parking on the street, recommended bike parking inside, and suggested that Solano in  
36 some places was struggling and the City would like to see more economic development  
37 although that had to be balanced with a requirement for more parking. He  
38 recommended that the economic development committee consider that issue and  
39 suggested there might be an opportunity to revisit the situation.  
40

41 Commissioner Kent verified with staff that there was a residence in the rear and the parking  
42 in the rear was for the residents and not for the retail component. He referred to the parking  
43 challenges and stated that anything that could be done to lessen the demand for parking  
44 would be critical, which he suggested had been addressed. He supported the application  
45 as a good use for the neighbors and for the City.  
46

1 Commissioner Donaldson commented that there would be no parking during the morning  
2 or noon hour and the center would be closed when the parking demand peaked given  
3 the restaurants and theater in the area. A bicycle savvy population would be using the  
4 center which should work out well for the site with the same impact or less than another  
5 use might have.

6 Commissioner Donaldson supported the application and recognized that with no  
7 available off-street parking, the parking demand would have to be met on the streets.

8  
9 In response to the Chair as to what had been done historically with respect to parking  
10 exceptions on the site, Ms. Hersch stated in the past the use had gone from a retail use to  
11 a retail use and there had been no discretionary review in that it had been a simple issue  
12 of a business license.

13  
14 Commissioner Kent asked about the redlining of the curb and Ms. Hersch stated that was  
15 typically done where a homeowner had an issue where the on-street parking blocked their  
16 driveway access; she would check with staff with respect to that situation.

17  
18 Chair Giesen-Fields supported a condition to require bicycle parking and Ms. Hersch stated  
19 that had been included as part of the draft conditions.

20  
21 **Motion to approve Consent Item C, PA 16-046 for 1007 Solano Avenue,**  
22 **pursuant to the staff report dated June 8, 2016.** Friedland

23 Seconded by: Donaldson

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

25 NAYES: None

26 ABSENT: None

27 **Motion passed, 5-0**

28  
29 Chair Giesen-Fields identified the 14-day appeal period.

30  
31 **5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

32  
33 There were no comments from the public.

34  
35 **6. DISCUSSIONS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING**  
36 **ITEMS:**

- 37  
38 A. **PA 16-042 Design Review, Conditional Use Permit, Parking Exception for**  
39 **Second Story Addition at 840 Carmel Avenue.** The applicant is seeking  
40 Design Review, Conditional Use Permit, and Parking Exception approval for  
41 a second story addition at 840 Carmel Avenue. The subject site is a 2,500  
42 square foot lot with an existing 891 square foot two bedroom, one  
43 bathroom home built in 1926. The applicant is proposing to add 218 square  
44 feet on the first floor of the existing home to accommodate an expanded  
45 kitchen, stairwell, and nook. The second story is proposed to be 529 square  
46 feet in area and will include two bedrooms and two bathrooms. This will

1 result in a 1,499 square foot four bedroom, three bathroom home, with a  
2 maximum height of 25 feet 6 inches. One off-street parking space is  
3 provided in the attached garage. A second off-street parking space is  
4 proposed to be located in the driveway in the setback, requiring an  
5 Exception. A Conditional Use Permit is required to extend the non-  
6 conforming north wall and a portion of the south wall. The home is an  
7 original "MacGregor" and is proposed to maintain the current  
8 appearance. **Recommendation: Review and approve subject to the**  
9 **findings and Conditions of Approval attached to the staff report dated June**  
10 **8, 2016.**

11  
12 *CEQA: The project is Categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15303 "New*  
13 *Construction or Conversion of Small Structures."*

14  
15 City Planner Anne Hersch presented the staff report dated June 8, 2016.

16  
17 **Jerri Holan**, the Project Architect, stated the approach to the home would be similar to the  
18 other MacGregor upgrades; upgrading the systems, stabilizing the structure, improving the  
19 energy performance, restoring materials and finishes, and maintaining the MacGregor  
20 quality. The improvements would be of the highest caliber since the home was situated  
21 adjacent to the MacGregor Building. The roofline had been changed at the sidewalk, a  
22 real tile roof would be installed on the entire structure, a new stucco finish would be  
23 installed on the entire structure, stucco reveals would be added as would wrought iron  
24 work, a new garage door, new landscaping, and on the interior the original tiles on the  
25 fireplace would be restored since they had been painted over. In addition, there would  
26 be a cathedral ceiling in every room except the dining room and the kitchen. She stated  
27 in general the neighbors supported the project.

28  
29 With respect to the landscape plan, the landscape architect referred to the loquat tree  
30 inside the setback, noted that loquat trees dropped fruit, were messy, and the neighbor  
31 asked that the tree be removed as part of the project. The tree would be removed given  
32 the small size of the back yard. She had met with the neighbor and agreed to plant a tree  
33 in a narrow spot on the neighbor's property where the tree, with full coverage, should be  
34 able to screen out the back of the building, and had offered options and suggestions for  
35 different trees that could be used.

36  
37 Commissioner Donaldson recommended a *prunus caroliniana*, a fast growing evergreen.

38  
39 Commissioner Kent commented that the offer to plant a tree was very neighborly; he  
40 understood the loquat was a messy tree and could impact the back yard, and supported  
41 its removal. With respect to the paving pattern for the driveway, he suggested the stones  
42 appeared to be too wide and could crack, although the landscape architect stated the  
43 stones had been shown schematically and would not be as wide as shown in the  
44 illustration.

45  
46 PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

1  
2 **Don LaFranz**, 837 Ramona Avenue, Albany, had submitted an email to request that the  
3 loquat tree be preserved given that it provided good screening to his home and his back  
4 yard. He had spoken with the landscape architect this date and stated something could  
5 potentially be worked out.

6  
7 PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

8  
9 Chair Giesen-Fields was pleased the applicant and the neighbor were working together to  
10 resolve the issue of the tree, clarified that the Commission could not require the applicant  
11 to plant something on someone else's property, and while the Commission could require  
12 the removal of the tree he suggested that be worked out between the applicant and the  
13 neighbor.

14 Commissioner Friedland supported the solution to the tiny home on the tiny lot, liked the  
15 proportions, the style, and for the most part the remarkable transformations, and  
16 commended the architect and landscape architect on the projects.

17  
18 Chair Giesen-Fields referred to the extension of the non-conforming wall on the property  
19 line, generally did not like to approve those extensions, but because of the spacing  
20 between the homes, he could support it in this case.

21  
22 Commissioner Donaldson had the same concern and the same conclusion, and supported  
23 the design. His only concern was the late arrival of the story poles which would normally  
24 have been installed at the same time as the notices were sent out. While he supported  
25 the project, given that the story poles had not been installed for long, he recommended  
26 that the application be continued and be included on the consent calendar at the next  
27 meeting.

28  
29 Chair Giesen-Fields concurred and supported the installation of the story poles for the full  
30 noticing period.

31  
32 Ms. Holan apologized for the late installation of story poles but explained that the day after  
33 she had submitted the project she had hand distributed the plans to each neighbor on the  
34 street, two weeks prior to the distribution of the notices. She added that everyone wanted  
35 the home improved. She would submit, for the record, a copy of the letter she had  
36 submitted to the neighbors on May 23, 2016.

37  
38 Commissioner Donaldson verified with staff that the story pole policy was included in City  
39 code, required installation 10 days in advance, and would remain during the appeal  
40 period.

41  
42 On the discussion by the Commission to make sure that the public was well informed of the  
43 application through the story poles, as required, Ms. Hersch explained that the Commission  
44 had approved 728 Cornell Avenue, which had a similar glitch in the installation of story  
45 poles, when the Commission had approved that application anyway, which had been  
46 mentioned in the appeal of that application.

1  
2 Commissioner Menotti commended the design but asked if there was no agreement with  
3 the rear neighbor whether there was an alternative landscape plan to provide something  
4 on the subject property, to which Ms. Holan stated that installing another tree in the yard  
5 was a concern given that there was no sun in the backyard; another tree was not intended  
6 but could be added if determined by the Commission.  
7

8 On a proposed continuance, Ms. Hersch advised that the next meeting scheduled for June  
9 22 would be cancelled and the next meeting thereafter would be on July 13, 2016.  
10

11 **Motion to continue PA 16-042 for 840 Carmel Avenue to a date certain of**  
12 **July 13, 2016.** Donaldson

13 Seconded by: Menotti

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

15 NAYES: Friedland

16 ABSENT: None

17 **Motion passed, 4-1**  
18

- 19 **B. PA 16-041 Design Review and Parking Exception for a Second Story Addition**  
20 **at 761 Gateview Avenue.** The applicant is seeking Design Review and  
21 Parking Exception approval for a second story addition at 761 Gateview  
22 Avenue. The subject site is a 4,262 square foot lot with an existing 1,080  
23 square foot three bedroom, two bathroom home built in 1969. The project  
24 scope includes a 341 square foot bedroom/bathroom addition located at  
25 the rear of the home as well as an 878 square foot second story addition.  
26 The second story addition includes three bedrooms and two bathrooms.  
27 This will result in a 2,320 square foot six bedroom, four bathroom house with  
28 a maximum height of 24 feet 9 inches. One parking space is provided in  
29 the attached garage and the second parking space is proposed to be  
30 located in the setback, requiring a front yard Exception. **Recommendation:**  
31 **Review and provide feedback to the applicant and staff. Draft findings and**  
32 **Conditions of Approval are included should the Commission decide to take**  
33 **action.**  
34

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

38 City Planner Hersch presented the staff report dated June 8, 2016.  
39

40 **Ben Tarcher**, the Project Architect, explained that the home would be expanded to  
41 accommodate the size of the family and he had designed something that worked for the  
42 client while remaining within the envelope of the zoning limitations. He noted that the  
43 second story would not be visible from the street. Most of the building was stucco, there  
44 was some horizontal wood siding in the front that would be retained, and since the deck  
45 would be redone the railings would also be replaced as would the steps. He stated there  
46 would be plenty of parking but some of the parking would be tandem parking. The



1 property owner owned a smaller car and he expected that three cars could be parked off  
2 street. He added that the backyard was steep, the addition would cantilever a bit into the  
3 yard, although the yard was currently almost unusable due to the steepness and a small  
4 deck had been added over what he called a cliff.

5  
6 There would be a new internal stair inside; the kitchen would be redone although it would  
7 be in the same place; and any impacts on the neighbors had been mitigated to the  
8 greatest extent possible. The homes on either side of the subject site were taller and larger  
9 than what had been proposed as part of the application. The addition would not be visible  
10 from the front or rear given the steepness of the lot, and the home in the rear would be  
11 able to see over the roof. The adjacent houses were currently looking onto the subject  
12 house and no setbacks were being violated.

13  
14 When asked, Mr. Tarcher identified some of the design elements of the cottage style home  
15 with simple lines in the same design and roof slope of the existing home. The master suite  
16 had a view and a Romeo and Juliet deck had been proposed to allow the enjoyment of  
17 the view. The design of the existing home had not been changed and the new elements  
18 were consistent with what currently existed.

19  
20 Given the high floor area ratio (FAR), Commissioner Kent emphasized that the proposal  
21 required exceptional design. He referred to the steps on the outside and commented that  
22 they were very steep at 8.9 inches per step, and the handrails did not reach the bottom.

23  
24 Mr. Tarcher explained that was the existing condition, and while the stairs would remain in  
25 the existing location, they would be rebuilt to code. When asked about the back deck,  
26 he emphasized the steep slope and agreed with Commissioner Kent's concern for the 18  
27 inches between grade. He suggested the area might have to be enclosed or used to store  
28 bicycles. He also commented that he did not think it would be cantilevered.

29  
30 PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

31  
32 **Younian Lou**, 756 Gateview Avenue, Albany, who lived across the street from the subject  
33 site, expressed concern for the second parking space which was very steep and for the  
34 number of cars that could be associated with the site given the proposed six bedrooms.  
35 He suggested the steepness of the slope could create a safety issue for neighbors, and  
36 recommended that other solutions to the parking be considered.

37  
38 When asked, Mr. Tarcher described the wide parking area and used the plan to show  
39 where three cars could be parked. As to the neighbors' concern for the existing slope of  
40 the parking, he stated if changing the slope there would be no way to get into the garage  
41 and there would be a very steep approach to the driveway. He agreed that the area was  
42 very steep and major excavation would be required to address that issue. When asked if  
43 other areas could be leveled, he stated that significant excavation would be required and  
44 compared to other houses on the block stated the subject site had a substantial amount  
45 of parking and residents currently parked on the driveway. Given the topography, he  
46 added it was fortunate the garage had been set back a decent space.

1  
2 Chair Giesen-Fields verified with staff the requirement for a Parking Exception for the front  
3 yard setback.

4  
5 In response to Commissioner Menotti, Ms. Hersch stated that generally when considering  
6 parking the slope was not a factor in that the concern was to ensure the base dimensions  
7 of 8.5 feet in width and 18 feet in length.

8  
9 PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

10  
11 Chair Giesen-Fields commented that every house in the cul-de-sac had a car parked in  
12 front of it on the sidewalk. In terms of the design, he liked the fact that some of the windows  
13 had an expressed trim adding some detail and he liked the mix of materiality in terms of  
14 keeping the horizontal siding at the bottom and stucco at the top. He agreed the stairs  
15 should be revised to be more code friendly.

16  
17 Commissioner Friedland asked if Commissioner Kent had to recuse himself given that he  
18 lived in the neighborhood.

19  
20 Commissioner Menotti noted that from the front view the windows on the upper level were  
21 not symmetrical. He was concerned with the steepness of the driveway and questioned  
22 whether it was a viable place to park.

23  
24 With respect to the windows on the upper level, Commissioner Donaldson agreed it was  
25 asymmetrical but suggested the window would not be visible. He generally supported the  
26 project, did not see that it reached a higher standard given the high FAR, questioned the  
27 six bedrooms and noted the likelihood that more than two cars would be parked in the  
28 future, although he recognized that the current parking requirement was two spaces for  
29 each single-family dwelling. His only concern with the Parking Exception was the steepness  
30 of the driveway although the City had no policy with that aspect. As it was, there was a  
31 big paved area that could easily accommodate two cars. He supported the project,  
32 acknowledged the steep slope, and noted there was a vacant lot behind the house and  
33 it would not be difficult to place a house on that hillside and have great views given that  
34 the second floor addition would be well below the hillside. He stressed the need for a  
35 higher level of design but recognized that the architect was following the contemporary  
36 mid-century modern style of the existing structure.

37  
38 Chair Giesen-Fields stated that the space below the balcony should be enclosed by wood  
39 slats or some other means to add some architectural detail.

40  
41 Commissioner Kent liked the proportions of the building, stated it fit nicely into the hillside,  
42 and while he had some concern for the deck and the stairs, he could accept the proposal  
43 with code compliance for the stairs. Since there was no requirement for driveway slope, it  
44 was difficult to address that situation although he asked if bollards could be installed. He  
45 supported the project.

1                   **Motion to approve PA 16-041 for 761 Gateview Avenue, subject to the**  
2                   **existing stairs on the south side of the building being rebuilt to code, the**  
3                   **space below the cantilevered back deck be enclosed in some fashion, and**  
4                   **pursuant to the staff report dated June 8, 2016.** Giesen-Fields

5                   Seconded by:           Donaldson

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

7                   NAYES:               None

8                   ABSENT: None

9                   **Motion passed, 5-0**

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

12  
13                   **7.         NEW BUSINESS: None**

14  
15                   **8.         ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/DISCUSSION**

16  
17                   **A.         Waterfront Transition Plan**

18  
19                   Ms. Hersch reported that the Waterfront Transition Plan had been approved by the City  
20                   Council on June 6, 2016 by a 4-1 vote.

21  
22                   **B.         ABAG MTC Report on Merger**

23  
24                   Ms. Hersch reported that the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the  
25                   Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had just moved into the same office in San  
26                   Francisco.

27  
28                   Ms. Hersch also reported on the Notice of Preparation for PlanBayArea to solicit feedback  
29                   on the plan; and highlighted the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) luncheon on the  
30                   water use in the District.

31  
32                   **9.         NEXT MEETING: July 13, 2016**

33  
34                   **10.        ADJOURNMENT**

35  
36                   The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45 P.M.

37                   Next regular meeting:   Wednesday, July 13, 2016 at 7:00 P.M. at Albany City Hall.

38  
39  
40  
41                   \_\_\_\_\_  
42                   Submitted by: Anne Hersch, City Planner

43  
44  
45                   \_\_\_\_\_  
46                   **Jeff Bond, Community Development Director**