

**April 24, 2013**

**Albany Planning and Zoning Commission**

## **General Plan Study Session #2**

The second Albany Planning and Zoning Commission General Plan Study Session was convened at 6:30 PM on April 24. .

Consultant Barry Miller did a PowerPoint presentation outlining the Land Use categories in the existing General Plan, and the projections for Albany's future developed by ABAG.

The following comments were made by Commissioners:

- Can you calculate the acres of land currently in residential, commercial, industrial use, etc?
- Look into the affordable housing impact fee that Berkeley has. Is this something transferable to Albany? How did Berkeley do this fee in light of the Palmer decision (which restricts inclusionary rental housing)?
- Were second units counted by the census as dwelling units? How are they considered in density calculations? If it is assigned an address, it is likely counted as a dwelling unit
- The Albany Hill category came about when the city required the merger of 2,500 sf lots
- Note that when the zoning was done for San Pablo Avenue, the height limit was lowered to 38 feet, so the 45 feet referenced in the General Plan is no longer correct
- Discussion of 2004 amendments; FAR 1.75 vs 2.25
- How might the market change between now and 2035?
- The "industrial" area along the railroad isn't really industrial anymore. We should take a closer look at development opportunities here. Look at West Berkeley as an example of how an area like this can transition. Perhaps live-work would fit in here? Does our zoning allow that? Is the market conducive to that?
- Should we move automotive uses off San Pablo to the industrial area, and then do mixed use on San Pablo? Seems like an economic study is needed to determine viability
- Consider Albany's future in the context of Richmond, Berkeley, and Emeryville
- Housing in the commercial area—allow higher FARs near San Pablo and Solano to recognize this is a "node"
- Will the Commercial Recreation category be changed as part of the General Plan process? How does Measure C influence this? Perhaps General Plan will describe a vision for Golden Gate Fields without needing to change the map. Would this require a vote? Is a vote needed only to change the map? Or to change any reference to GG Fields in the General Plan?
- I like the idea of designating UC Village land uses to coincide with the Master Plan (e.g., show the housing as housing, and show the parks as parks, rather than showing the whole site as "public")
- How should the mixed use sites along the San Pablo frontage of UC Village be designated? Some sort of mixed use category
- Agreed that the categories should be simpler

The following comments were made by the public:

- How has Albany done in the past with respect to RHNA?
- Take UC village out of the equation when talking about our demographics and housing production. It skews the results
- General Commercial height limit is 38 feet, not 45 feet. Make sure this is corrected
- It will be hard to get 1170 new units of housing in Albany in the next 30 years
- Does the UC Village housing count toward meeting the RHNA? Most of the occupants are low income, but it isn't really subsidized per se.

Additional Commissioner discussion:

- Look at the Cleveland St corridor and the Eastshore Freeway area. Can we encourage auto body shops to move off of San Pablo and into this area?
- Is San Pablo Avenue Community Commercial or Neighborhood Commercial? What's the difference?
- Can we offer incentives to achieve the desired land use pattern?