

## **Albany Waterfront Committee**

### **April 2, 2014 Meeting Summary**

Barry Miller, General Plan consultant, provided a summary of how the General Plan was progressing and how waterfront issues would be addressed. A series of key questions was posed to the Committee members and a discussion followed:

Comment: How can this be a vision for Albany's future when it assumes no change for the next 20 years on the waterfront? Isn't that an incomplete plan? *Barry responded that the expectation was that a General Plan Amendment would be initiated in the future if the City chose to move forward with a waterfront plan. This would be subject to voter approval. The new Plan will assume status quo, but that does not mean no change. There is a lot of new material on the waterfront that will be incorporated, including all the provisions for park and open space improvements.*

On the question of whether there should be a separate Waterfront Element, a Committee member observed that this was a good idea, especially since the Waterfront Committee would no longer provide a dedicated venue for discussion of waterfront issues. Another Committee member agreed. It was clarified that the General Plan would not "adopt" Voices to Vision but would acknowledge the process and outcome. The Waterfront Element could be used as a starting point for future discussions if and when development is proposed on the GG Fields site.

A Committee member suggested that the General Plan should articulate a vision for land uses at the GG Fields site rather than waiting until a proposal was made. He noted the city's experience with the LBL proposal, and that it was done without the benefit of rules for land uses. The General Plan needs to acknowledge in the Introduction that Albany made a conscious decision to not include a vision for this site in this document.

A separate issue that could be addressed in the General Plan is the uncertainty about land ownership and responsibilities for different portions of the site. Does the City retain control over land where it sold the land but retained an easement? What if the City does not contemplate controlling those lands even if it is the owner?

Parking for planned public improvements has not been addressed adequately in prior documents. Need to work with GG Fields to develop joint parking agreements as the parklands are improved.

North side of the peninsula should stay natural, with little human interaction. South side (Albany Beach, etc.) is where the activity should stay. Maintain a "north is nature" vision.

Don't try to resolve the dog issue through the General Plan process. It is an operational issue.