

**MINUTES OF MEETING
ALAMEDA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 15, 2007
(Approved November 5, 2007)**

FIELD TRIP:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Mike Jacob and Glen Kirby, Chair.

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Commissioners Ken Carbone, Vice Chair; Frank Imhof; Alane Loisel and Kathie Ready.

OTHERS PRESENT: Rodrigo Orduna, Senior Planner and Howard Lee, Planner III.

The Commission convened at 224 W. Winton Avenue, Room 111, Hayward, California, at the hour of 1:30 p.m. and adjourned to the field to visit the following properties:

1. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE, GPC-2007-01 ~ PROPOSED PURCHASE OF 100% UNDIVIDED INTEREST IN THE TYLER RANCH PROPERTY:** Request by the Real Estate Section of East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 for the purchase of an 100% undivided interest in fee of a 1,476 acre± property containing one single-family residence and a permitted mobile home, near Pleasanton Ridge west of the City of Pleasanton and north of Niles Canyon Road, for the purpose of park, trail and open space, in unincorporated Alameda County, designated County Assessor's Parcel Number 085A-4800-001, 946-4525-002-04, 096-0131-02, 096-0125-006-04, 096-0533-001,-002, 096-0534-001,-002, 096-0535-003,004, 096-0540-002.
2. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE, GPC-2007-02 ~ PROPOSED DEDICATION OF LAS COLINAS ROAD AND EXTRA-TERRITORIAL CONDEMNATION, NORTH LIVERMORE:** Request by the City of Livermore for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 for the extra-territorial condemnation of privately-owned land in North Livermore and right-of-way dedication of Las Colinas Road, which spans Interstate Highway 580 north-south from Las Positas Road. Once condemned, Las Colinas Road will be extended to serve as primary access for a private high school campus in the City of Livermore.
3. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE, GPC-2007-03 ~ PROPOSED PURCHASE OF PORTIONS OF PARCELS:** Request by the Redevelopment Agency for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 to purchase approximately a 32,000 square feet portion of parcels identified by County Assessor's Parcel

Numbers 080C-479-006-03, 080C-479-006-04, 080C-479-006-11, 080C-479-006-13 and 080C-479-006-07, located on East 14th Street, Ashland area of unincorporated Alameda County.

4. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2247 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-7868 - SANTOS/ISCANDARI** ~ Petition to reclassify one lot containing approximately 0.40 acres from the R-S-D-3 (Suburban Residence, 3,000 square feet per Dwelling Unit) District, to a P-D (Planned Development) District, allowing six condominium units, located at 19635 Meekland Avenue, southwest side, approximately 125 feet south of Cherry Way, Cherryland area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 429-0005-021-00.
5. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2249 – EVART** ~ Petition to reclassify one site containing approximately 0.22 acre from the R-1 (Single Family Residence, 5,000 square feet Minimum Building Site Area per Dwelling Unit) District to a P-D (Planned Development) District, to allow a secondary unit located in front of the principle dwelling unit and in a structure two stories in height, located at 22610 Valley View Drive, north west side, approximately 0.24 miles north of Kelly Street, Fairview area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 417-0140-021-06.
6. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2256 – HIGHLANDER HOLDINGS** ~ Petition to reclassify one site containing approximately one acre from the R-S-D-3 (Suburban Residence, 3,000 square feet per Dwelling Unit) District to a P-D (Planned Development) District, allowing fifteen residential units located at 19745 and 19755 Meekland Avenue, southwest side, approximately 350 feet south of Cherry Way, Cherryland area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 429-0005-022-00 and 429-0005-023-00.
7. **DETERMINATION, D-161 – SPALDING** ~ Planning Director-initiated Determination by the Planning Commission to decide whether the Planning Department's findings that an accessory structure is nonconforming is a correct interpretation of the various guidelines and provisions of the Alameda County Zoning Ordinance, for a parcel located at 27647 Fairview Avenue, west side, approximately 300 feet south of Oakes Drive, Fairview area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 425-0500-014-00.

REGULAR MEETING: 1:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Ken Carbone, Vice-Chair; Frank Imhof; Mike Jacob; Glenn Kirby, Chair; and Kathie Ready.

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Commissioner Alane Loisel and one vacant.

OTHERS PRESENT: Chris Bazar, Planning Director; Phil Sawrey-Kubicek, Senior Planner; Beth Greene, Planner; Andrew Young, Planner; Howard Lee, Planner; Eric Chambliss, County Counsel's Office; Nilma Singh, Recording Secretary.

There were approximately twenty-three people in the audience.

CALL TO ORDER: The Chair called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:

OPEN FORUM: Open forum is provided for any members of the public wishing to speak on an item not listed on the agenda. Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. *No one requested to be heard under open forum.*

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. **APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES** – August 6 and September 17, 2007. *Commissioner Jacob, with a typo correction on page 7, made the motion for an approval for the August 6th Minutes and Commissioner Imhof seconded. Motion carried 5/0.*

Commissioner Ready made the motion to continue approval of the September 17th Minutes to the next meeting and Commissioner Jacob seconded. Motion carried unanimously, 5/0.

Commissioner Loisel excused and one vacant.

2. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE, GPC-2007-01 ~ PROPOSED PURCHASE OF 100% UNDIVIDED INTEREST IN THE TYLER RANCH PROPERTY:** Request by the Real Estate Section of East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 for the purchase of an 100% undivided interest in fee of a 1,476 acre± property containing one single-family residence and a permitted mobile home, near Pleasanton Ridge west of the City of Pleasanton and north of Niles Canyon Road, for the purpose of park, trail and open space, in unincorporated Alameda County, designated County Assessor's Parcel Number 085A-4800-001, 946-4525-002-04, 096-0131-02, 096-0125-006-04, 096-0533-001,-002, 096-0534-001,-002, 096-0535-003,004, 096-0540-002. **(Moved to the Regular Calendar).**
3. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE, GPC-2007-02~ PROPOSED DEDICATION OF LAS COLINAS ROAD AND EXTRA-TERRITORIAL CONDEMNATION, NORTH LIVERMORE:** Request by the City of Livermore for a General Plan Conformance Report

under Government Code Section 65402 for the extra-territorial condemnation of privately-owned land in North Livermore and right-of-way dedication of Las Colinas Road, which spans Interstate Highway 580 north-south from Las Positas Road. Once condemned, Las Colinas Road will be extended to serve as primary access for a private high school campus in the City of Livermore.

4. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE, GPC-2007-03 ~ PROPOSED PURCHASE OF PORTIONS OF PARCELS:** Request by the Redevelopment Agency for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 to purchase approximately a 32,000 square feet portion of parcels identified by County Assessor's Parcel Numbers 080C-479-006-03, 080C-479-006-04, 080C-479-006-11, 080C-479-006-13 and 080C-479-006-07, located on East 14th Street, Ashland area of unincorporated Alameda County. **(Moved to the Regular Calendar).**

Item #2 was moved to the Regular Calendar for further discussion. *Commissioner Jacob made the motion to approve Consent Calendar items 3 and 4 per staff recommendation and Commissioner Imhof seconded. Motion carried unanimously, 5/0.*

Mr. Bazar acknowledged receipt of City of Livermore's letter on Consent Calendar item #3. *Commissioner Jacob amended his motion to approve the modified Consent Calendar to include item #3 only and to move #4 to the Regular Calendar for further discussion. Commissioner Ready seconded the amended motion which carried unanimously, 5/0.*

Commissioner Loisel excused and one vacant.

REGULAR CALENDAR:

- 2 **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE, GPC-2007-01 ~ PROPOSED PURCHASE OF 100% UNDIVIDED INTEREST IN THE TYLER RANCH PROPERTY:** Request by the Real Estate Section of East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 for the purchase of an 100% undivided interest in fee of a 1,476 acre± property containing one single-family residence and a permitted mobile home, near Pleasanton Ridge west of the City of Pleasanton and north of Niles Canyon Road, for the purpose of park, trail and open space, in unincorporated Alameda County, designated County Assessor's Parcel Number 085A-4800-001, 946-4525-002-04, 096-0131-02, 096-0125-006-04, 096-0533-001,-002, 096-0534-001,-002, 096-0535-003,004, 096-0540-002 **(Moved from the Consent Calendar).**

The Chair announced that the Commission had visited this site adding that EBRPD has purchased 400 acres and a private trust the remainder of the acreage, to be purchased by the District within the next three years. This acquisition will substantially increase the

park acreage protecting open space and species habitat. Commissioner Jacob added that this is a positive step.

Nancy Farber, 12563 Foothill Road, Sunol, said she owns the original building which was part of the Tyler Ranch. It is surrounded by parklands and both share a ½ mile common road. She asked for the location of the land purchased and how it will be developed for public access. Her concerns included buffer zones, security on the ranch, fire hazard, reaffirmation of the District's commitment to graze the land and who will be the ranch foreman. The Chair explained that this hearing is only to consider conformity with the General Plan. The District's representative had, during the Field Trip, pointed out the easement and the existing structure which will be converted as the security residence and had also expressed a desire to accommodate the existing uses. The Park District has its own land use public process and the contact person is Nancy Wenninger, Acquisition Manager. The acres purchased are located on the top of the ridge.

Peter Szekrenyi, 12563 Foothill Road, expressed his concerns regarding the lack of any mention of a residence in the staff report, the impact of being encompassed by the park; and road maintenance in the interim. The Chair advised him to contact EBRPD, Ms. Wenninger.

Sharon Lawson, 12587 Foothill Road, realtor certified by the California State Board, pointed out that neither she nor her neighbor had received any notification. The adjacent easement is part of Tyler Ranch Road. She recommended a survey. Her property is located at the end of the road, past the solar panel. Ms. Lawson further requested that the neighbors be notified of any future improvements and urged that the Park District and the County be good neighbors. The Chair advised her also to contact EBRPD to be included in their mailing list.

S.J. Lyang, 12587 Foothill Road, stated that although he had not received any notification, he felt that this was a good purchase for the wildlife and the community. His concerns were safety which included lack of lighting, presence of cattle on the easement road, neighborhood and the public; and the one-car lane entrance.

Leroy Dias, 12357 Foothill Blvd, said his property is located on the east side of the proposed park. His concerns also included lack of notification and process, privacy issues and impacts on the road. He requested contact information for Ms. Wenninger.

The Chair explained that this hearing is limited to the determination of whether or not the proposed purchase is consistent with the General Plan. *Commissioner Jacob made the motion to make the General Plan conformance finding in the affirmative and the Chair seconded. Motion carried unanimously, 5/0. Commissioner Loisel excused and one vacant.*

1. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2247 and TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-7868 - SANTOS/ISCANDARI** ~ Petition to reclassify one lot containing approximately 0.40 acres from the R-S-D-3 (Suburban Residence, 3,000

square feet per Dwelling Unit) District, to a P-D (Planned Development) District, allowing six condominium units, located at 19635 Meekland Avenue, southwest side, approximately 125 feet south of Cherry Way, Cherryland area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 429-0005-021-00.

Mr. Sawrey-Kubicek presented the staff report adding that item #3, Zoning Unit, ZU-2256, is adjacent to this project.

Public testimony was called for. Erica Campisi, Cherryland Community Association, stated that the Association has not received a referral on this project and, as such, requested a continuance. Mr. Bazar said that the project was initially referred and Ms. Campisi requested a re-referral.

Susan Stoddard stated that her property, 135 Cherry Way, is directly opposite the subject site. Her concerns included the height and compatibility as a three story building will not be a fit in this area; parking which is already a problem for this area as the existing commercial uses and multi-unit complexes do not have adequate off-street parking; and too many units with limited green areas. Ms. Stoddard felt that better planning is required for the Meekland area including the commercial uses since the existing commercial uses are not being supported. In response to the Chair, she confirmed that her testimony was related to both projects.

Sullivan Santos, Project Designer, discussed the four Findings as outlined on page 5 of the staff report pointing out that all be made in the affirmative. The project meets all applicable objectives and goals of all Plans and is suitable for the parcel; there are similar projects in the area; and although Mr. Santos felt that the fourth Finding is open to subjective interpretation, he was willing to work with staff. He has not received any specific direction from staff since last month when Ms. Greene had indicated that the project was ready for action. However, now staff is encouraging affordable housing component (as indicated on page 7, third paragraph) and to work with the adjacent developer. Additional time and costs will be incurred if postponed to combine both projects.

Alieu Iscandari, property owner, explained that the initial plan was, at the request of staff, re-designed to a condo project to increase the density and be compatible with existing similar developments at an increased cost. At that time, the adjacent project was not in the pipeline. Planning Department is now recommending a combined project which will result in additional increased costs for both him and the adjacent developer, and raise maintenance problems in the future. One alternative is for both projects to enhance the other through landscaping, common fencing and lighting. The chair noted that there are mechanisms to solve some of his concerns and hoped for continued dialogue between the two developers. Mr. Iscandari further described his project: the smallest units (2-6) are 1,700 square feet and the largest is 2,300 square feet; each unit has a 2-car garage with a total of six rear parking spaces; rear play area; individual trash can areas; and skylights in

all east and west units. In response to the Chair, he confirmed that although he was not sure whether to rent or sell the units, he will be living in one unit.

Public testimony was closed. Commissioner Ready stated that she was impressed with the project. Mr. Bazar added that the Commission could direct staff to look at the projects separately or as combined projects. The Chair felt that projects could blend and benefit each other. Commissioner Jacob asked why this was a PD rezoning. Mr. Lee explained that the rezoning would relax the required setbacks and driveway, and allow a bigger building than allowed under the current zoning. Commissioner Jacob agreed that this was a great project but would be better if combined resulting in an increased number of units with a better layout, eliminate setback variances, consolidated play area, open space and fire access, and the legal points will not be crucial.

The matter was continued to a future date. Staff will continue working with the Applicant towards project improvements and working with the adjacent project owner.

4. **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE, GPC-2007-03 ~ PROPOSED PURCHASE OF PORTIONS OF PARCELS:** Request by the Redevelopment Agency for a General Plan Conformance Report under Government Code Section 65402 to purchase approximately a 32,000 square feet portion of parcels identified by County Assessor's Parcel Numbers 080C-479-006-03, 080C-479-006-04, 080C-479-006-11, 080C-479-006-13 and 080C-479-006-07, located on East 14th Street, Ashland area of unincorporated Alameda County. **(Moved from the Consent Calendar).**

The Chair announced that the Commission had visited the site today. Mr. Lee presented the staff report.

Public testimony was called for. Ray Mofrad, 16305 E. 14th Street, a 20-year auto sales business owner, said he is a tenant at this location. Although this property is extremely contaminated, the staff report indicates that the proposal is exempt from CEQA and does not require an environmental review contrary to what he was told. He did not understand the exemption and asked if and how the property will be cleaned up. The Chair explained that all public entities have to go through the same process and Mr. Bazar added that the conformity is exempt and upon completion of the process, any use will go through an environmental process. Larry Lepore is the HARD contact person along with the Redevelopment Agency.

Commissioner Jacob made the motion to approve the General Plan conformance finding in the affirmative and Commissioner Ready seconded. Motion carried unanimously, 5/0. Commissioner Loisel excused and one vacant.

2. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2249 – EVART - Preliminary Plan Review ~** Petition to reclassify one site containing approximately 0.22 acre from the R-1 (Single Family Residence, 5,000 square feet Minimum Building Site

Area per Dwelling Unit) District to a P-D (Planned Development) District, to allow a secondary unit located in front of the principle dwelling unit and in a structure two stories in height, located at 22610 Valley View Drive, north west side, approximately 0.24 miles north of Kelly Street, Fairview area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 417-0140-021-06.

Mr. Sawrey-Kubicek presented the staff report.

Public testimony was called for. Jim Evart, Trustee owner and Applicant, pointed out that the slope of the property does not allow the use of the 20 feet of the rear yard. He also owns the adjacent property which has a two-car pad and language has been incorporated to the easement to allow the use of this pad if this property is sold. The proposal provides a two-car garage for the secondary unit with 2 additional spaces (pad); it is compatible with the surrounding; the house is below street level and provides better use of the space under the garage and parking is provided above the garage.

The Chair announced that the Commission had visited the site today and had toured the inside also. He asked if the existing house is a single family dwelling or a duplex since both floors have a complete kitchen and a dead-bolt on the lower floor. The new unit has only a half bath. Mr. Evart explained that the second kitchen is a wet bar with no stove. Staff clarified that the Applicant currently has a Building Permit for a storage room with a ½ bath and upon approval of this application, will install the full bath. The Chair expressed concerns with the number of units especially with the lack of off-street parking.

Commissioner Imhof requested that another Field Trip be scheduled when the application is ready for action and the Chair requested that the matter be set for an evening meeting. Although this was a positive utilization of the space under the garage, Commissioner Jacob agreed with the Chair's concerns.

Public testimony was called for. James Pate, 22607 Valley View Drive, pointed out that this project is part of a bigger project, a six-bedroom six bathroom assisted-care living facility as outlined in a letter addressed to the Applicant's brother. His concerns including the easement; the approval of a three-foot setback and the replacement and/or service of the underground culvert pipe; lack of on-street parking; illegal parking; backing out of his driveway; loss of one street parking space as a result of the driveway cut; and emergency vehicle access. He asked if the Commission had received a copy of his wife's letter, faxed to the Planning Department this morning. The Chair replied yes.

Steve Evart stated that he lives downstairs and is a beneficiary of the trust. He did not receive any notification and, as such, requested a continuance. He had distributed copies of the Applicant's Letter of Intent for a managed care facility to the neighbors. His concerns included privacy, parking, ingress and egress. At the request of the Chair, project planner, Andrew Young, explained that Mr. Evart lives downstairs of the existing house, 22628 Valley View Drive. Mr. Evart requested notification through certified mail.

Junita Vasut, 22767 Valley View Drive, said her concern is backing out of the steep driveway as there is no turnaround area. She felt that there is not a need for another house. The applicant is already renting out to 20 college students.

Public testimony was closed. The Chair reiterated his concerns regarding the number of units and parking. He requested another site visit. Commissioner Ready requested a copy of the Applicant's Letter of Intent. Mr. Young explained that the Applicant has changed his intent from a care facility to a single family home and further explained the parking situation.

The matter was continued to a future date.

3. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2256 – HIGHLANDER HOLDINGS – Preliminary Plan Review** ~ Petition to reclassify one site containing approximately one acre from the R-S-D-3 (Suburban Residence, 3,000 square feet per Dwelling Unit) District to a P-D (Planned Development) District, allowing fifteen residential units located at 19745 and 19755 Meekland Avenue, southwest side, approximately 350 feet south of Cherry Way, Cherryland area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 429-0005-022-00 and 429-0005-023-00.

Mr. Sawrey-Kubicek presented the staff report.

Public testimony was called for. Scott Sutherland, Applicant, read his letter of support. Initially, he had approached the applicant of the adjacent project. In response to the Chair, Mr. Sutherland confirmed that the building height will not exceed the required 25 feet. Commissioner Carbone disagreed that the project was within walking distance nor near a Bart station and, as such, did not qualify for relaxation of parking requirements, and the project will create parking problems for the area. He recommended replacing the three rear units with parking spaces and noted the lack of a landscape plan. He preferred larger structures with lower density and would support a project per the Condo Guidelines similar to the adjacent project. Mr. Sutherland clarified that there is a corner bus stop which is part of the transit system and although available as an option, he did not consider tandem parking as a great design. There are three big constraints: the 25-foot building height, parking and open space. Affordable housing means more density and they are not proposing low income housing. Commissioner Ready noted that the project favored the higher side of the required density, insufficient parking and lack of landscaping. Mr. Sutherland pointed out that this is the best design for this property. The Chair agreed with the cul-de-sac-like design pointing out that the Commission is not generally supportive of PD applications. Commissioner Jacob had similar comments as for the adjacent project. Combining projects will allow utilization of PD planning with additional creativity. He was not opposed to the proposed density and noted that the Condo Guidelines are only guidelines. Commissioner Imhof suggested subterranean parking with a different design and perhaps eliminating one unit and requested clarification on the height elevation. Mr. Sutherland indicated that subterranean parking

was not an option at this location, the maximum height would be 24-25 feet with varying rooflines and the 17,000 square foot structures exceed the guidelines. The Condo Guidelines conflict with the Housing Element and the Ordinance. Mr. Bazar clarified that this is a Housing Element designated site. Mr. Sutherland added that another alternative would be a low-income housing apartment-like project with maximized density or adding two-story units. Commissioner Ready stated that the area needs to be 'lifted up' as it is the second most densely populated area; the Chair pointed out that the Commission supports ownership housing; and Commissioner Jacob suggested perhaps with a combined project, two stories in the rear as it backs against a non-residential area.

Erica Campisi stated that Cherryland Homeowners Association opposes this project as presented due to the following reasons: this is a huge project with too many units and limited open space, a cemented area with a small play area located behind the guest parking area, will increase traffic with no street parking, and lack of designated trash can areas. She concurred with Commissioner Ready that there is a need to bring this area up with fewer units, perhaps 12, with a larger open area in the rear.

The matter was continued to a future date.

4. **DETERMINATION, D-161 – SPALDING** ~ Planning Director-initiated Determination by the Planning Commission to decide whether the Planning Department's findings that an accessory structure is nonconforming is a correct interpretation of the various guidelines and provisions of the Alameda County Zoning Ordinance, for a parcel located at 27647 Fairview Avenue, west side, approximately 300 feet south of Oakes Drive, Fairview area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 425-0500-014-00.

Ms. Greene presented the staff report. The Commission discussed the guidelines, setback encroachment; location of accessory structures, specifically on steep slopes; and the required attachment be six feet wide and no longer than ten feet. The Chair asked where the ten feet is measured from. In response to the Chair, staff explained that it was measured wall to wall adding that the original application for the building permit had some discrepancies.

Public testimony was called for. Jewell Spalding, Applicant, disagreed that the existing garage is nonconforming and noted the following: the existence of an old established olive tree; the difficulty of building a roofed-breezeway which is also not needed nor will be attractive; the location of the deck and its foundation, and its inclusion as part of the building; depth of the lot; language of exception; the garage falls under the description of Section 17.52.270; and the grade of the slope. She noted that the original garage was already conforming based on extreme elevation drop, as it is located as an accessory building can be in the front half of the lot with the required setbacks. The only difference is the 'front yard' vs. 'front half' of the lot.

The Chair noted that the Commission had visited the site. Commissioner Jacob disagreed with staff's interpretation of Section 17.52.270 - Accessory buildings-where not permitted (page 3). A discussion ensued regarding the different interpretations. Commissioner Jacob asked why Section 17.52.310 did not apply. Staff explained that it relates to two issues--front yard and slope. The Chair thought that .310 would be applicable if there is an issue with setback. It was not applicable in this case. Commissioner Jacob pointed out that there is no other alternative location for the garage as the lot steps further down. Staff felt that in order to get the actual slope grade, a surveyor's elevation map would be needed. Ms. Spalding said that such a map had been submitted previously. Commissioner Jacob added that, if required, he would recommend a trellis. *He made the motion to find that the accessory structure is conforming based on the application of Sections 17.52.270 and 17.52.310 due to the slope and topography.* The Chair added that connecting the garage and the dwelling would not accomplish much. Staff requested further clarification--steepness not just in the requirement front yard but in also in the front half of the lot or where an accessory structure would be located could permit an accessory structure to be located in the front half of a lot and be considered conforming. Commissioner Jacob confirmed. *Commissioner Ready seconded. Motion carried unanimously, 5/0. Commissioner Loisel excused and one vacant.*

STAFF COMMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE: Mr. Bazar reminded the Commission of the upcoming CCPCA Conference. Information is available and welcomed Mr. Eric Chambliss adding that there are several new Planning staff on board, Liz McElligott, Policy Planning; Rodrigo Orduna, Senior Planner; Angela Robinson, Howard Lee and Jeff Bonekemper.

CHAIRS REPORT: *None.*

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENT, COMMENTS AND REPORTS: Commissioner Jacob announced that he is working with the Chair on a meeting with the Green Building Committee before the end of the year. The Chair added that he is also having a meeting with Stopwaste, Inc., in the near future. Mr. Bazar indicated that the County Building Code is currently under revision with incorporation of Green Building components and suggested contacting County Building Official, Mr. Lang or perhaps he could be invited for a presentation at a future meeting. The Chair recommended a presentation from all related departments including Stopwaste, Inc. He also announced that he has submitted his name for an environmental seat on the Waste Reduction and Recycling Board.

Commissioner Jacob noted that contrary to his request, the energy center had not been included on the agenda. Mr. Bazar confirmed that the site was not under County jurisdiction. The Agency Director, Mr. Sorensen, had submitted a letter to CEC requesting for a continuance and had provided testimony in Sacramento. However, CEC declined the request and has approved the facility. Hence, there is nothing to report. East Shore, a similar project, is moving thro the pipeline and will be on the agenda when ready.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Commissioner Ready moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:00 p.m. Commissioner Imhof seconded the motion. The motion was carried 6/0.

CHRIS BAZAR, SECRETARY
COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION OF ALAMEDA COUNTY