

CASTRO VALLEY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes for April 27, 2009

(Approved as submitted on June 8, 2009)

A. CALL TO ORDER: The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Council members present: Jeff Moore, Chair; Cheryl Miraglia, Vice Chair, Sheila Cunha, Dean Nielsen, Andy Frank, Dave Sadoff and John Ryzanych. Council members excused: None. Staff present: Sonia Urzua, Bob Swanson and Maria Elena Marquez. There were approximately 15 people in the audience.

B. Approval of Minutes of April 13, 2009

Council member Dave Sadoff moved to approve the minutes of April 13, 2009 as submitted. Council member Cunha seconded. Motion carried 7/0

C. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS / Open Forum – None.

D. Consent Calendar –

- 1. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, PLN2009-00019 – KNUDSEN** – Application to allow new signage in conjunction with façade improvement, in the Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan – Sub Area 7, located at 3323 Castro Valley Blvd., south side, 200 feet west of Wilbeam Avenue, across from the southern terminus of Santa Maria Avenue, in the unincorporated Castro Valley area of Alameda County, bearing County Assessor’s designation: 084A-0040-019-00. **Staff Planner: Damien Curry**

Council member Nielsen moved to approve PLN2009-00019. Council member Ryzanych seconded. Motion carried 7/0.

E. Regular Calendar

- 1. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, PLN2009-00020 – RT NAHAS COMPANY/TOM KLEIN** Application to allow Building Facade Improvements, including two buildings in the Castro Village, and approval of new Castro Village Tenant Signage, in the (Castro Valley Central Business District, Sub Area 7) located at 3318 – 3484 Village Dr., in the unincorporated Castro Valley area of Alameda County, bearing County Assessor’s designation: 084A-0080-016-06 and 084A-0085-001-03. **Staff Planner: Howard Lee**

Ms. Urzua summarized the staff report. Staff recommends approval of the proposed renovations. She noted that the Redevelopment Agency staff is collaborating with the owner as well.

Council member Sadoff said asked for clarification of the CEQA. Ms. Urzua explained that the CEQA review determined that this project qualified for a categorical exemption.

Applicant and owner Ron Nahas, provided some background about the property and stated that long term plans for additional expansion. They are planning a renovation. They engaged the services of SGPA Architecture & Planning to help them in this process, and they appeared to talk about the first phase.

Tom Kleine, representing the applicant, said that they have been working for three years on this redevelopment project. All along the way, they worked very closely with the Redevelopment Agency and the Planning Department as they developed their plans. Their goal is to preserve the “town and country” character of the village while enhancing

the signage and exposure for the tenants and the overall customer experience. He explained some of the details using several color drawings with elevations and examples of different tenant signage.

Council member Miraglia asked Mr. Kleine why is he coming for just these two buildings. Mr. Kleine explained that the strategy was based on economic reasons and they wanted to address the high impact areas of the center.

Council member Miraglia asked Mr. Kleine why he didn't want to do the whole project all at once. From an economic standpoint, she observed that there is something to be said for having an overall plan already developed and then going forward. She asked how much of a time frame there would be between having the two buildings done and the rest of it looking as it does.

Mr. Kleine said that it depended on the economic conditions. They are talking with the Redevelopment Agency about coordinating some work along the front of Castro Village with the streetscape project. They plan to do landscaping along Castro Valley Blvd. in front of the center. This is going to look substantially different a year from now between the streetscape and the improvements that they are making in the private property in conjunction with the streetscape. After that, they will be addressing these other phases.

Council member Nielsen said that he shared Council Member Miraglia's concern in the phasing approach. He was concerns about committing to the whole thing without Council seeing the whole thing.

Mr. Kleine said that they intended to modernize the property and bring on an anchor store.

Council member Nielsen expressed concern that the property owner may demolish the two rear buildings. The Council will have to take their word that the rest of the buildings will be in harmony. This has been a successful business. He expressed concerns about making a decision on doing this without getting some idea what else they have in mind. Mr. Kleine assured Council member Nielsen that it is their best interest to make sure that the future is consistent with what they are building.

Council member Moore asked Mr. Kleine about making changes to the store front windows. Mr. Kleine said that they have to address the columns in the front. The store front will remain the same.

Public testimony was called for. No public testimony submitted.

Council member Sadoff said he shared Council member Miraglia's opinion about maintaining the basic concept of the town and country aspect. He understands the need for some updating. He likes the color schemes, the improvements on the exterior lighting and the trash receptacles

Council member Miraglia said that she could vote for approval of this, but she had reservations with the signage program given the absence of exhibits, the signage locations, the monument sign, and the master ID sign that is going to come to this Council later. Those are major components of this renovation. She would rather see the whole project but could support the work proposed on building "N" and "O".

Jaimie Benson, from the Redevelopment Agency, commented about the proposed sign program. She asked for some flexibility to not have to come back for a site development review simply for a tenant sign. Redevelopment is working with them on developing the master center signage at the primary locations like Village Drive, Santa Maria and Greenwood. The Center Signage will come before this Council with some really great landscape improvement at a later date.

Council member Nielsen said the Council support renovating the center but the Council is setting a precedent to go ahead with this without seeing any signage.

Carter Hemming, also representing the applicant, reviewed the four types of signage options for tenants.

Council member Moore noted that the sign program provides the basic parameters, materials, specifications, while allowing flexibility, which he totally supports, it is pretty well defined in here. He is hearing the concerns here should be addressed here, specifically not only inclusions but exclusions too.

Jaimie Benson commented about the type of review each sign would go through. Ms. Urzua clarified that each sign would not have to come back to the MAC but it would require Planning Director approval. She also noted that the proposal includes language about neon signs. She noted that those provisions should be compared with the Specific Plan language since there are specific limitations with regard to neon signs. A discussion about neon signs ensued.

Council member Moore said that his personal opinion is that he does not dislike neon in a proper application. He said the examples are nicely done. Ms. Urzua said that her concern is consistency with the plan, but this can be clarified.

Council member Sadoff asked about the blade signs how the blade signs differ, if at all, from the existing. Mr. Hemming provided some details about the proposed blade signs.

Council member Miraglia what if some tenants in one of the other buildings want to upgrade their signage and ask if this program applies to them. Mr. Hemming said the does not think that the opportunity to place those tenants' signage because the physical location to put the sign does not exist.

Council member Moore said that there is an existing blade sign, one of those rectangular ones, and a new tenant comes in, they are going to use the existing signs for the time being until the building is upgraded, assuming it does, it will have the same sign program applied to it. Mr. Hemming said he was not sure, they could take this new program and actually see it rolled out. There is not much change they can put.

Council member Ryzanych asked about the square footage comparison between the old blade signs and the new proposed. Mr. Hemming said 6 inches by 4. Council member Ryzanych asked if there are any requests for variances if a customer wants something different, who is going to handle the variances. Ms. Urzua said that they would have to come back to the MAC.

Council member Sadoff moved to approve PLN2009-00020 with considerations. Council member Cunha seconded. Motion carried 6/1/0 with Council member Miraglia opposed.

-
2. **SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, PLN2009-00029-RAPS CASTRO VALLEY, LLC//ASSOCIATED SIGN COMPANY/QUALITY INN** Application to allow new signage and to replace existing signage in the Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan – Sub Area 3, located at 2532 Castro Valley Boulevard, north side, 300-feet east of Stanton Avenue, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 084A-0181-062-05. **Staff Planner: Richard Tarbell**

Ms. Urzua summarized the staff report. She said that there is a change in operator, from Holiday Inn Express to The Quality Inn. Staff recommends against increase in size of the monument sign. The Redevelopment Agency supports this as well. The applicant considered the recommendation and submitted updated graphics. The recommendation would be to approve the signage with the modified monument.

Stephanie King, representing the applicant, said that regarding the monument sign, they propose installing two sign faces into the existing face and existing cabinets will not change in size dimension, they will keep everything the same, the channel letters including the patch and paint from the old signage because that will make the new signage.

A. Patel, owner of this property since 1994, requested not to reduce the size of the sign as recommended by staff.

Council member Moore asked Ms. Urzua if the issue had been addressed.

Council member Miraglia moved to approve Site Development Review PLN2009-00029. Council member Cunha seconded. Motion carried 7/0.

3. **SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, PLN2009-00050 – FAIZI** Application to allow construction of a new 8,930 sq. ft. single family residence, including a new 1,790 sq. ft. attached three-car garage, and a new detached 377 sq. ft. pool house, on a 8.15-acre property located in an "A" (Agriculture) Zoning District, and located on Cull Canyon Road, southwest side, 5.5 miles north of Briar Bridge Road, unincorporated Castro Valley area of Alameda County, with County Assessor's Parcel Number: 0085-0540-001-00. **Staff Planner: Jeff Bonekemper**

Council member Moore informed the Council and the audience that this item will be continued; however, the Council will take public testimony.

Public Testimony was called for.

Diana Hanna, resident at 10142 Cull Canyon Road, gave a detailed description of the zoning history starting from 1972 to the present, noting that the property did not have building site status and that the parcel was to be used as pasture land.

Council member Moore told Ms. Hana that the item has been continued, it will go to public record and then the applicant would talk with Planning to decide how they want to move forward with this project.

- F. **Chair's Report – None.**

G. Committee Reports

- **Eden Area Alcohol Policy Committee**
- **Redevelopment Citizens Advisory Committee**

Council member Nielsen said that the Committee will meet in May.

- **Ordinance Review Committee**
- **Eden Area Livability Initiative**

H. Staff Announcements, Comments and Reports

I. Council Announcements, Comments and Reports

Council member Miraglia said that she sent an e-mail to everyone from Supervisor Miley and encouraged everybody to go to the meeting on Wednesday night regarding San Leandro's Hospital closure.

J. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Next Hearing Date: Monday, May 11, 2009