

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, JULY 9, 2020**

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED AFTER
PUBLISHED AGENDA**

ITEM #1 WS 20-030

**Draft Hayward Bicycle and
Pedestrian Master Plan**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

From: Steven Dunbar
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 9:19 PM
To: CityClerk
Cc: Marcus Martinez; Sara Buizer
Subject: Item 2, July 9th Planning Commission Comment

CAUTION: This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Hello Hayward Planning Commissioners and Staff,

This project ended up in the same meeting as the Bike / Ped Plan review, so it got some attention by association.

This project is required to provide 4 “long term” bicycle parking spaces. Staff has specified that the spaces provided in the plans are simple U-racks in the rear parking lot.

While this may be more secure than racks out on the public sidewalk, I believe more is required to meet the intent of “long term” bicycle parking.

I would suggest that a condition of approval be added to use bike lockers instead. Such lockers allow personal use of locks, but they protect the bicycle from rain and prevent theft of bicycle components as well.

Of course, there are other ways to meet the “long term” bicycle parking requirement, such as a storage room (which might be more accessible for different-sized bikes, trikes, or bike trailers) – and even with an elevator, getting those larger examples into the apartments can be difficult.

Thanks for your consideration,
Steven Dunbar

Opinions My Own
Board Member, Bike East Bay

ITEM #2 PH 20-056

**Proposed Multi-Family Residential
Development with Nine (9) Dwelling
Units on a Vacant 0.27-Acre Infill Site
Located at 24997 O'Neil Avenue,
Assessor Parcel No. 444-0057-006-00
Requiring Approval of Site Plan
Review and Density Bonus
Application 201901824.**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

From: Robert Stevens
To: Sara Buizer; Marcus Martinez
Subject: RE: 07.09.2020 Hayward Planning Commission Agenda
Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 12:47:52 PM
Attachments: image001.png

CAUTION: This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Ms. Buizer and Mr. Martinez,

Thank you for the staff report and supporting documentation for the multi-family residential development located at 24997 O'Neil Avenue proposed for this Thursday night's Planning Commission meeting. It looks like a great addition to the neighborhood. In reviewing the application, I have a few technical questions to help me understand the design intent.

1. Building architecture

- a. The building elevations note "color A or B." Do we know the proposed colors? Does the applicant have color elevations that could be presented at the meeting?
- b. What is the proposed finish for the cement plaster in terms of texture?
- c. Are the fences at the units made of wood or a composite material? Do they match the siding noted as "wood" of the building?
- d. What is the color of the metal railing along the decks? Does the color of the gates match the deck railing?
- e. Elevation number 2 on sheets A6 and A7 are both noted as "south." Should the elevation on sheet A6 be the north elevation?
- f. Is that an opening shown on sheet A6 of the balconies on floors two and three? Will it have trim?
- g. Will the landscaping adjacent to the trash enclosure obscure the painted CMU blocks? Or does it need to receive the same treatment of cement plaster to match the building? What is the type of the roof and gate of the trash enclosure?

2. Site Layout

- a. Can a vehicle backout of the last parking stall on the west side of the site adjacent to the trash enclosure?
- b. What are the applicant's thoughts on the usability of the picnic/ BBQ area? It seems that sunlight would be blocked based on the location of the amenity on the site and height of existing and proposed buildings. Can the site be used in the evenings? If so, will the proposed wall pack lights on the building provide sufficient lighting?
- c. On Sheet C4.0, note U-13 states, "to provide a new fire water service consistent with City of Hayward Standard SD-201 and 204." Based on the City detail, it appears this will be an above ground detector check assembly. While I recognize the drawing is diagrammatic, it is currently shown within the entry porch of unit 1B. Is there sufficient room to place it within the landscape area southeast of porch?

3. Storm water quality and drainage

- a. On Sheet C4.0, note U-14 states to, "install a new sidewalk underdrain". Does this drain directly to the street gutter? Condition of Approval 48 requires a connection to

the public drain system. Will this arrangement be adequate to meet the Conditions of Approval? Note that the topography does not appear to illustrate a public storm drain system within the O'Neill Avenue.

- b. Condition of approval number 44 states that discharge rates from the site shall not exceed the predevelopment rate. Since the site is currently pervious and much of it will be converted to impervious, is a detention system required? In looking at the plan set, it does not appear to include storm water flow control features.
- c. Sheet C3.2 illustrates storm water treatment requirements. Must this project comply with Alameda County's C.3d requirements for sites that creates and/ or replace 5,000 square feet or more of imperious surfaces or is it exempt due to its proximity to transit? Based on the treatment calculations, it looks like the conventional roof and concrete/ asphalt exceed 5,000 square feet. Based on the stormwater treatment area calculations, it looks like the required treatment area is sized at 4% to require 270 square feet. But, is this based on a bioretention? It does not look like there are bioretention areas at the site. Can the applicant clarify the intent?
- d. Several areas proposed on the site as illustrated on Sheet 3.2 feature pervious pavers; will these require a subdrain? If so, will the subdrain be able to drain to the underdrain shown on Sheet C4.0 in note U-14 given their depth due to the structural section below the paver?

Thank you, the staff, and the applicant for helping me understand the project.

Robert

From: Robert Goldassio <Robert.Goldassio@hayward-ca.gov>

Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2020 7:11 PM

To: Robert Goldassio <Robert.Goldassio@hayward-ca.gov>

Cc: Sara Buizer <Sara.Buizer@hayward-ca.gov>

Subject: 07.09.2020 Hayward Planning Commission Agenda

Good afternoon,

Attached is the City of Hayward Planning Commission agenda for Thursday, July 9, 2020. Agenda attachments and reports are also available via the iLegislate app and on the City's website at <https://hayward.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Please Note: This meeting will be conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, and Alameda County Health Officer Order No. 20-10 dated April 29, 2020, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. The live stream of the meeting may be viewed on Comcast Channel 15 and broadcast live on the City's website www.hayward-ca.gov. Pursuant to Executive Order N-29-20, the public may only view the meeting on television and/or online and not in the Council Chamber.

Public comment will be accepted by email to cityclerk@hayward-ca.gov prior to the meeting and distributed to the Planning Commission and uploaded to the City's website. Furthermore, public comment will be accepted by telephone during the meeting, prior to the close of public comment on an item, by calling (510) 583-4400 at the

time indicated by the Meeting Chair.

Please see attached for additional information.

Regards,

Robert Goldassio | Senior Secretary | DSD – Planning Division

T: 510-583-4204 | Robert.Goldassio@hayward-ca.gov



PLEASE NOTE COVID-19 response:

In order to prevent the spread of the COVID-19 virus the City of Hayward has declared a State of Emergency. The Permit Center will be closed to the public.

The Planning Division will continue to accept new planning applications and resubmittals. For more information, please review the submittal requirements on the City's website at: <https://www.hayward-ca.gov/your-government/departments/planning-division>

During this time building permits will be issued in accordance with the revised County Order issued on 4/29/2020; for assistance please contact a Permit Technician at 510-583-4005 or email at Building.Permits@hayward-ca.gov. Building inspections will take place during this time frame provided that Social Distancing Requirements are met, including maintaining a minimum 6 feet from other individuals.

Most other staff are working from home, so to reach other divisions, call the numbers below, or e-mail your staff contact directly.

For Building Division, 510-583-4005

For Fire Department, 510-583-4900

For Planning Division, 510-583-4216 or email: planning.division@hayward-ca.gov

For Code Enforcement Division, please contact your code inspector directly or the telephone number shown on the letter you received.

You may also be able to find general information on the City's web page at www.hayward-ca.gov. For the latest COVID-19 data, please visit: www.hayward-ca.gov/covid-19.

STAFF RESPONSE TO COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Agenda Item #2 - O'Neil Avenue Multi-Family Residential Development		
Commissioner	Question/Inquiry	Response
Stevens	1A - The building elevations note "color A or B." Do we know the proposed colors? Does the applicant have color elevations that could be presented at the meeting?	Please refer to the architectural elevations, Sheets A6 and A7. In addition, an architectural rendering will be included within the public hearing presentaiton. All painted cement plaster is noted as "Color A." All wood siding is noted as "Color B." The current color palette includes a lighter white/beige blend. Per the Conditions of Approval, the Planning Director shall review all final materials and colors prior to building permit issuance.
Stevens	1B - What is the proposed finish for the cement plaster in terms of texture?	The proposed finish will be a smooth modern finish to compliment the contemporary architectural style.
Stevens	1C - Are the fences at the units made of wood or a composite material? Do they match the siding noted as "wood" of the building?	Stained and sealed wood which will match the. Please refer to the plans and elevations for this notation. Per the applicant, "the project will be executed with the utmost of artistic sensibility and care, based on my full faith and professionally credibility".
Stevens	1D - What is the color of the metal railing along the decks? Does the color of the gates match the deck railing?	Galvanized steel. It is a pure and natural material, and will weather well for centuries. Yes, the color of the gate will match the deck railing.
Stevens	1E - Elevation number 2 on sheets A6 and A7 are both noted as "south." Should the elevation on sheet A6 be the north elevation?	Elevation 2, Sheet A6, should be labeled NORTH Elevation. That elevation faces the walk north of the property. This will be corrected at the building permit phase.
Stevens	1F - Is that an opening shown on sheet A6 of the balconies on floors two and three? Will it have trim?	All openings/balconies will have consistent trim and is fundamental to the design.
Stevens	1G -Will the landscaping adjacent to the trash enclosure obscure the painted CMU blocks? Or does it need to receive the same treatment of cement plaster to match the building? What is the type of the roof and gate of the trash enclosure?	Applicant proposes that the CMU block will be painted as same color as rest of the building. Roof: Applicant is proposing to use the Polycarbonate Corrugated Roof Panel.Gate: Applicant is proposing to use either galvanized steel or aluminum

Stevens	2A - Can a vehicle backout of the last parking stall on the west side of the site adjacent to the trash enclosure?	Yes, the proposed backout space will accommodate a compact car to fully back out and turn.
Stevens	2B - What are the applicant's thoughts on the usability of the picnic/ BBQ area? It seems that sunlight would be blocked based on the location of the amenity on the site and height of existing and proposed buildings. Can the site be used in the evenings? If so, will the proposed wall pack lights on the building provide sufficient lighting?	<u>Applicant Response:</u> "1. We believe this will be a wonderful amenity and the best this limited lot size can offer while providing 9 units of much needed housing and 1 parking space per unit. 2. Per the photometric study; that was conducted on the site, the building will have sufficient lights."
Stevens	2C - On Sheet C4.0, note U-13 states, "to provide a new fire water service consistent with City of Hayward Standard SD-201 and 204." Based on the City detail, it appears this will be an above ground detector check assembly. While I recognize the drawing is diagrammatic, it is currently shown within the entry porch of unit 1B. Is there sufficient room to place it within the landscape area southeast of porch?	The Public Works Department will review it closer during post-entitlement phase as Public Works will need to coordinate with Landscaping. If needed, the project could consider a configurable DCDA instead of a typical DCDA; this would reduce the space needed. The double check detector assembly (DCDA) will need to be installed on private property behind the property line and outside the public right-of-way.

Stevens	<p>3A - On Sheet C4.0, note U-14 states to, "install a new sidewalk underdrain". Does this drain directly to the street gutter? Condition of Approval 48 requires a connection to the public drain system. Will this arrangement be adequate to meet the Conditions of Approval? Note that the topography does not appear to illustrate a public storm drain system within the O'Neill Avenue.</p>	<p>The plan sheet C4.0 submitted by the applicant proposed site drainage discharge to the new street gutter. However, the city staff recommended conditions #48 and 87 would require construction of a drain inlet fronting the property and an underground pipe connecting this drain inlet to an existing drain inlet in O'Neil Avenue. O'Neil Avenue has one existing drain inlet along its east curb across from the project site at Challenger Way and another one near Voyager Way. The new drain inlet will collect drainage discharged from the project site and street frontage and convey it to existing underground drainage system along east curb of O'Neil Avenue. The existing drain inlet at Challenger Way is shown on the project plan sheets C1.0, C1.1, C2.0, C3.0 C3.1 and C4.0 (Sheet 16 of 19).</p>
Stevens	<p>3B - Condition of approval number 44 states that discharge rates from the site shall not exceed the predevelopment rate. Since the site is currently pervious and much of it will be converted to impervious, is a detention system required? In looking at the plan set, it does not appear to include storm water flow control features.</p>	<p>The project plans submitted by the applicant do not show on-site drainage detention. The city staff recommended condition #44 would require the project to provide on-site storm water detention facility of sufficient capacity to detain any increase in flow rate from the property to existing rate of flow. Many projects have stored higher intensity flows in oversized underground pipes to meet this condition. Please note that the applicant will be required to submit revised and more detailed plans and calculations on plans submitted for construction permits. Such plans must address the City's conditions of the project approval.</p>

Stevens	<p>3C - Sheet C3.2 illustrates storm water treatment requirements. Must this project comply with Alameda County's C.3d requirements for sites that creates and/ or replace 5,000 square feet or more of imperious surfaces or is it exempt due to its proximity to transit? Based on the treatment calculations, it looks like the conventional roof and concrete/ asphalt exceed 5,000 square feet. Based on the stormwater treatment area calculations, it looks like the required treatment area is sized at 4% to require 270 square feet. But, is this based on a bioretention? It does not look like there are bioretention areas at the site. Can the applicant clarify the intent?</p>	<p>The project has less than 5,000 sf of uncovered parking. It is not a C3 regulated project. No bioretention areas are proposed. However, pervious pavers in the uncovered parking area exceed the stormwater treatment area calculations. The project is required to treat on-site initial flows during a rainfall as per the requirements of regional stormwater pollution prevention program. The city requires that such treatment be a biological treatment. Typical such treatments rely on bacteria in the plants' root zone to breakdown oils and other pollutants into inert material. The bio-treatment areas also treat stormwater through ground percolation and trans-evaporation. Reduced drainage volume will be required for treatment for this project being in the close vicinity of a transit facility. Please note that only single family residences with total impervious area less than 5,000 S.F. are exempt from this requirement.</p>
Stevens	<p>3D - Several areas proposed on the site as illustrated on Sheet 3.2 feature pervious pavers; will these require a subdrain? If so, will the subdrain be able to drain to the underdrain shown on Sheet C4.0 in note U-14 given their depth due to the structural section below the paver?</p>	<p>Detail 1/C5.0 shows subdrain for the pervious pavers. The subdrain will discharge to the below-grade stormwater control device. The pavers shown on the plans will be required to have subdrains. These sub-drains can be connected to the city staff recommended drain inlet in O'Neil Avenue. The pavers often are placed over drain rock, which provides storage area for storm water detention. These details will be reviewed by the city staff when detailed plans are submitted for construction permits.</p>