

August 10, 2016 Design Review Committee

ATTACHMENT C: Public Comments Received by August 1, 2016

## Payne, Catherine

---

**From:** Deirdre Snyder <desnyderus@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 29, 2016 9:30 AM  
**To:** Adhi Nagraj; cmanusopc@gmail.com; Pattillo, Chris; Payne, Catherine  
**Cc:** Kalb, Dan  
**Subject:** Social Justice and our vision for Oakland: MacArthur BART Transit Village

The City of Oakland claims that there is no "official plan" for the MacArthur BART Transit Village, as it is not a part of the Broadway Valdez plan, or any other Specific Area Plan. We in the neighborhood had thought that the years of meetings in 1999-2000 and 2005-2006 with over 100 people present in various meetings that resulted in a Transit Village with a 4-8 height limit were "The plan." Even without a plan, for the past 35 years we, as neighbors, have been working to improve the area and serve the needs of our community. We believe that it is our - and the city's - responsibility to improve life for those who already live here over facilitating the mass influx of wealthy outsiders.

Our aspirations are to integrate those who live here into the future of the community. We have been an active group that has changed city regulations about fast food restaurants and drive-thrus, as well as establishing street trees and speed bumps on our streets, in addition to the beautification of the median strips. In return, we have found that many new businesses have embraced our neighborhood, and 40th St. has become a hip corridor of small, independent businesses, including a parklet at 40th and Webster. Ultimately all our struggles have contributed to the "organic urban vibrancy" that would make Jane Jacobs proud.

On the other hand, the 24 story luxury Tower is a dividing object, even more dividing than the freeway and the BART tracks. The latter are physical, the former is physical, social and economic.

In the process of working on plans for the MacArthur Transit Village one of the issues that has often come up is the unwillingness of investors to put money into a project in an area with open prostitution and drug-dealing. And while we also want these activities to stop, and they have abated or moved indoors with cell phones, we are also aware of another dynamic that has an effect on investors (and possible renters.)

As the income inequality grows in the neighborhood and at the BART station, crimes of property theft - robberies both domestic and vehicular, including both car break-ins and the theft of bicycles and their parts have increased. Residents with laptops and games systems are particularly targeted.

When the neighborhood was homogeneously somewhat lower income (when at least those who owned homes did much of the upkeep and improvements on their own) we had very little crime. In the past years as the area has gentrified, the number of home robberies and petty vandalism of cars has increased enormously. (These are documented with the police and/or on the Nextdoor listserv.)

Investors and wealthy renters of the large, high level apartments in the Boston properties may balk at contact with the lower income people of the area. We need to take care of all the members of our community. Creating what will amount to a vertical gated community in the midst of our neighborhood is discordant and disruptive. We need a more harmonious development and humane provisions for the homeless and housing insecure members of our community. It is too much like the Third World to have the luxury high rise and the homeless in the street below. We can do better than

that. We want to promote positive interactions among the various members of the community. We are not willing to send the long term residents off to Stockton so the newly arrived can be at peace.

The viability of this project comes into question when you look at exactly this issue of income inequality. The more fortunate may prefer not to rent in an area with obvious poverty and crime, especially when so much housing construction is nearby.

Aside from the two major (300+) developments in the Broadway-Valdez Plan, there are quite a few other developments which all abide by the 4-5 story zoning limit for this area. Among them are the 20 apartments at 411 W. MacArthur, the large units at 41st St and Broadway and the major development at 51st and Broadway, as well as several infills on 40th St and MLK Blvd. These are already in process and all are within the concept of organic development which will significantly increase the density of the neighborhood- without the necessity of a luxury tower.

Should the Planning Commission be so unwise as to permit this misguided tower, it should remember that it might end up being less than full. As a previous commentator in 2005 noted, an empty high rise is uninviting to all as well as a financial burden to the investors and the city. It is an epic failure.

We believe that this tower is an example of completely inappropriate development and call on the good sense of the Design Review Committee to reject this dubious ploy for corporate gain and civil domination.

Deirdre Snyder,  
420 37th St.  
Oakland

Sent from my iPhone

## Payne, Catherine

---

**From:** Shifra de Benedictis-Kessner <shifra@temescaldistrict.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2016 11:06 PM  
**To:** Payne, Catherine  
**Cc:** Bill Lambert  
**Subject:** Temescal BID endorsement of the MacArthur Transit Village Parcel B development  
**Attachments:** MacArthur Transit Village Parcel B endorsement letter.pdf

Catherine,

Can you please forward the attached endorsement letter from the Temescal BID to the Design Review Committee and all pertinent staff prior to the August 10th Design Review meeting?

Thank you,  
Shifra

--

Shifra de Benedictis-Kessner  
Executive Director  
Temescal Telegraph BID  
4430 Telegraph Ave #49  
Oakland, CA 94609  
510 860-7327  
[shifra@temescaldistrict.org](mailto:shifra@temescaldistrict.org)  
[www.temescaldistrict.org](http://www.temescaldistrict.org)  
<https://www.facebook.com/temescaldist>

# TEMESCAL TELEGRAPH

BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

**Temescal Telegraph Community Assoc.**

4430 Telegraph Avenue #49 • Oakland, CA 94609

510-860-7327 • [info@temescaldistrict.org](mailto:info@temescaldistrict.org) • [www.temescaldistrict.org](http://www.temescaldistrict.org)

July 27, 2016

Dear Design Review Committee,

On July 27, 2016, the Temescal Telegraph Business Improvement District (BID) board unanimously endorsed McGrath/Boston Properties development on Parcel B of the MacArthur Transit Village. This project will create 402 apartments for Oakland residents (45 affordable), housing hundreds in the midst of a city-wide housing crisis, and creating much needed transit-oriented development that will decrease Oakland's per unit greenhouse gas emissions.

The BID is supportive of the proposed narrow building design that maximizes the number of housing units and affordable housing, while minimizing shadows on nearby residents and businesses. This design allows for a welcoming pedestrian plaza that will be activated by the over 13,000 square feet of retail, serving both Transit Village residents and the surrounding community.

The BID appreciates that this transit-oriented development provides high density right at a BART station. The low ratio of parking to residential units – 0.65/apartment, totaling 260 spaces – will encourage residents to walk, bike, and take transit. Furthermore, this development will give significant financial support to BART, contributing to the maintenance and expansion of our regional public transit system. The proximity to transit, high walkability, and the building's LEED Gold certification will decrease Oakland's per unit greenhouse gas emissions for years to come.

MacArthur Transit Village development will completely transform the southwest corner of the Temescal District, creating a gateway from the MacArthur BART Station to the main business district. Also, the addition of 402 new families to the neighborhood will enhance its vitality and increase the customer base for Temescal's locally owned, independent businesses.

Because of these positive economic and public benefits, the Temescal Telegraph BID urges the Design Review Committee to approve the project.

Sincerely,



Shifra de Benedictis-Kessner

Executive Director

Temescal Telegraph BID

## Payne, Catherine

---

**From:** Marty Price <emprice@mindspring.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 25, 2016 7:30 PM  
**To:** nagrajplanning@gmail.com; Pattillo, Chris  
**Cc:** cmanusopc@gmail.com; Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** BART Village

To our planning commission members,

First of all as someone who at one time was heavily involved in our community I want to thank you for your participation in this process and serving our city. I have participated in the civic process for all of my life in this city which is basically 72 years. My parents had me in a stroller as they picketed to integrate Safeway, and Lucky Stores in the late 40's. My dad through the late Jeffery Cohelan was one of the first black milk truck drivers in this town and worked with Jimmy Hoffa to integrate our Teamsters locals which had been segregated.

I have been a part of the process from Oakland CORE's walk to Sacramento in support of the Rumford Fair Housing Act. Of course this was over turned by prop15, but I worked with mark Comfort as we picketed the Tribune for jobs and justice. I then was an active member of PTSA's in my children's schools, Peralta, Montera, and Skyline. I coached Babe Ruth Baseball and along with the late Pop Bess helped to sod the field out there at Greenman. I participated in every form of the political process from walking precincts, phone banking, to managing successful campaigns. It was through all of these things I was invited by Councilperson Jane Brunner to represent my area on the PAAC of North Oakland Redevelopment , and as a former ten yr member of the Mosswood Advisory Commission. I retired from my old high school in 2005 as Assistant Principal a proud Oakland Tech bulldog where my youngest son now serves our community in that same position.

I am writing you in support of my neighbors opposition to this proposal by Boston Properties of a 25 story tower, I have no opposition to our existing height limit of 85 feet which we fought for in the development of the BART Village. We went through this process in 2000, and 2006. For this developer to once again try and foist this on our neighborhood is at best disingenuous, and at worse opportunistic greed. It is they , the developer pimping the efforts of those of us who worked with Walter Miles to see this dream of reuniting our area's commercial areas once again . To once again have some sort of continuity along the commercial corridor from MacArthur Blvd and MLK along with that on Telegraph, trying to restore what we once had. That corner of MLK and Mac Blvd once had a thriving drug store and there were local businesses on both sides of the street. Tis proposal should never have come back to us. we welcome newcomers on both sides of the BART, and this is not what we were shooting for for working with Walter , Ms. Brunner and my classmates on the PAC redevelopment Lee Cherry, and the late Charles Porter.

If Mayor Brown had not raided all the redevelopment districts(7) to ensure Forrest City's project in downtown, this would have been a done deal already.

As the Chair of the PAC we presided over facade improvement to the Berkeley Border from in all of our North Oakland commercial streets from San Pablo to Broadway. We helped bring to fruition the Whole Foods at the old Cadillac dealership on Harrison. We wanted our businesses to once again prosper in what had been a thriving working class area. The planning commission agreed with us in 2006 and this is one of the reasons we have seen new apartments going up on the Telegraph, Shattuck corridor and now at Broadway and 51st.

We no longer have redevelopment in our town but my classmates and I were all in agreement that we participated because of what happened to our neighbors in building BART, and (\*) for suburbanites dividing our North Oakland neighborhoods. We saw folks given pennies on the dollar for their businesses and were determined that we would try and bring us together through the physical division , and that division is once again proposed in an enhance new way with this tower.

We accomplished our goal and none of this came from our elected leaders who worked with us from Mary Moore, Sheila Jordan and Jane Brunner, but came from the vision of a citizen Walter Miles who believed in restoring the Common as much as possible. Walter had a vision and recruited, cajoled, and brought us ll into it. This was not to be a

gated community nor a luxury one but one of low income housing that would restore the working and middle class to patronize our businesses. Already the lack of vision and forces of gentrification have closed every public school below Telegraph. Lets get this built the way it was supposed to and work on re-opening Santa Fe for the new families moving into the Longfellow, Santa Fe area, but lets also beware of the opportunist developers playing on the real fears of folks who would like to live here. We wanted all low income, but that does not look like it will happen either, but the Tower certainly does not need to. If this developer cannot follow the guidelines that were agreed to he should bow out and we can find a new one. A Bridge like entity that has the experience and where with all to get a project like this done.

Sincerely, Marty Price , Mosswood, Bulldog for Life!!,

**Payne, Catherine**

---

**From:** Ian Petrich <ianpetrich@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 24, 2016 8:39 PM  
**To:** nagrajplanning@gmail.com; cmanusopc@gmail.com; Pattillo, Chris; Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** In support of large tower at Macarthur Village

Hello,

I am an Oakland resident and homeowner and wanted to voice my support for the 28 story tower at Macarthur Village. I think we need all the density we can get to make housing more affordable and prevent farmland from being developed in the outer exurbs. I know this design is a bit contentious but I think new land should be developed as densely as possible so please build as many units as you can.

Best,

Ian

--

Ian Petrich

503.349.4569 cell



## **Payne, Catherine**

---

**From:** Matthew Hornyak <matth@funtruth.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 23, 2016 6:26 PM  
**To:** nagrajplanning@gmail.com; cmanusopc@gmail.com; Pattillo, Chris; Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** MacArthur tower -- YES PLEASE!

Hi,

I'm a property owner, resident and landlord at 4411 Martin Luther King Jr Way.

I fully support the tower being proposed near MacArthur BART. I urge you to see that residents are in desperate need of more housing. I have the privilege of owning property already. But many of my friends don't, and they are being displaced because housing is so expensive.

I do not think it will have a negative effect on quality of life. I do not think we are in a position to worry about shadows or small changes to neighborhood aesthetics.

Opponents of this project paint tall buildings as enemies. We all know that in other cities, tall buildings exist side-by-side with short buildings. No one would call cities that do this, such as Portland, Seattle, Brooklyn, New York, and others, terrible cities with poor quality-of-life. We need to keep this in mind, rather than fall prey to the fear of people who see all change as bad.

Thank you for your time.

Matt

## Payne, Catherine

---

**From:** Deirdre Snyder <desnyderus@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 22, 2016 3:22 PM  
**To:** Payne, Catherine; nagrajplanning@gmail.com; cmanusopc@gmail.com; Pattillo, Chris  
**Cc:** Kalb, Dan  
**Subject:** Physical Impacts of 25 story tower at MacArthur BART Transit Village.

I want to discuss the physical impacts on the neighborhood of a 25 story tower. This first installation follows the daily experience at the station.

The approach from the parking lot (W. MacArthur side) to the station becomes a dark, narrow canyon with little light (especially in the morning). This is where people also wait for shuttles (Kaiser, EmeryGoRound, etc.) It will be not only cold, but also a bit creepy.

There is a helicopter route over the BART station to Children's Hospital.

The noise of the freeway and BART (which is quite loud at present) will bounce off the building and be amplified.

This, and the wind (which is increasing because of climate change and tall buildings) will make being on the roof gardens on the 14th and 25th floor, unless they are enclosed - which defeats the purpose of open space. The roof gathering places on the MLK building are placed so they are protected from the freeway- exactly because of the noise.

There is a issue of the glare of reflected light (such as a dusk) or excessive shadow in the morning for drivers on the freeway.

I am not questioning the architects' credentials, but I have seen errors for a lack of consideration for the environmental interface. At MIT years ago, two buildings were built across from each other near the Charles River. The wind tunnel produced required them to hire Alexander Calder to place a stabile, The Sail, between them so people could pass. In Boston, the glass of the John Hancock tower- designed to reflect the city and sky- popped out because of wind patterns.

This tower would not be invisible either. It would have a real physical impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration. I will write later about another issue

Deirdre Snyder  
420 37th St.

**Payne, Catherine**

---

**From:** Kalb, Dan  
**Sent:** Friday, July 22, 2016 8:56 AM  
**To:** Deirdre Snyder  
**Cc:** Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** Re: MacArthur BART Transit Village

Thank you Deirdre for including me on your email message.  
Outreach has been and will continue to be done with residents in the Longfellow neighborhood as you suggest.

Thanks again,  
-Dan

-DAN KALB  
Oakland City Councilmember, District #1  
One Frank Ogawa Plaza, 2nd floor  
Oakland, CA 94612

510-238-7001

<http://www2.oaklandnet.com/Government/o/CityCouncil/o/District1/index.htm>

On Jul 21, 2016, at 1:49 PM, Deirdre Snyder <[desnyderus@yahoo.com](mailto:desnyderus@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Ms. Payne and Design Review Committee,

I am writing today to let you know that there is an organized group of neighbors of the MacArthur BART, the Coalition for Appropriate Development who are meeting tonight and will be sending you letters of concern about the many issues the recent request for a change in the permit raise.

Today I just want to mention that since high rise proposals have been denied twice before in 2000 and 2006, we feel that this proposal to go from an 85 ft height limit to 260 feet should warrant a new EIR. As it was judged before, this project is completely out of scale with the character of our neighborhood.

We also want to be sure that there is sufficient outreach to neighbors on the MLKing side of the project, since this proposal would have a real impact on their quality of life.

I appreciate you attention to our concerns.

Deirdre Snyder  
420 37th St.

**Payne, Catherine**

---

**From:** Colin Dentel-Post <dentelpost@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 22, 2016 8:41 AM  
**To:** Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** Design Review committee agenda error

Good morning,

Perhaps you're aware of this already, but the August 10th Design Review Committee agenda states that the MacArthur Parcel B development is proposing 502 units, not 402.

Thanks for correcting,

Colin Dentel-Post  
511 42nd St

Sent from my iPhone

## Payne, Catherine

---

**From:** Adriana Valencia <avalenc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 21, 2016 3:28 PM  
**To:** Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** A message in support of MacArthur BART Parcel B project

Hi, Catherine,

I'm an Oakland resident and homeowner who first moved here in 1998; my husband, 3-month-old son, and I live on 38th Street, a few minutes' walk from MacArthur BART and within sight lines of both the recently-constructed affordable housing and the proposed market-rate housing at the transit village. I am an enthusiastic supporter of both.

It's clear that both the City of Oakland and the larger Bay Area are facing a housing crisis. To that end, it is imperative for the City of Oakland to allow for the construction of as much housing as possible. The proposed Parcel B tower project gets that done: it provides a significant number of units. Constructing these units next to transit will both minimize additional automobile traffic, increase the pedestrian traffic that brings vitality to a city, and provide a needed consumer base to both boost existing local businesses and be able to support new ones.

The construction of this project will mitigate the already-crisis-level displacement that's occurred in the past few years. If anything: density and positive impact could be improved by lowering the proposed number of parking spaces and increasing retail square footage and/or adding more units where parking would otherwise be.

Best,  
Adriana Valencia  
38th Street

PS: Please note also that I'm very much in support of there being a supermarket in the space and that a ground-floor supermarket in the center of a space (with smaller retail around the edge) and housing above would have an immediate positive effect on my quality of life and, I suspect, on that of many people in the neighborhood who walk home from BART at the end of the day and would love to pick up some groceries. -AV

**Payne, Catherine**

---

**From:** Deirdre Snyder <desnyderus@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 21, 2016 1:49 PM  
**To:** Payne, Catherine; Adhi Nagraj; cmanusopc@gmail.com; Pattillo, Chris  
**Cc:** Kalb, Dan  
**Subject:** MacArthur BART Transit Village

Ms. Payne and Design Review Committee,

I am writing today to let you know that there is an organized group of neighbors of the MacArthur BART, the Coalition for Appropriate Development who are meeting tonight and will be sending you letters of concern about the many issues the recent request for a change in the permit raise.

Today I just want to mention that since high rise proposals have been denied twice before in 2000 and 2006, we feel that this proposal to go from an 85 ft height limit to 260 feet should warrant a new EIR. As it was judged before, this project is completely out of scale with the character of our neighborhood.

We also want to be sure that there is sufficient outreach to neighbors on the MLKing side of the project, since this proposal would have a real impact on their quality of life.

I appreciate you attention to our concerns.

Deirdre Snyder  
420 37th St.

**Payne, Catherine**

---

**From:** john medley <medleyink@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 21, 2016 10:29 AM  
**To:** Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** McArthur Trans village

Dear Ms. Payne and anyone of Oakland City Planning

As a resident of Mosswood, Oakland, I would like to put in my objection to the McArthur Transit Village project as it is proposed.

This developer is showing no respect for the desire of the people of this community. Maximizing profits appear to be the main goal of this project and such will only exacerbate the current problem of unaffordable rents in this area.

The extreme height is also a problem for me as it would completely dominate the landscape.

If the project is to be approved, I would say 120 ft height would be more appropriate.

Thank you for your consideration,

Best,

John Medley  
3921 Webster St.  
Oakland, Ca.

## Payne, Catherine

---

**From:** Andrew M. <theandrewmillershow@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 21, 2016 10:26 AM  
**To:** Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** MacArthur BART Parcel B Application

Hi Ms. Payne,

I saw a posting on NextDoor about the project and the upcoming meeting. It's exciting to hear about 400 more neighborhood housing units that don't displace anyone. I think it is an ideal location project of this scale. All for it, the sooner the better.

Andrew Miller  
822 Apgar Street  
Oakland, CA 94608  
(510) 595-3665  
[theandrewmillershow@gmail.com](mailto:theandrewmillershow@gmail.com)



**Payne, Catherine**

---

**From:** Deirdre Snyder <desnyderus@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 30, 2016 2:19 PM  
**To:** Payne, Catherine  
**Subject:** EIR for MacArthur Transit Village

Ms. Payne,

First, thank you very much for your clarity and assistance at the meeting last night. I truly appreciate your working above and beyond.

I have been trying to locate the EIR for MacArthur Transit Village and all I can find at the link is that it is available for viewing in the office, even though it says the format is Adobe.

Could you verify this for me?

In 2006? when we went through the original proposal with many, many meetings and came up with the final proposal of a maximum of six stories height. When later someone mentioned a higher tower, the planning department told him that that was out of the question.

Thank you again,  
Deirdre Snyder

## Payne, Catherine

---

**From:** Colin Dentel-Post <dentelpost@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 14, 2016 11:33 PM  
**To:** deborah@mcgrathproperties.com; Bolotina, Olga; Payne, Catherine; Kalb, Dan  
**Cc:** Robert.Raburn@bart.gov; Rebecca.Saltzman@bart.gov  
**Subject:** Support for Macarthur BART high-rise proposal

Greetings,

I am writing to convey my overall strong support for the proposed high-rise development on Parcel B of the MacArthur transit village, as well as a few comments on the design and other aspects of the project. Most importantly, I'm concerned that the project proposal includes too much parking.

Our region's current housing crisis is a result of too little housing being constructed for the number of people who live here. The only way to address this crisis without sprawling outward is to concentrate density near major transit hubs such as the Macarthur BART station.

A 402-unit high-rise on Parcel B will help address our regional crisis while bringing benefits to the local community with new shops and many new residents to help support a thriving retail district. The proposed affordable housing is a major bonus.

I do have a few comments on the specifics of the proposal:

1. The building should have a lower parking ratio, not higher than 0.5 spaces per residential unit for the entire project, with a focus instead on strong parking demand management (e.g. carshare memberships, free transit passes, bike parking, bikeshare memberships, etc). This is important to avoid adding to neighborhood traffic congestion and pedestrian/bicycle safety issues, and appropriate given the site's proximity to a major transit hub.
2. By reducing the parking ratio, the size of the garage would be reduced. I suggest adding more residential units on the first few floors of the Turquoise St. side, which would create a more pleasant, intimate, eyes-on-the-street environment than several floors of exposed parking garage. If this adds more units to the total, even better.
3. I'm a bit concerned that the retail space along Turquoise St. might not get the foot traffic and exposure needed to make it successful. Consider possible flex uses of this space if it doesn't work out as planned or replace it with town-house style live-work or residential units.
4. Think carefully about the environment the building will create on the station access road side, since many people wait there for shuttles. How about a mural or other art installation? You could potentially even fund a mural on the freeway side of the street too, creating an immersive art experience instead of an unadorned concrete trench. You should also analyze noise here: the building could reflect freeway noise down to the street, making it louder. Are there ways to absorb or deflect the freeway noise?

Overall, I hope this project proceeds smoothly and swiftly through the approvals process and can be built as soon as possible, bringing sorely-needed new housing and additional vibrancy to our neighborhood.

Thank you,

Colin Dentel-Post  
511 42nd Street

July 25, 2016

Oakland City Planning Commission  
Design Review Committee  
250 Frank Ogawa Plaza  
Suite 2114  
Oakland, CA 94612

Re: Proposed MacArthur Transit Village Parcel B

Dear Commission Members,

I strongly object to the currently proposed height of the above Parcel B project for the MacArthur Transit Village.

The proposed tower would actually be taller than a number of buildings in downtown Oakland: (Only five buildings in downtown would be taller.) Such a tall building is inappropriate in our neighborhood of small businesses, two to three story houses and small apartment buildings. It would be so much taller than any other buildings in the neighborhood, it would look like a giant finger pointing up into the sky.

It will also make the waiting area for BART shuttles as well as the path to the parking garage a dark pit at all but noon. It will make me as well as other people nervous to wait there or walk there even in daylight.

I am also concerned about the safety impact on helicopter overflights to Children's Hospital which is in the near neighborhood.

Thank you for hearing my concerns,

*Linda J Lutigens*

Linda J Lutigens  
486 - 38<sup>th</sup> Street  
Oakland, CA 94609

## Payne, Catherine

---

**From:** Colin Dentel-Post <dentelpost@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 14, 2016 11:33 PM  
**To:** deborah@mcgrathproperties.com; Bolotina, Olga; Payne, Catherine; Kalb, Dan  
**Cc:** Robert.Raburn@bart.gov; Rebecca.Saltzman@bart.gov  
**Subject:** Support for Macarthur BART high-rise proposal

Greetings,

I am writing to convey my overall strong support for the proposed high-rise development on Parcel B of the MacArthur transit village, as well as a few comments on the design and other aspects of the project. Most importantly, I'm concerned that the project proposal includes too much parking.

Our region's current housing crisis is a result of too little housing being constructed for the number of people who live here. The only way to address this crisis without sprawling outward is to concentrate density near major transit hubs such as the Macarthur BART station.

A 402-unit high-rise on Parcel B will help address our regional crisis while bringing benefits to the local community with new shops and many new residents to help support a thriving retail district. The proposed affordable housing is a major bonus.

I do have a few comments on the specifics of the proposal:

1. The building should have a lower parking ratio, not higher than 0.5 spaces per residential unit for the entire project, with a focus instead on strong parking demand management (e.g. carshare memberships, free transit passes, bike parking, bikeshare memberships, etc). This is important to avoid adding to neighborhood traffic congestion and pedestrian/bicycle safety issues, and appropriate given the site's proximity to a major transit hub.
2. By reducing the parking ratio, the size of the garage would be reduced. I suggest adding more residential units on the first few floors of the Turquoise St. side, which would create a more pleasant, intimate, eyes-on-the-street environment than several floors of exposed parking garage. If this adds more units to the total, even better.
3. I'm a bit concerned that the retail space along Turquoise St. might not get the foot traffic and exposure needed to make it successful. Consider possible flex uses of this space if it doesn't work out as planned or replace it with town-house style live-work or residential units.
4. Think carefully about the environment the building will create on the station access road side, since many people wait there for shuttles. How about a mural or other art installation? You could potentially even fund a mural on the freeway side of the street too, creating an immersive art experience instead of an unadorned concrete trench. You should also analyze noise here: the building could reflect freeway noise down to the street, making it louder. Are there ways to absorb or deflect the freeway noise?

Overall, I hope this project proceeds smoothly and swiftly through the approvals process and can be built as soon as possible, bringing sorely-needed new housing and additional vibrancy to our neighborhood.

Thank you,

Colin Dentel-Post  
511 42nd Street