

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION  
ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS:**

**Klara Komorous, Chair  
Ben Fu, Vice-Chair  
Chris Andrews  
Marcus Johnson  
Alison Lenci  
Tim Mollette-Parks  
Craig Rice**

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION  
ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES:**

**December 13, 2021  
  
Special Meeting: 5 PM  
  
Via: Tele-Conference**

.....

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY: Chair Komorous @ 5pm**

**ROLL CALL: Board Public Service Rep – Deborah French**

**Board Members present: Komorous, Fu, Johnson,  
Lenci, Mollette- Parks, Rice**

**Board Members absent: Andrews**

**Staff present: Karen August, Deb French, Betty Marvin**

**WELCOME BY CHAIR - Chair Komorous, welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Board Secretary Karen August, to give a helpful explanation on the meeting and some pointers on how this works for everyone in attendance either by Zoom or by phone.**

**By Zoom:** she asked all attendees to lower any hands that are raised and only raise them if you're interested in speaking on an item when it's called. This will help us avoid confusion and calling speakers for the wrong item. The system will keep track of the order of hands that are raised and it's important that once you raise your hand, keep it raised, unless you change your mind about speaking on that item. Lowering and raising your hand will bump you to the end of the line. Each speaker will have a maximum of 2 minutes to speak and during this time, speakers cannot concede time. When it's your time to speak, the City will unmute you and then you will need to unmute yourself on your device to begin speaking.

**By phone:** you press \*9 to engage the raise your hand feature. When it's your time to speak, the City will refer to you by the last four digits of your phone number and then press \*6 to unmute yourself. If you do not wish to speak on any item, you can also view the hearing on KTOP Live on television as well, instead of this platform if you so choose.

**BOARD BUSINESS**

**Agenda Discussion - None**

**Board Matters – 1st item - Chair Komorous – introduced new Board Member; Craig Rice.**

**BM Rice**, licensed architect – originally from Portland, has been in Oakland for the past 6 years, has experience in both Historic and non-Historic projects. Says he's happy and excited to be here on the Board to serve the community in this capacity. **2nd item** – introduce and discuss, whether or not the Board should have their cameras on (for attendees) when conducting their LPAB meetings. **BM Rice** – yes, until we return to in-person meetings, this would be an advantage for us in the way we interact. **Vice-chair Fu-** welcomed BM Rice and echoed his suggestion stating, this would be a good way for the Public to see us. **Chair Komorous** – it would be easier and, I'd appreciate it if we did turn our cameras on.

**BM Mollette-Parks** – also, would like to see everyone and, it would be good for the Public to see who’s participating. (**Per Chair Komorou**, this matter will be further discussed at their next LPAB meeting and, a decision will be made then).

### Sub-committee Reports - None

**Secretary Reports – August** – regarding **item #2** in the Applications, no action will be taken by the LPAB on the draft EIR, only comments are requested at this time. The design proposal will return to the LPAB (at a letter date), to discuss the merits of the proposal. Also, a friendly reminder that the next LPAB meeting will be January 10, 2022.

**OPEN FORUM** – **Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** – welcomed new BM Rice and, reported on the successful clean-up efforts of the J. Mora Moss House in Mosswood Park. She stated, they had 30-50 volunteers, staff, Public Works, OHA, Neighborhood Recreation Advisory Council and two Council Members all helping to clear out the home. Also, thanked the LPAB, for having helped to raise a ‘human cry’.

**CONSENT CALENDAR** – the Commission will take a single roll call vote on the item listed below.

|            |                                     |   |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b># 1</b> | <b>Location:</b>                    | <b>Citywide</b>   |
|            | <b>Accessor’s Parcel Number:</b>    | N/A   |
|            | <b>Proposal:</b>                    | Adoption of a Resolution Determining that Conducting In-Person Meetings of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Would Present Imminent Risks to Attendees’ Health, And Electing to Continue Conducting Meetings Using Teleconferencing In Accordance With California Government Code Section 54953(e), A Provision of AB-361, to Allow Continuation of Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Meetings. |
|            | <b>Applicant:</b>                   | Karen August, Secretary to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board  |
|            | <b>Phone Number:</b>                | 510-238-6935  |
|            | <b>Owner:</b>                       | NA  |
|            | <b>Case File Number:</b>            | NA  |
|            | <b>Planning Permits Required:</b>   | Adopt Resolution  |
|            | <b>General Plan:</b>                | NA  |
|            | <b>Zoning:</b>                      | NA  |
|            | <b>Environmental Determination:</b> | Exempt pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) (Common Sense Exemption).   |
|            | <b>Historic Status:</b>             | NA  |
|            | <b>City Council District:</b>       | NA  |
|            | <b>Status:</b>                      | NA  |
|            | <b>Staff Recommendation:</b>        | Receive public testimony and consider adoption of Resolution.   |
|            | <b>Finality of Decision:</b>        | Decision Final.   |
|            | <b>For further information:</b>     | Contact case planner <b>Karen August</b> at 510-238-6935 or by e-mail at <a href="mailto:kaugust@oaklandca.gov">kaugust@oaklandca.gov</a>   |

**The LPAB Board passed the motion:** to continue using Teleconferencing for their meetings: **6-eyes, 1-abstain**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS / APPLICATIONS**

|            |                                     |   |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b># 2</b> | <b>Location:</b>                    | <b>4315, 4365, 4368, and 4500 Lincoln Ave.</b>  |
|            | <b>Accessor's Parcel Number:</b>    | APN 29A-1367-4-4,29A-1367-1-14,29-1009-10-5, and 29-1009-6  |
|            | <b>Proposal:</b>                    | Public Hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report to receive public and Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board comments on the Head-Royce Planned Unit Development Project. Head-Royce School proposes to integrate the existing Campus with the former Lincoln Children's Center site (the proposed South Campus) to create a unified, 22-acre K-12 school (the Project). The Project proposes to connect these two campuses via an underground tunnel under Lincoln Avenue and/or with an at-grade pedestrian crossing across Lincoln Avenue. There are 12 existing buildings on the proposed South Campus. Generally, these existing buildings are in fair condition on the exterior, but in poorer conditions in the interior. The Project proposes to remove eight of the twelve existing buildings on the proposed South Campus, to rehabilitate three existing buildings identified as historic resources for use as school facilities, and to use one existing building for school-related or potentially short-term employee housing. The Project also includes a proposal to construct a new Performance Arts Center (for student curriculum relating to theater, music, dance and culture) and to construct two new small structures (each 1,500 square-feet, one for maintenance and the other as a link to the proposed pedestrian tunnel, housing an elevator). The Project also proposes a one-way circulation loop driveway on the proposed South Campus to provide off-street drop-off and pick-up space, thereby eliminating pick-up and drop-off activities (other than for buses) from Lincoln Avenue and reducing turn-around traffic in adjacent neighborhoods. The Project also proposes to increase permitted student enrollment by 344 students over the currently allowed enrollment of 906 students, to a maximum student enrollment of 1,250 students. |
|            | <b>Applicant:</b>                   | Crystal Land, Head of School  |
|            | <b>Phone Number:</b>                | 510 351-1300  |
|            | <b>Owner:</b>                       | Head-Royce School   |
|            | <b>Case File Number:</b>            | PLN-18532 and PLN18152- ER01  |
|            | <b>Planning Permits Required:</b>   | Planned Unit Development, Conditional Use Permit, Major Encroachment Permits with Californian Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis through an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which will require certification for Project approval.  |
|            | <b>General Plan:</b>                | Institutional; Hillside Residential   |
|            | <b>Zoning:</b>                      | RD-1; RH-4  |
|            | <b>Environmental Determination:</b> | The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was published for a 45-day review period from November 5, 2021 to December 20, 2021.   |
|            | <b>Historic Status:</b>             | PDHP C-3  |
|            | <b>City Council district</b>        | 4   |
|            | <b>Status:</b>                      | Under Review  |
|            | <b>Staff Recommendation</b>         | Receive public and Landmark Preservation Advisory Board comments on the DEIR.   |
|            | <b>Action to be Taken:</b>          | No action to be taken by the Landmark Preservation Advisory Board on the DEIR other than to provide comments.   |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>For further information:</b> | Rebecca Lind: Phone: (510) 672-1474 or by e-mail: rlind@oaklandca.gov. |
|---------------------------------|--|

**Rebecca Lind, case planner** – this proposal is to expand the Head Royce School across Lincoln Ave. to the site of the former Lincoln Children’s Center site creating a new South Campus. The proposal, is to connect the existing and proposed South Campus, with a pedestrian tunnel under Lincoln Ave. or, (as a second option) to have an additional grade pedestrian crossing. The CEQA and DEIR documents reviews both options. The proposal is to: demolish 8 of 12 existing buildings on the proposed South Campus; construct a new performing arts center; three historic resource buildings will be retained and rehabilitated; two small structures will be built, one for maintenance and, the other building will link the pedestrian crossing on the South Campus; a circulation drive-way is proposed on the South Campus that would provide off-street drop-off and pick-up parking space; increase in student enrollment from the current 906 to 1,250 students. This project would require an amendment to the existing 2016 Planned Unit Development permit that governs the existing school. Also, there was a Historic Resource Evaluation prepared as part of the DEIR (Appendix 7A). Three buildings on the campus qualify as individual historic resources for the purposes of CEQA and, are eligible for the California Register, the campus (itself) was not found to qualify as a historic district for the purposes of CEQA. The three buildings are proposed to be rehabilitated and reused with substantial interior renovation. The DEIR did not identify any significant or significant and unavoidable impacts.

As part of the DEIR analysis, there are three alternatives; #1 – is the required No Project Alternative, which includes the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation; #2 – Minor Development Alternative, would include a cap on enrollment and some modification and reuse of existing buildings; #3 – Reduced Alternative, would provide for a reduced incremental increase in student enrollment, a new Loop Road for off street drop off and pick up and, an at grade crossing at Lincoln Ave., no underground pedestrian tunnel. Of these three alternatives, the DEIR concludes that Alternative #2, Minor Development Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

In conclusion, the purpose of this public hearing, is to provide information and to take comments on the adequacy of the DEIR. The hearing is not intended for receipt of comments on the merits of the project, we will be returning to the LPAB for further discussion on that. Comments tonight should focus on which potential adverse effects might be minimized and alternatives to the project. No action is asked of the Board tonight.

**Crystal Land, applicant, Head of School, Head Royce** – gave a PowerPoint presentation on the general project overview and key project benefits. When they purchased the property over 10 years ago, they envisioned having a thoughtful, inclusive and intentional approach to developing the proposed South Campus. The current plan incorporates detailed feedback from neighbors, which helped resolve issues related to; traffic, parking, noise and the neighborhood character. The Lincoln Child Center has been on that site for over 100 years and they would like to continue to serve children. She showed renderings of the current campus and the proposed South Campus, which includes; a collaboration center, a welcome center and science classrooms, a stem center, an underground tunnel link and the loop driveway.

**Lisa Follman, architect, SOM** – continued the presentation with the existing and historic buildings on the site. There are twelve existing buildings on the site, three have been identified as historical resources and, not part of the historic district. She went over the three historic buildings, (0, 1, & 2) their existing architecture, which were all done in a Spanish Colonial Revival Style. The alterations, deferred maintenance and, the defining historical characteristics will be retained/rehabilitated to ‘breath some life’ back into these buildings and bring them up to code per the Secretary of the Interior standards.

**BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **BM Rice** – asked what the orientation of the interior will be and the uses for the buildings. **Follman** – non-historic interior and the use will be classrooms and Admin. Offices. **Chair Komorous** – the term ‘falsely historic’, does it apply to the restoration. **Follman** – the windows facing

the campus, will be non-historic. (**Chair Komorous** - suggested they discuss this topic further when they return to the LPAB).

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS** –

**Rod Thompson, representative, Neighborhood Steering Committee (NSC)** – has worked on various issues regarding the school and recommends that the DEIR have alternatives to the following; the installation of the ADA compliance ramp, the front stairway egress and, the steel sash windows.

**Karen Caronna, member, NSC** – also agrees, the DEIR should have more information regarding the windows and stairways and, explain in more accurate detail, the impacts of the planned demolition of buildings 4 thru 8.

**Peter Smith, Board Chair, NSC** – strongly supports the proposal to rehabilitate the ‘three’ buildings with historic resources. The issue has been addressed in a tasteful and proper way and, supports the conclusion that the South Campus does not meet the definition of a historic district.

**Sarah Malan – member, Board of Trustees, Head Royce** – has two daughters that attend the school (from kindergarten to middle school) and is very happy about this project. Says the project has been thoughtfully planned and to see these ‘three’ buildings maintaining the historical nature for our beautiful City and keeping our neighborhood with its original feel, has been lovely.

**Kristin Dwelley, neighborhood resident** – this plan will restore and preserve the buildings, the project honors the historical use of the land. It would be wonderful to see it finally return to be used for supporting our children in our City.

**Jason Langkammer, member, Board of Trustees** – glad the DEIR found that the project has no significant or unavoidable impacts to the neighboring environment. Pleased that the school and the design team chose to keep and rehabilitate those ‘three’ buildings that have served the kids, students and the youth of the East Bay.

**Naomi Schiff, OHA** – OHA supports the modest requests of the NSC and it seems like this project is heading towards a consensus. She asked that the following items should be studied in greater detail in the DEIR; more retention of the historic fabric, the ADA ramps need additional design alternatives, the deck addition and the demolition proposals.

**Vangeria Harvey, neighborhood resident** – supports and is pleased that the site can be re-used in a way that keeps up with the historic use and, that the DEIR found the renovation and mitigation plans, will not impact the historic significance of the buildings on the property. Now, we can continue the long-standing legacy set forth by the Lincoln Child Center as being, historically used to serve children.

**Annie Prozan, neighborhood resident** – as a neighbor, I just want to say ‘thank you’ for such a thoughtful plan that Head Royce has done and, working with the neighborhood to ensure that it meets everyone’s needs. Agrees with the DEIR regarding the findings of the ‘three’ buildings and, qualifying them as historical resources.

**Dawn Fergosa, consultant, Collaborative Consulting firm** – a former Oakland teacher and is very passionate about education. By having good schools in the neighborhood, it benefits our community. Head Royce has had decades of high performance, from the teachers to their academics. The DEIR and plans have been thoughtful about everything including, noise/pollution abatement to traffic issues, all done with accuracy and high quality.

**Leila Moncharsh, attorney, NSC** – had the following comments on the DEIR; building #4 - needs to have more work done on it and not demolished; building #0 - should be an entertainment venue not another theater and building #8 - is miss described in the DEIR, it is a new building.

**Amelia Marshall, OHA** – the Head Royce expansion plan is a project that has many merits but, are quick to dismiss the historic value of some of the buildings on the campus. The Ethel Moore Cottage, should be looked at more closely and, a feasibility study done for either rehabbing or moving the cottage to a different part of the campus. Also, OHA supports the NSC regarding, the ADA ramp and windows.

**Ken Dupee, real estate developer** – served on the Planning Committee for this site and, is very pleased the school elected to retain the ‘three’ historically significant buildings and, incorporate upgrades to those

buildings. Also, that the DEIR founded those renovations will not impact their historic significance and, all the treatment for the buildings is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior standards.

**Kurt S., Oakland resident** – supports the DEIR review and its key findings.

**Carla Arnold Foster, Oakland resident** – delighted that the City’s DEIR has done a good job with its Cultural Resources analysis. I agree that the ‘three’ buildings on the South Campus, qualify as historic and, the renovations proposed for the exterior of these buildings, will not adversely impact their historic significance. Delighted that we’re able to honor both the heritage and historic significance of the Lincoln Child Center and Head Royce, in bringing this plan forward.

**Marc Perrin, real estate investor** – great supporter of the investment that Head Royce is planning to make and, continuing to serve and educate young people in the East Bay community.

**BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** –

**Chair Komorous** – asked that the following corrections be made to the draft EIR:

1. the proposed reuse and rehabilitation of building #2, the floor plan shows the ramp on the right side but, on the elevation, it is shown on the left side, the floor plan and elevation should match.
2. the refurbishing of the windows on building #0, is being considered as a possibility, is not in the text and,
3. the inaccuracies in building #8, it would be good to look at it and make any changes while this is a draft.

**BM Rice** – as a procedure, are we able to take additional time and add comments to any report that goes to the Planning Commission or, do we capture those comments tonight. **Chair Komorous** – today, we are being asked about, how the completeness of the draft EIR. **BM Rice** – would like to comment on the different use of the historic building code versus the building code and, how that code was considered. I also have questions about the ADA ramp and the window restoration, would like it shown in more detail in the DEIR.

**Lind** – you can comment on any issue but, it’s needed tonight to go forward to the Planning Commission as a comment from the LPAB. **August** – as a member of the public, comments can be submitted thru 12/22/21 or, you can also attend the Planning Commission meeting on 12/15/21, all Board members are welcome. **Chair Komorous** – no action/motion will be taken by the Board on this item.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS** - No

**UPCOMING** – No

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – No

**ADJOURNMENT** – 6:48p

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING: January 10, 2022**

Minutes prepared by: **LaTisha Russell**