

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION  
ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS:**

**Vince Sugrue, Chair  
Klara Komorous, Vice-Chair  
Chris Andrews  
Ben Fu  
Marcus Johnson  
Nenna Joiner  
Tim Mollette-Parks**

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION  
ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES:**

**February 10, 2020**

**Regular Meeting 6 PM  
City Hall, Council Chambers  
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza  
Oakland, California 94612**

.....

**ROLL CALL**

**Board Members present: Andrews, Johnson, Joiner, Mollette- Parks, Sugrue**

**Board Members absent: Fu, Komorous**

**Staff present: Pete Vollmann, Betty Marvin, LaTisha Russell**

**BOARD BUSINESS**

**Agenda Discussion - No**

**Secretary Reports – No**

**Board Matters – No**

**Sub-committee Reports - No**

**OPEN FORUM** – Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance, (OHA) – announced the upcoming series of presentations hosted by OHA; How Transportation Corridors and Eminent Domain changed by Stu Swiedler, Thursday, 2/20/2020; African American Oakland: 1915-1965 by Dorothy Lazard, Thursday, March 19, 2020 and Hays Canyon by Kathleen DiGiovanni, Thursday, April 21, 2020. Ms. Schiff invited all to come and enjoy. All the presentation will be held at OK Stereo, (previously the American Bag Co., Landmark, Ord. 12124, 3/30/1999), 299-3<sup>rd</sup> St., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Oakland.

**INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS** – No informational presentations were scheduled.

**APPLICATIONS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Location:</b>	<b>460 24<sup>th</sup> St-465 25<sup>th</sup> St. and 2354 Valley St.</b>
	<b>Assessor's Parcel Number:</b>	<b>008-0674-033-1, 008-0674-006,008-0674-007, 008-0739-008</b>
	<b>Proposal:</b>	Scoping session for environmental review of an office and retail proposal on two sites. Site 1: Developing a 99,788 square foot mixed-use office and retail building on a site partially in the 25 <sup>th</sup> Street District API. The project would provide an interior midblock retail paseo connecting 24 <sup>th</sup> and 25 <sup>th</sup> Streets. Site 2: Developing a 640 square foot portion of the lot at 2354 Valley St. with artist and craft stalls.
	<b>Applicant/ Phone No.:</b>	Signature Development Group
	<b>Contact Person/Phone Number:</b>	Elisse Douglass 510-251-9269
	<b>Case File Number:</b>	<b>PLN19096, PLN19096-ER01</b>
	<b>General Plan:</b>	Community Commercial
	<b>Zoning:</b>	Site 1:CC-3. Site 2: D-BV-4
	<b>Environmental Determination:</b>	Staff has determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared for this project. A NOP to prepare the EIR was published on January 17, 2020. The comment period for the NOP ends on February 20, 2020.
	<b>Historic Status:</b>	Site 1: Garage District API, PDHP OCHS rating Cb1+, C1+ Site 2: 2356-98 Valley St. ASI PDHP D2+
	<b>City Council District:</b>	3
	<b>Action to be Taken:</b>	Receive public and Landmarks Board comments about what information and analysis should be included in the EIR.
	<b>For Further Information:</b>	Contact Case Planner <b>Rebecca Lind</b> at (510) 238-3472 or by email at <a href="mailto:rlind@oaklandca.gov">rlind@oaklandca.gov</a> .

**Pete Vollmann, Board Secretary** – introduced the project at 460-24<sup>th</sup> Street, as a scoping session for an environmental review proposal. The point for this evening, is to take comments on information that should be included in the environmental document, with the focus on cultural resources, and not a hearing to comment on the merits of the project.

**Rebecca Lind, case planner** – the purpose for tonight is to begin the discussion of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review for the proposal in the Garage District's API, between 24<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup> Streets. There are two separate locations being studied in the CEQA analysis that would require different sets of entitlements but CEQA does allow us to consider them together. Site 1; is the larger site that will be used for a mixed-use office/retail development and Site 2; will be presented as a 'pop-up' retail on a portion of an existing parking lot. The scope of work that has been reviewed and drafted for this proposal, is a very focused EIR at this point. We are going to be looking at the esthetics of the project; hazards, hazardous materials, historic resources, air quality, green-house gas admissions, land use, noise and transportation. The other areas of the environment have been scoped as potentially not resulting in any significant impact and since these properties are CEQA resources, we are aware that the historic resource portion of this will be a very important part of the analysis.

**Elisse Douglass, applicant, Signature Development Group** – thanked the Board for taking the time to hear the proposal and especially staff, whom they've worked with very closely these past few years on this project and are very excited about starting the process with the community outreach and CEQA. Douglass did a PowerPoint presentation that focused on the 25<sup>th</sup> Street Garage district, which is the most important part, from a Landmark perspective. She stated, the great thing about this site is, that there are a number of objectives that we've worked on with the community and staff and, we want to bring that same energy and strategy that we've developed for 'The Hive'. We want to support them in terms of space and resources

by bringing that into the new project with additional retail/commercial and art space. Other important things that we've heard about this project from the community are about the pedestrian activity and increasing that by adding the 24<sup>th</sup> Street Paseo, connecting the businesses and developing a strategy to preserve the historic buildings that are contributors to the 25<sup>th</sup> Street Garage District API.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **Daniel Levy, Oakland Heritage Alliance, (OHA)** – his main conundrum with the project is, that it's not a project in a vacuum, it's a project that's another phase of a much larger project or an evolution of new projects. In regards to the scoping, it's hard to assess the impacts to the district just based on this project alone with all the other projects, the 'Hive', the West Elm hotel and another project few doors down from this project. We need to look at this holistically and in the context of the entire district to make sure we don't end up with a district full of facades of buildings. As part of this project specifically, I'm interested in seeing an alternative plan that looks at retaining more of the historic structure, study the impacts on the doorways, windows, the paseo and converting a garage into retail storefront use, which could be used for more art space or just retaining more of the historic structure.

**Hiroko Kurihara, Art & Garage District (AG&D), Oakland** – says the A&GD is extremely concerned about the proposal from an architectural/cultural perspective and provided the following comments; the height limit increase is inappropriate for the area (from 45ft to 85ft), retaining facades with stucco is not a high level of design for the neighborhood, stop proposing retail in light industrial zones, allowing more parking than required (taking away space that could be used for cultural activities), widen the 'paseo' to full width (18ft to 20ft) and develop an incentive program, such as a cultural density bonus, that identifies affordable arts, cultural/commercial space.

**Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance, (OHA)** – says that OHA is also concerned with new proposal, what impacts it will have on the neighborhood and the Environment Impact Report (EIR) should provide more information on all plans for future projects in that area and not just this one. She provided the following detailed questions that should be addressed; can the project be redesigned to preserve more of the historic structure, can the new construction surface materials blend in better with the existing buildings, study the impacts to the building more fully, can we work around rather than continue to demolish historic buildings and leave the historic structure intact, can consideration be given to alternatives that devote more art space rather than more 'parking' space and can the applicant avoid destroying a historic building for a walkway (paseo).

**BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **Sugrue** - thanked the speakers for giving a thorough overview of the project and had a question for staff as to why the amount of parking. **Lind** – this property is not in the Downtown zone where there is no parking but the corridor commercial does still require parking at a minimum, we haven't completed the detailed zoning analysis yet. **Sugrue** – had a comment in terms of aesthetics, regarding studying different materials with warmer colors is very important for this district, (when walking in this area), the more we can blend it makes a lot of sense. Also, the concept of the walkway, studying that with potential alternatives, would be helpful.

**Mollette-Parks** - questioned the data sheets from the applicant about parking; he asked if the parking alternatives could be included in the draft EIR because of the way it relates to both the alignment of the mid-block pedestrian crossing and to further protect parts of the historic structures. Also, the gates at the mid-block crossing, what is the intended use over time, will it be open consistently or only during business hours. Says he's not sure about the process within the draft EIR to take on the cumulative impacts questions, but feels this one (about the parking) is very important. **Andrews** – says he agrees with some of the comments made by the public speakers in regards to; looking at the overall effect of the district with these piece-meal projects. The applicant spoke about the hodge-podge nature of the design, which I think is inaccurate. If we look at the architecture that was built before WWII, I would call it eclectic and quite cohesive. The development that's been done most recently, makes it look

hodge-podge. With the lack of symmetry and materials which are not similar to the character of the existing buildings, those pieces make it look hodge-podge and to continue using that, is disappointing. I also think it's disingenuous to tear down a building to say you're preserving it, that's not preservation. We also need a better answer on the parking issue, in which I think we're progressing beyond parking. **Joiner** – says just allowing the historical portion to be upfront and then the new buildings to be behind, gives a disservice to the building and the community as well. And, we want to make sure we're (LPAB) doing our best for the residents and artists of that community, and do as much as possible for the preservation of both, because this is an 'Arts District', which has helped the revitalization of Oakland. **Johnson** – supports having parking. He stated that, if you're going to have retail and businesses, there's going to be a need to support them by having some limited parking. He would also like more data on the year the structure was built, the materials used and if all the side walls are made of the same material. **Sugrue** – asked what the timeframe for the project is moving forward, establishing the EIR and completing it. **Lind** – we're at the beginning of the process and we don't have a set schedule yet but it does take a few months.

The following is a summary of the comments presented by the Board:

- Closely study cumulative impacts on the 25<sup>th</sup> Street Garage District API, taking into account past, present and future development.
- Consider that the depth of the garage buildings in the district is a character defining element of the API, and this should be considered in analysis of impacts
- Look at potential impacts with regard to compatibility of proposed exterior materials of the proposal to that of the existing buildings in the API.
- Alternatives should include looking at preserving more of the existing API buildings through looking at reducing parking to allow for the retention of more of the buildings by reducing square footage of the parking garage – also look into the issue raised about the viability of retaining interior tile walls.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS - No**

**UPCOMING** – the Draft EIR for the Howard Terminal proposal, will be going out this month and come before the LPAB at the March meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – December 9, 2019 & January 13, 2020 - Andrews motioned to approved the minutes for the December 9, 2019, seconded by Joiner, minutes approved. January 13, 2020 minutes will be read at the March LPAB meeting (due to absentee members).

**ADJOURNMENT – 6:55p**

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING: March 9, 2020**

Minutes prepared by La Tisha Russell