

**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:**

**August 10, 2020
Special Meeting 5 PM
Via: Tele-Conference**

.....

ROLL CALL

**Board Members present: Andrews, Fu, Johnson, Joiner, Komorous,
Mollette-Parks, Sugrue**
Board Members absent:
Staff present: Pete Vollmann, Betty Marvin

WELCOME BY CHAIR - **Board Chair Vince Sugrue** welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked **Pete Vollmann, Board Secretary**, to give a helpful explanation on the meeting. He gave some pointers on how this works for everyone in attendance either by Zoom or by phone. **By Zoom:** he 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. 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 also need to unmute yourself on your device to begin speaking. **By phone to comment:** you press *9 to raise your hand. When it's your time to speak, the City will refer to you by the last four digits of your phone number = 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, instead of this platform.

BOARD BUSINESS

Agenda Discussion - None
Secretary Reports – None
Board Matters – None
Sub-committee Reports - None

OPEN FORUM – **Naomi Schiff – Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** –invited everyone to a free presentation, co-sponsored by OHA and the Oakland Public Library History Center on, Thursday, 8/13/2020 @ 7pm. The guest presenter will be **Kathleen DiGiovanni** who will talk about The Women's Movement in Oakland, the women's organizations that have led the way in advancing Oakland's cultural

and philanthropic life and helped women get the vote. This event will be made available through Zoom. To receive a link, contact ohr@oaklandlibrary.org or the Oakland Heritage Alliance at www.oaklandheritage.org.

INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS – No informational presentations were scheduled.

APPLICATION

Location:	5200 Broadway, California College of the Arts Campus
Assessor's Parcel Number(s):	014-124-300-101
Proposal:	<p>Staff information update for a proposal to redevelop the California College of Arts Oakland Campus. The proposal requires, at a minimum, a General Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Design Review. The project subject to CEQA includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Proposed Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolition of 10 buildings and landscape features; Retention of 2 existing Landmark buildings for 10,435 sf of office use. Development of two new buildings would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One building would be 8 stories and the other 9 stories tall; ○ 462 residential units, 10% of which would be affordable to moderate income families; ○ 6,310 square feet of office; ○ 1,408 square feet of café/retail use- ○ 261 parking spaces;- ○ 462 bicycle spaces; and 1.85 acres of open space accessible to the public (including reconstruction of the existing Landmark view corridor). ❖ General Plan Amendment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change from Institution Land Use to Community Commercial Land Use; ❖ Rezoning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change from RM 3/CN-1 to CC 2; Change from a 35-foot Height Area to a 90-foot Height Area; New Overlay Zone amending demolition findings within this Area of Primary Importance.
Applicant:	Arts Campus LLC
Contact Person/Phone Number:	Marc Babsin 415-489-1313
Case File Number:	ER19003
General Plan:	Institutional
Zoning:	CN-1, RM-3
Planning Permits	General Plan Amendment, Rezone, Design Review, Tree Permit
Environmental Determination:	An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is in preparation for this project.
Historic Status:	Various individual building statuses; Area of Primary Importance(API)
City Council District:	1-Kalb
Action to be Taken:	Provide Comment
For Further Information:	Contact Case Planner Rebecca Lind at (510) 238-3472 or by email at rlind@oaklandca.gov .

Prior to the informational presentation of CCA, **Board chair Sugrue**, advised the public speakersI of the 'two minute' time limit and asked if any of the Board members have met with the applicant. **Sugrue** had

met with the applicant. **Fu** met with the applicant, **Komorous, Mollete-Parks** each had a Zoom meeting with the applicant and saw their presentation (at separate times), **Johnson** met with the applicant and toured the site. **Sugrue** went over the procedures of the meeting: the applicant will give their presentation, we will then have Board questions, then we'll hear from the Public Speakers, followed by Board comments. The purpose of the meeting tonight is that 'the action being taken' is hearing comments on this project.

Rebecca Lind, staff planner – gave a verbal and PowerPoint presentation on the project, the Historic Landmark and the California College of the Arts and Crafts campus (LM#12-Ord. 9195, 8/5/1975) at 5200 Broadway. The purpose of the meeting is to provide information for the Board members and members of the public, about the regulatory issues surrounding the project as well as to ask questions and get some formal feedback. We are not looking for any recommendations or a decision, this is a working and informational session. Lind summarized the proposal of the project, the new development of the campus site that includes two new buildings with eight stories each and 467 residential units with a café/retail space on the ground floor facing Broadway. The project also includes moderate income housing (10% - at \$104,100 per one person to \$148,700 for 4 persons), and 1.85 acres of private open space available to the public that includes an existing view corridor. Macky Hall and the Carriage House will be remodeled, 10 to 12 buildings will be demolished and half of the wall on Broadway. The project as proposed does not comply with city regulations and cannot be entitled without changes to the demolition and zoning ordinances. The General Plan would change from institutional land use to community commercial land use; the zoning would change from residential multifamily to community commercial; and an overlay zone would replace current demolition/replacement findings with less restrictive standards. The CCA is considered an Area of Primary Importance (API). It was identified in 1986 and formally evaluated in 2019 with an intensive survey. All 12 campus buildings, landscaping and site features contribute to the API and are qualified as historic resources for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) evaluation. A Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) will be provided also, to determine regulatory and environmental review framework.

John Clawson, Equity Community Builders, applicant – thanked the Board for allowing his presentation. Mr. Clawson did a verbal/PowerPoint presentation on the 4 acre CCA campus site that was classified as an Oakland Area of Primary Importance (API) in 1986. The site contains multiple buildings, site features, and landscaping elements. There are twelve buildings, including facilities for institutional uses, performing arts, library, student center, crafts/art studios and a great opportunity for housing within the area. The structures range in date of construction from circa 1879-1881 (Macky Hall and the Carriage House) to 1992 (the Barclay Simpson Sculpture Studio). Together, Macky Hall, the Carriage House, and associated site and significant landscape features (Broadway wall and steps, Carnegie brick pathways, Eucalyptus Row, and the Great Lawn) constitute Oakland Landmark 75-221 and are commonly referred to as the Treadwell Estate. Macky Hall and Carriage House, and those portions of the landscape and site features that comprise the Treadwell Estate, are also listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The potential development of the site is critical for any residential development here. A substantial 'pad' for housing needs to occur at the corner of Broadway and Clifton Street. It being a quarry and all rock, parking cannot be below grade, we need to have a 'pad' big enough to fit above grade parking to wrap with the housing. This would require demolition of 3 buildings, 2 of which are not considered significant. The Carriage House we're keeping in place, the demolition potential to rebuild the Simpson Hall and the other buildings, we'll look at for preservation. We had our design team; architect, mechanical and structural engineers evaluate each of the 10 buildings and they all concluded that all the mechanical, electrical, plumbing systems and roofs need to be replaced and significant structural and ADA accessibility upgrades are needed.

We looked at each one of the buildings for feasibility, to determine which one would generate the highest revenue potential. We evaluated the cost to rehabilitate each one of the buildings, established what is the income potential and their value based on the market rate of return required. Unfortunately, because the API is a historic district and we would be demolishing some of the buildings and adding density, we're not eligible for the historic tax credit. Mr. Clawson went over the first original plan, stating they received a lot of feedback from the community and the City on that scheme. We came back with a lower density proposal and a scheme that's much more open to the street and more visible for the historic resources. This scheme was focused on how we take advantage of the opportunity to create a significant amount of housing here and still preserve the core of the historic asset.

Marc Babsin, Emerald Fund, applicant – thanked the Board members and the attendees of the meeting for allowing this presentation. He stated, they went over the historic analysis and the housing concept and came up with five different scenarios that range from more to less housing. Option 1 is based on our Environmental Review application that we submitted as a draft proposal. Option 2 saves the three California Register eligible buildings, Treadwell, Martinez and Founders Halls. Option 3 saves the Carriage House where it is currently located, reduces the size of bldg. 'A' with 298 units and more office space. Option 4 rebuilds a new Simpson Hall (next to Treadwell) and the footprint of bldg. 'B' shrinks to 305 total homes. Option 5 has the most preservation, with 8 buildings being saved and bldg. 'A' will have a total of 228 homes. Mr. Babsin went over the cost expenditures (plus/minus) for each scenario, and states they're making progress and very hopeful we can come up with something that works for both Oakland and the neighborhood.

BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS – **Andrews** – is there an option that looked at the conversion of these historic buildings into residential, artist or loft type spaces? **Clawson** – we had the architect look at each building and they are not suitable for residential conversion, and artist lofts would be less feasible than office. **Komorous** – do you have mitigation costs built into your budget; how much of the wall along Broadway will be preserved; will the re-zoning you requested include a possible density bonus and is the height set at 90ft.? **Clawson** – on the mitigation, we anticipate we'll be providing interpretive elements in the plan; the wall, we're in the process of studying an alternative to preserve the full length. **Alexis Pelosi** – on the re-zoning, a density bonus could apply (also noted that mitigation measures have not yet been identified and CEQA process is ongoing – in response to earlier question by Komorous). **Fu** – if the density bonus is applied, would the building be taller than the 90ft limitation? **Pelosi** – the project as proposed is not pursuing a density bonus. **Sugrue** – regarding the townhomes, has there been any thought about utilizing the architectural context of CCA with that design and how would you incorporate that into ground floor space? **Clawson** – we haven't 'dove' into that very far, we want to get a clear direction on the overall massing and the scope of the development.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – the following Public Speakers **support** the proposed project:
Ariele Scharff, Nico Nagle, Edward Giordano, Nicole Lazaro, Kuanbutts, Jennifer McElrath and SK Trauss.

The following Public Speakers **did not support** the proposed project (concerns w/affordable housing, demolition of the API, mitigations) Naomi Schiff - OHA, Daniel Levy – OHA, Amelia Marshall, Susan Shawl. Tom Debley - OHA, president, Adriana Valencia, Valerie Winemiller, Elin Christopherson, Liat Zavodivker, William Goodwin, Kirk Peterson and Mary Harper.

BOARD COMMENTS – **Fu** – thanked the public for taking the time in showing their passion for the City and this proposal. Wanted more information regarding the demolition ordinance and how it interacts

with the preservation of the existing site, also, the landscape, culture and art preservation that you may/may not have planned for in the development. **Lind** – the existing regulations (located in the Design Review section of the Planning code) are part of the Design Review findings. The City must make certain findings for the demolition and replacement of buildings located in an API and, it also applies to Landmark Buildings and Potential Designated Historic Properties. All the buildings would be affected or need to be looked at, in terms of the findings, and we've identified six individual historic resources within the API. These are the findings that would apply to the site, the current findings require consideration to include the character of the district, structures, the neighborhood and the status of the district itself. There are also hardship findings for actual demolition, where the developer can show that the site is not economically feasible to be retained. **Pelosi** – regarding the demolition findings; what is being proposed is not an elimination of the demolition findings but acknowledging the unique circumstances around the property and how the demolition findings apply. **Clawson** – regarding the culture/art preservation, it's our intention and objective throughout the proposal, to take advantage of this site, to open it up to the community and make more access to the open space of the historic resources of the site.

Komorous – has concerns regarding the overlay, mitigations, the density bonus and changing the demolition findings. This is not a typical area that an overlay would be used for (ultimately up to City Council). From a Landmark point of view, I don't see where this would not set a precedent and it's an inappropriate use of the overlay. I read the staff report but from my understanding, the only reason why there is this overlay, is so that you'll make this project not an API any longer and again, that sets a dangerous precedent. It's very contemporary, we all agreed that it's eligible for the National and California Registers, it's an Oakland API but now we're going to say that it's not. I would like to be on record, that I'm not opposing the demolition of those buildings that are required but I don't think that this is the way to go about it. Komorous stated that she's happy the applicant is preserving the wall on Broadway and would like for them to include the carriage entrance as well. Facilities building from 1920's should be preserved.

Andrews – says it was great to hear from the applicants, members of the public and the Board. Has many of the same concerns voiced by the public and OHA and seconds Board member Komorous' comments. He doesn't think the purview for us as the LPAB is to decide whether or not this should be preserved as an API or overlay, our job is to preserve the API. What is being proposed is not under our charter. The point of preservation is to preserve, not to take down these buildings or change the character of the district. He appreciated former Board member Kirk Peterson's comments, stating that CCAC did enjoy certain privileges under its tenure in Oakland and now has decided to sell the property but that's not the business of the LPAB. We made this into an API and we recognize these buildings as Landmarks and it's our job to continue and preserve that. In regards to the demolition ordinance, we can't look favorably on the demolition of these historic resources when no design of equal or higher quality has been proposed. I know it's difficult in large scale planning projects but we need some assurance and the applicant needs to demonstrate that to us. On the issues of housing and landscaping, Andrews says that Oakland does need more housing and this proposal starts to address that, with more affordability being carefully considered, and the applicant does offer preservation to a good part of the landscape heritage of the site, which is very critical and should be recognized.

Sugrue – in closing, says there is a clear expectation that we'd love to see this project come back with emphasis to the cultural preservation. I would like to thank OHA for bringing attention to and allowing us to open up the conversation on demolition. I'd like to urge the applicant to take into consideration how much cultural relevance there is to this whole project, not just to the neighborhood but all of Oakland, and incorporate that into the future project.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – None

UPCOMING – No

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – for July 13, 2020 - **Joiner** – moved to approve minutes.
Andrews – seconded. (Vote: +6, -0) Minutes approved

ADJOURNMENT – 6:56pm

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: September 21, 2020

Minutes prepared by La Tisha Russell