

**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:**

**January 11, 2021
Special Meeting 5 PM
Via: Tele-Conference**

.....

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY: Board Chair Sugrue @ 5:01pm

ROLL CALL

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

WELCOME BY CHAIR - Board Chair Vince Sugrue welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Board Secretary Pete Vollmann, 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: 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 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 –

Johnson - reported on the progress he's made checking on Oakland's Historic Landmarks, due to the discussion the Board had at last month's meeting (12/20) regarding the Preservation and safeguard on some of the City's Landmarks. He stated, he was pleasantly surprised to notice that some of the residences are being maintained, almost as if the pictures of them on the Website were taken today. There was one Landmark that stood out, the Montclair Firehouse on Moraga Avenue. There was a notice of a Development Opportunity (March, 2018) and at that time, I visited the Firehouse and remember, it was so much shrubbery around it and the poor condition it was in. I contacted the person in the Real Estate Dept. and asked for status of that property, but I don't know if the City still owns it or if it's being developed.

Sugrue – stated, that he emailed the Real Estate Property Assessment Manager, Brendan Moriarty, with the City of Oakland, about the potential utilization of funds collected from the Fire Insurance from the buildings that we unfortunately had lost due to fire, that were Landmarks and, also about securing and restoring other City owned Historic buildings. He hasn't heard back yet but will report at the next meeting when he does. **Andrews** – several years ago, the Real Estate Division did make a presentation to the Landmarks Board about this and wonders if it's time for them to update that again.

Komorous – wanted to discuss further how to proceed with a plan on visiting the Landmarks, like Johnson. She stated, that maybe between us, we could cover more of the list but wanted to find a way to keep track of the listings, so they won't be repeating themselves and visiting the same Landmark twice.

Sugrue – we did talk about emailing to both Board Secretary Vollmann and Betty Marvin and asked Vollmann if he had any thoughts on how to organize this item more effectively. **Vollmann** – asked Johnson to email the list of Landmarks he has visited and we can keep track and, asked Komorous to reach out to either himself or Betty Marvin and they can let her know which Landmarks have been seen already.

Johnson – says he will make the list available to Vollmann and Marvin. Also, he is now focused on the Commercial, Industrial sites, (especially the exterior conditions), rather than residential and has covered most of West Oakland and now moving towards downtown Oakland.

Sub-committee Reports – None**Secretary Reports – None**

OPEN FORUM – **Daniel Levy, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** – wanted to thank the Board for following-up on the Landmark item and to Johnson, for looking at the Landmarks and the Firehouse in Montclair. He says, it's 'great' and appreciates that you are doing this and checking in on their status. Also, it would be good if the Real Estate Division did make another presentation. **Naomi Schiff, OHA** – tagged on to the remarks made by Levy and particularly, we (OHA) are concerned about City owned Landmarks, such as the Moss House (in Mosswood Park) and one that is privately owned but at risk, the 16th and Wood Railroad Station.

INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS – No informational presentations were considered.

APPLICATIONS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Location: | 316 12th Street (APN: 002-0063-007-00) |
| Proposal: | Proposal is for the construction of three stories above an existing two-story commercial building to create 21 residential units. Three residential units will be affordable housing units at the low-income level. |
| Applicant: | Colin Nelson, Owow Design |
| Phone Number: | (530) 966-5777 |
| Owner: | 316 12th St. LLC |
| Case File Number: | PLN20121 |
| Planning Permits Required: | Regular Design Review for the construction of a multi-family residential facility |
| General Plan: | Central Business District |
| Zoning: | Lake Merritt Station Area District Mixed - 4 Commercial (D-LM-4) Zone Height Area – 85 feet |
| Environmental Determination: | Determination Pending, Environmental analysis to be conducted prior to any discretionary action. |
| Historic Status: | Designated Historic Property (DHP); Rating C1+, contributor to the King Building Group Area of Primary Importance (API) |
| City Council district | 3 |
| Status: | In review |
| Action to be Taken: | Receive public and Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board comments on the design |
| For further information: | Contact Case Planner, Michele T. Morris at 510-238-2235 or mmorris2@oaklandca.gov |

Michele Morris, case planner – gave a brief presentation on the purpose of this report, to seek input and design recommendations from the LPAB regarding the applicant’s proposal for the construction of three new stories above an existing two-story commercial historic building, to create 21 residential dwelling units. Three residential units will be affordable housing units at the low-income level. This project involves a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) historic resource as laid out in the General Plan’s Historic Preservation Element. Therefore, further analysis is needed to determine whether the project will have a significant effect, either on the existing building or the Area of Primary Importance (API), as a whole. However, this analysis can’t get started until the project design has been largely finalized because, the design is integral to the determination of the impact on the King Building Group. The ‘King Block’ is a full City block, bounded by 12th, 13th, Webster and Harrison Streets and, is listed on the California Register and determined eligible for the National Register. (you can find more Historic information about the King Block, on pages 2 & 3 of the staff report).

The project site is within the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan (LMSAP) and, to start the CEQA Historic analysis, staff is requesting the LPAB to provide comments on the design. The applicant, Jeremy Harris of Owow, is here tonight to make his presentation and will provide an overview of the evolution of the designs his team has proposed, and they’ve narrowed the proposal down to the one you’ve reviewed in the staff report.

Jeremy Harris, Develop. Director, oWow Design – thanked the Board and is very grateful to be able to give his PowerPoint presentation on the proposed project at 316 12th Street. He started with the Historic Significance of the King Block API, with its skeletal articulation and expansive window areas. The corner buildings are the primary focus of this API with the King Building being the most important. There are

'6' key resources in the King Block API; the five corner buildings and the 'Alleyway', that comprises the whole subject block. The King Building is rated 'A' (highest), the two corner buildings on Webster are rated 'B' (major) and the remaining two buildings and the 'Alleyway' are rated 'C' (secondary). In progress now, Project 1, is a renovation and retrofit construction project within the existing 2-story commercial building, that is slated to be completed by April 2021. The ground floor will be refurbished and reactivated for commercial tenancy, they plan to preserve the exterior character defining elements and it has zero impact to the surrounding API.

Project 2, (in review tonight), is the 3-story residential addition with eighteen apartments under market rates and three apartments for low-income housing. Early in the process, we received some initial feedback from Planning on Option 1, before we submitted in Feb. & July 2020, which was; be sensitive to setback, height, keep modern but complimentary and compatible but differential. We made 'some moves' to truly respect the building and what's around it. We intentionally dropped the building height so it's lower than the King Building, we setback in all directions recessing the north and south elevations, we recessed off the existing property line ten feet, to preserve the King building windows. We also received further feedback from Planning and OHA on Option 2 which included; too many faux historicist details, more abstraction in the cornice, larger groupings of windows, felt the façade a bit flat and to recess slightly to give some shadow and depth. So, we focused effort on Option 2 only. He showed the current design (in which they are today) with a more sensitive coloration along with a stair element, compatibility, differentiation with a glazed link between the two buildings that's neither competitive nor derivative. Our intention is to have a modest and deferential building. He also showed a 'materials board' that included; stucco, stone tile, flagstone, a multi-pane window system and brick, along with, horizontal cladding, a modern abstracted cornice and powder coated aluminum expressed beams. In conclusion, Mr. Harris went over the items addressed; modest patterning, height & scale, removed all faux historicist detailing, horizontal banding, material differentiation and comments of stair to provide greater material and style compatibility.

BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS – **Andrews** – a few years back, there was talk of developing a commercial space/social functions in the Alleyway, is that still in development? **Harris** – no, the Alleyway is a private property under different ownership that has '4' property lines that restrict openings from buildings, unless it is merged into lots or becomes owned by the City. Unless there is a major variance by the City, it can't be developed. **Andrews** – is there any updates on that project (at 1261 Harrison Street). **Vollmann** – the applicant has withdrawn the project, it's no longer active. **Johnson** – said he discussed with the applicant, if it was possible to include the same character of brick-work as the old into the new building and the window treatment, will that be the same. **Harris** – we were asked to make a more modest building but keeping it a little more modern and, the window treatments will be similar. **Vollmann** – the existing brick-work will be retained (clarification since rendering did not include the existing brick). **Johnson** – with the addition of the other stories, will the roof be able to support them. **Harris** – the roof will be able to withstand the project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS – **Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** – we spoke with the developer several times about this project and appreciated their openness on this. There are still a couple of things; we are not convinced that this rain screen approach is better than brick and we ask the LPAB, to look at an actual materials board and be cautious about the coloration. Also, wanted to thank Mr. Johnson for asking about the brick, and OHA doesn't believe that differentiation is not the only thing. Overall, the configuration with the deep set-back and the window patterns are good, the building is not inordinately tall, and we look forward to seeing the restored transom windows in the existing project. Lastly, we question how CEQA was approached on these elements, and would like the LPAB and staff, to have a serious conversation about 'phased projects and piece milling', and we are concerned about the precedent we are setting for other projects. We need to be cautious here, address that issue and make

some rules about it. We did not know about the activities at this site because it was approved without going through any Board. It was considered a ‘small project’ and approved with no public review. And now, we are looking at floors 3, 4 & 5 and not having reviewed floors 1 & 2, which are the Historic Elements, and that is a very awkward way to perceive with the Cultural Resources.

Daniel Levy, (OHA) – also thanked the developer for meeting with OHA, responding to all their feedback and working with us constructively. We think the design has come far along on the set back, the height and would like to see how the wrapping of the façade around the back of the building will look like. We’d also like an overview from staff, on how CEQA was applied here because we didn’t get an opportunity to review the first part of the project. It seems these two phases are tightly coupled together, and we’d like to see how they were separated under CEQA.

David Johnson, architect/planner, tenant of the King Building – our primary concern was the set-back at the property line and the response of the design to the King Bldg. and the API. We are satisfied with the direction of the project and we encourage you to focus on the details and the review of the finishes’. Housing in Oakland is very important and we need to find a way to streamline and provide infill housing like this. Mr. Johnson thanked the Board and stated, that they (the tenants) are in support of this project.

Sugrue – suggested, that the item regarding the *CEQA* process, should be discussed before the Board Comments. He stated, that since this subject has been brought up, and we did receive communication on this from OHA as well, I was hoping someone from staff could address the two-separate parts project and why not the coupling.

Morris – last year, when Owow Design applied for a Small Project Design Review (SPDR), we reviewed the project and found that it met the existing facilities category exemption, that was one separate project. Then they came in for this project, which is currently under review, and at the same time, we were also doing an Environmental Review. So, today the focus is on the design of the addition and not the façade improvement of the separate project from last year that we did under the SPDR. We are currently looking at the impacts of this project on the entire building and the King Block.

Vollmann - from general processing, when a historic building comes in and it’s being proposed for restoration or a seismic retrofit, we usually don’t bring those to the LPAB, if just a full restoration and replacement of existing materials. Sounds like a large amount of the interior of this building was taken apart as part of that structural retrofit. The applicant in replacing these, is proceeding at their own risk of making the structural integrity that could support future development on top, without any guarantee that this project would be developed or approved.

Heather Klein, Planning Dept. – when the project that was for the restoration came in first, we didn’t know there would be an addition to the building when we reviewed the process of that project. When the next project came in, (they were designed to be stand-alone projects) the stair in its configuration right now, it could go up 3 stories more, but it works in that location for the existing building retrofit. When the second project came in, we did have concerns regarding this idea with the ceiling, the CEQA process and especially where they were in the process for the building permits for the renovation and restoration of the front façade. We can’t speculate or know if there will be any future plans (at the time of the renovation project) but, we as staff are only looking at the project before us.

BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS – **Andrews** – had concerns about the ground level bay and the store-fronts (at the proposed lobby entrance) being completely different from the existing. He stated that the overall design is fantastic but when you get to the details, it doesn’t all quite come together and the stairwell tower doesn’t belong to either the existing building or the proposed addition. **Fu** – agreed with

the comments made by Andrews. He added that, the design of the project seems safe, the stair tower does not fit in, the proposed setbacks are appropriate, and the façade on the lower level could be improved.

Komorous – says she has concerns about the window cleaning equipment not being shown in the renderings and if they are removable so not to impact the facade. She stated that the project sponsor has done a good job and, this project can be an asset to the King Block area. She cited the description of the stairwell in part of the staff report *(the glass stairway and its generous, transparent and open fenestration creates a visual impact which serves to highlight the King Building’s ornamentation and façade details) and disagreed with the statement. The stairwell would have to be lit 24-7 and it doesn’t enhance the project, and is not integrated well into the design of the building. The entry lobby bay (stair tower) should be pushed back. Statement that she hopes staff is not telling applicants that brick is not an appropriate modern material. **Sugrue** – appreciated the developer coming in and willing to meet with OHA up front before coming to the LPAB. We respect their (OHA) input and dedication. He stated that he likes the open space and the set-back, in an area where you can build up. This project also brings to light, the importance of asking applicants to provide ‘night renderings’ of their projects, especially, if they are in a downtown environment and where the building will have a presence both day and night. He also agrees with his Board members, about the stairwell, and figuring out ways to reduce the visual impact is very important.

Vollmann – asked Chair Sugrue, if the Board would like to see this item come back to the LPAB. Since we did receive comments this evening on the design, would the Board like to see those modifications incorporated into the re-design or have a sub-committee to discuss the additions. **Andrews** – made a motion to have a ‘sub-committee’. **Komorous** – seconded. **Vollmann** did a verbal roll call – **5 ayes, motion passes.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS - None

UPCOMING – No

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 14, 2020 – **Komorous** - requested a correction to the minutes: The Board to approve the meeting minutes with an addition of several sentences at the end of the Board Discussion but these changes will only be sent to me (**Komorous**) for review and then they will be re-distributed amongst the Board. If we could add that to the end of the Board Discussion, the minutes would be more complete. **Sugrue** – asked the Board, is there a request to have them revised or a motion to approve with corrections? **Komorous** – made a motion to approve minutes with correction, seconded by – **Johnson**. Motion passes, (+4 ayes – Andrews, sustained). Minutes approved pending the requested revisions. ****(correction completed – LR)**

ADJOURNMENT – by Chair Sugrue – 6:32pm

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: February 8, 2021 (cancelled)

Minutes prepared by La Tisha Russell