

**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:**

**October 12, 2020  
  
Special Meeting 5 PM  
  
Via: Tele-Conference**

.....

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – by Chair Sugrue @ 5:05pm**

**ROLL CALL**

**Board Members present: Andrews, Johnson, Joiner, Komorous,  
Mollette-Parks, Sugrue  
Board Members absent: Fu  
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 need to unmute yourself on your device to begin speaking. **By phone to comment:** 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 - 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 if you so choose.

**BOARD BUSINESS**

**Agenda Discussion - None**

**Secretary Reports – None**

**Board Matters – None**

**Sub-committee Reports - None**

**OPEN FORUM** – No speakers for Open Forum

**INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS** - No informational presentations were scheduled

**APPLICATIONS**

**1. Mosswood Park Master Plan** – Board review and comment on draft historic impact analysis.

Board secretary **Vollmann** introduced the item. The City of Oakland Public Works Division has proposed a Master Plan for the rehabilitation of Mosswood Park. As part of that, an environmental document will be prepared prior to this going to the City Council for a decision on the Master Plan. Mosswood Park is identified as an API (Area of Primary Importance) and is considered a Historic Resource. City staff wanted the Board to review the draft HRE (Historic Resource Evaluation) and statement on the impacts in relationship to the proposed plan, and asked the Board to make a motion as to whether they agree with the findings of the reports.

**Christine Reed, Project Delivery, Oakland Public Works** – did a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed plan for Mosswood Park. The project began in 2016 when the former Recreation Center, built in the 1950s, burned down. We felt a Master Plan was the most important and appropriate way to ensure that the new Community Center was well integrated within the context of this beautiful and historic park. The process started in September 2019. We had intensive nine-month community engagement meetings, leading to the draft Master Plan, which was published on the City’s website at the end of May 2020.

**Sarah Kuehl, landscape architect, Einwiller Kuehl Architecture** – history was a big part of this project from the beginning. She’d spoken with the community, people who live by the park, used to live by the park or went to events at the park. Four guiding principles emerged from those conversations; a dialogue of rich history, a green oasis, the creative energy and the resiliency. Much of the existing park will remain intact, with new proposals as follows; improved ADA access, wider pathways and trails, rehab of the Pergola (built in 1911), interpretive elements for teens, and arts, improved lighting and bicycle resources.

**Dominique Elie, architect, Leddy Maytum Stacy Architects** – the master planning process of the park was an opportunity to look at the park holistically and find the best program and location for the new Community Center. The results of that process were a three-pronged building program consisting of a community center, a multi-purpose gymnasium with a performing arts room, and a small warm water pool, which will be developed in three separate phases.

**Frederic Knapp, Knapp Architects - Historic Resource Evaluation** – recapped some of the history and research they did on Mosswood Park which included; when Joseph Moss bought the 32 acres in 1863, married Julia Theresa Wood in 1864 and built the Moss House (J. Mora Moss Cottage), 1912 when the City acquired the land and developed it into the Park, 1948 when the Park was renovated and 1954 when the Community Center was built. He stated, that the Park is very important to local history and is a cultural landscape as a Historic Resource and the Moss House is individually listed as a Historic Building (Ord. 9120, Jan. 7, 1975). The entire Park is eligible under California Register Criterion One, as part of the City’s history. The period of significance is from 1912 when the City opened it as a Park, to 1970, which is a temporary end date, due to the 50-year rule to define the period of significance). It retains its historical integrity and among the character defining features are the layout of the park itself. The Master Plan should be evaluated under CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act), for effect on

12 acre Mosswood Park, and that's how the report evaluated it. The Master Plan would rehabilitate the Park under the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The character defining features will remain with enhancements to the functions of the Park.

**BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **Andrews** – was the existing Community Center from 1954 that burned down in 2016 considered as part of the historic resource of the Park. **Knapp** – no, we didn't evaluate it because it doesn't exist anymore. **Mollette-Parks** – what extent does the Glen Echo Creek play in the design and was it part of the community engagements. **Kuehl** – we had some good dialogue about it. To add ADA accessibility to the Amphitheater, which is on the creek, there's a wall that's exposed, and we've considered placing interpretation about the creek there. **Sugrue** – the Mosswood House has come before us before, mainly in Public Comment, with concern for the neglect surrounding it. From a preservation standpoint, what is the Master Plan doing toward activating the house and protecting it. **Reed** – one of the pieces of the Master Plan was an architectural evaluation, so we can understand what would be required to renovate it and make it functional. **Sugrue** – what is the fundraising plan to seeing this project through. **Reed** – we (Public Works) raise all the funds. Currently we have some SEED funding and that gave us enough to start the Master Plan. Also, OPRYD (Oakland Parks & Rec) advocates for the Park to the various stakeholders.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** – OHA appreciated all the public outreach on this project. Our group is in support of the plan but in the Master Plan, we were hoping for additional revisions to the design of the Rec Center to better reflect the adjoining historic house. We also want to make sure that the Moss Cottage survives and not end up a 'fire victim'. We would like to urge the LPAB in conjunction with approving the Master Plan, to request that a security plan be attached, to safeguard the building.

**BOARD COMMENTS** – **Andrews** – finds it alarming that rehabilitating the Moss House is too expensive and felt the implication was that 'it's not worth it'. That's a problem when we look at historic resources and evaluate them in terms of economic cost to preserve them. We do need to make a motion that the security of the building be a priority for the City of Oakland. Also, the report is missing something in terms of the evaluation of the historic resource, the previous Community Center. We still need to acknowledge it and at least, show a reflection of it in the new proposal. **Komorous** – agreed with the comments by Andrews and Schiff, regarding the Moss House. It's important that we don't lose it to another fire, and stabilizing the house should not be that expensive. On the design/re-design of the Pergola, she states she likes the third option and from a historic point of view, there's no issue with removing part of the wall. It would be interesting to leave some of it, so there is a record of the park in 1948. **Sugrue** – commended both Andrews and Komorous on honing in on preservation of the Mosswood House and incorporating it into the plan, and requesting a better explanation around the old Community Center. The plan stated that it was challenging this year due to COVID, to access archival resources, so information may currently be limited, but those aspects are very important to the history of the park. I appreciate the innovation around the new Community Center but we want to make sure the historic aspect is fully encapsulated in the plan. **Andrews** – would move to make sure the comments are forwarded to the Planning Commission. The main point we want to emphasize is that security of the Mosswood House be looked at again. We've moved this several times (I'm not sure it's had an effect) but it's our duty to continue to do that. Secondly, the report should reflect the historic significance of the old Community Center so that it's part of the record. And last, the Center design that's presented in the Master Plan feels a little generic and doesn't have the character that a building in that setting should have. Even the images of the buildings shown, are images of buildings not in parks. We would like to see buildings in parks that have life and character, are functional and will be treasured and loved by the residents of the City of Oakland. **Sugrue** – asked the Board to make a motion.

**Vollmann** –clarified that the issue before the Board was CEQA review, the question being, is the Master Plan considered to be an impact on the historical resource or not. According the HRE report, it is not. The Board could make an additional motion, to raise the importance of a security and maintenance plan for the Moss Cottage as this proceeds to Planning Commission and City Council for a decision on the Master Plan.

**Komorous** – made a motion, that the Board agrees with the HRE (Historic Resource Evaluation) as presented, that there is no significant impact. **Joiner seconded, (5 ayes – 1 pass)**, motion passes *and* the second part of the motion is as follows: 1. Planning Commission and City Council to be made aware of the importance of a security and maintenance plan for the Moss House. 2. To include more detail about the 1954 Community Center into the text of the HRE. 3. The Board would recommend including language in the Master Plan that speaks to the new Community Center being part of a park and the importance of excellence in the architectural design, to make that building memorable to the Community. **Andrews seconded, (6 ayes – 0)**, motion passes.

2. **National Register Nominations** – Secretary **Vollmann** introduced two Oakland nominations for the National Register that will be going before the State Historical Resources Commission for consideration at its November 6 meeting. No action is required by the LPAB but this is an invitation to comment on National Register eligibility prior to the meeting. The Board can make a motion of support of the applications and it will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

**A. Menlo Hotel** – **Komorous** was recused from this item.

**Jessica Sheldon, Resources for Community Development** – stated RCD acquired the Menlo in 2017 and are just wrapping up substantial renovation of the property, in part financed by Historic Preservation Tax Credits, public funding, Measure KK from the City, as well as, the Oakland Housing Authority and Alameda County. She says they are very excited about the possibility of getting listed on the National Register. The property is located at 13<sup>th</sup> and Webster streets in Downtown Oakland, was built in 1914 by architect and builder, Fred D. Voorhees, is 7 stories tall with a basement and 96 small hotel units. After the renovation, it will have a total of 66 apartments, 54 studios and 12 one-bedroom units. RCD is a non-profit organization based in Berkeley, so everything we build is affordable housing. These apartments are only eligible for households who earn 60% or less of area median income and rents are much lower than market rents. We’ve been doing this for 35 years and own about a dozen properties in Oakland. Another RCD property, the Harrison Hotel, is already on the National Register.

**Frederic Knapp, Knapp Architects** - wrote the nomination and Historic Resource Evaluation. The Menlo is a very good example of the kind of buildings that made this part of Downtown what it is, in an important era (1906-1929) of development. The nomination states that the building is significant at the local level under National Register Criterion C for architecture, because it embodies the use of the Renaissance Revival style during this important period of the City’s growth. The use of steel frame construction went hand-in-hand with the use of this traditional style, to tie the building to historic architectural sources and also civic ideals like the City Beautiful Movement, that was made famous in 1893 at the Chicago World’s Fair.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** – says that OHA will be putting in a letter of support to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and is very excited to see the building come back from “recent drama” and rescued for affordable housing.

**BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **Andrews** – also in support of the project. “Despite what some developers tell us,” we can renovate historic buildings, occupy them, make them viable and beautiful. **Sugrue** – thanked the applicant for bringing this project forward and stated, that this is a great opportunity to see a historic building preserved in this City and great representation.

**Andrews** – moved to support of the application. **Johnson** seconded – **(vote; 5 ayes -0) motions passes.**

**B. Oakland (Kaiser) Auditorium - Mark Hulbert and David Dial, Orton Development** – we’re here tonight with the Oakland Civic project, the refurbishing of the historic landmark Oakland Auditorium (Ord. 9746, 4/3/1979). We’re pleased to join you (again) to answer any questions you may have about the Oakland Auditorium’s application for the National Register for Historic Places. After 15 years the building of sitting dormant, we look forward to assuming responsibility for the landmark and working to restore this gem.

**BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **Andrews** – wanted the applicant to summarize where they are in the process of fixing up the building and making it occupyable again. **Dial** – we have recently secured approval for the Tax Credit financing we needed. We’ve been working on the project since 2014 and received approval from the City, July 2019. We will be assuming our lease in Dec. 2020 and start construction in 2021.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS** – **Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** – OHA will be sending a letter to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in support of this project. We certainly hope it’s going to get off the ground and people are very excited that it will move forward.

**Joiner** – moved to support the application. **Johnson** seconded. **(vote; 6 ayes – 0) motion passes.**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS** - None

**UPCOMING** – None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – for September 21, 2020 **Andrews** – moved to approve minutes. **Johnson** seconded. **(vote; 6 ayes – 0) Minutes approved.**

**ADJOURNMENT – 6:51pm**

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

*Minutes prepared by: LaTisha Russell*