

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Approved Minutes of the March 5, 2018, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Safety Announcement.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Karen Alschuler called the meeting to order at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at approximately 5:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Board Members Cheryl Barton, Jacinta McCann, and Stefan Pellegrini. BCDC staff in attendance included Andrea Gaffney and Ethan Lavine. The presenters were David Burton (KTGY), Paul Houtz (Alameda Marina), Sean Murphy (Alameda Marina), and Bill Smith (Smith and Smith Landscape Architects). Public comment via email was submitted by Ben Botkin (San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail), Maureen Gaffney (San Francisco Bay Trail), and Susan Threlfall (Waterfront Action). Also in attendance were Peter Brand (Alameda resident), Dorothy Freeman (Save Alameda's Working Waterfront (SAWW)), Nancy Hird (SAWW), Lee Huo (San Francisco Bay Trail), and Joanne Martin (Alameda Marina resident).

Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda.

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** Ethan Levine, BCDC Coastal Program Manager, discussed the upcoming projects for Commission review:

- a. Oyster Point Redevelopment Project
- b. Mission Rock Mixed-Use Development
- c. South Bay Salt Ponds Project, Phase 2
- d. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposal to retain four or five of the old Bay Bridge piers to be reused for public access.

info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov
State of California | Edmund G. Brown — Governor



DRB MINUTES
March 5, 2018

3. Approval of Draft Minutes for February 5, 2018, Meeting. Ms. Gaffney updated the Board on the projects reviewed at the February 5th meeting: The Caltrans proposal to construct two public access piers - at Yerba Buena Island in the city and county of San Francisco and the former Oakland Army Base in the city of Oakland - atop foundations of the former San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span.

Ms. Gaffney stated, as part of the February 5th discussion, it was noted that a portion of the Yerba Buena Island site was a former military landfill in the location of the existing shoreline beach and proposed parking lot and road. A security fence was proposed for installation to restrict access to the contaminated soils present at the shoreline beach.

Ms. Gaffney stated, since that discussion, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has requested that Caltrans stop work at the site prior to the development of a work plan for site remediation in coordination with the DTSC and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Remediation for the contaminated portion of the site is expected to take a minimum of one year.

Ms. Gaffney stated the proposed public access pier is outside of the contamination boundaries towards the water. The BCDC is working with Caltrans to determine the appropriate next steps for this portion of the project, and the project as a whole continues forward through the permitting process and will be reviewed by the Commission prior to June of 2018.

Ms. Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Maureen Gaffney, Senior Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail, as follows:

a. Although the road leading down to the Yerba Buena Island Pier E2 proposed project site is a greatly constrained right-of-way, bicyclists will come anyway. The proposed configuration of the parking lot and pathways around it and out to the pier will not likely accommodate a mix of cars, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Because it is a dead-end, everything converges here.

b. More bicycle parking is also needed.

c. The project materials reference "Bay Trail shared road." "Bay Trail" and "shared road" are words that should never appear together.

d. The Bay Trail does not accept Class 3 bicycle lanes as a complete Bay Trail. Roads that do not provide at a minimum a Class 2 bicycle lane and sidewalk will remain gaps in the Bay Trail system until such time that accommodations can be made.

Ms. Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Ben Botkin, Planner, San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail, as follows:

e. Yerba Buena Island is a popular destination lunch spot for paddlers making the crossing to or from San Francisco to the East Bay. A small existing beach near the proposed parking area is currently used by kayakers as a destination stopping point.

f. The development of the exciting facilities at the site as well as the redevelopment of Treasure Island and the Torpedo Room would make an excellent destination for paddlers.

g. Due to limited parking, this is unlikely to be a good launch point, but should be developed as a destination for paddlers.

h. Due to site conditions and anticipated moderate low use, a ramp should be sufficient. If the site use becomes higher, a dock could perhaps be added associated with the Torpedo Room redevelopment.

i. A ramp through the riprap closer to the Torpedo Room would provide sufficient access for paddlers looking to stop and have lunch or use the new amenities.

j. Short-term kayak storage near this ramp would also be a benefit.

k. On the Gateway Park side, the existing unit is limited due to the access to the shoreline. The Beach north of the bridge (Radio Beach) is popular with kiteboarders. It is critical that Gateway Park provides high-quality facilities for nonmotorized watercraft and small boaters.

l. Due to the distance for parking, the point next to the pier is not ideal for a kayak launch. Do not invest time and money in kayak facilities. It would be redundant and unused once the facilities at Gateway Park are constructed.

m. Mr. Pellegrini requested copies of Ms. Gaffney's and Mr. Botkin's comments.

n. **MOTION:** Mr. Pellegrini moved approval of the Minutes for the February 5, 2018, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as presented, seconded by Ms. Barton.

o. **VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of 4-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler and Board Members Barton, McCann, and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

4. **Alameda Marina Mixed-Use Redevelopment (First Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their first pre-application review of a proposal by Pacific Shops, Inc., and the city of Alameda for a mixed-use redevelopment of the 44-acre Alameda Marina site at 1815 Clement Avenue in the city and county of Alameda. The proposed project would include maritime, marina, commercial, retail, residential, and open space. Public access improvements include construction of a new segment of the Bay Trail, park and hardscape plaza areas, reuse of existing wharves for passive and recreational public use, installation of a public floating dock within a historic graving dock, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Ethan Levine, Coastal Program Manager, showed a video of the project site and pointed out areas of interest. He introduced the project and summarized the issues in the staff report including whether the project:

(1) Provides sufficient amenities to accommodate the expected level of use from new residents, employees, and visitors to this segment of the shoreline

(2) Takes advantage of the Bay setting and provides adequate opportunities to get close to and experience the water

(3) Includes the appropriate sort of amenities for the public at this location, and will feel inviting to the public

(4) Creates clear delineations between public areas and private development and resolves areas of potential conflict between these uses

(5) Provides adequate and appropriately sited public parking for the public amenities at the site

(6) Provides adequate public access areas with each phase of development

(7) No details have yet been provided about site furnishings, signage, planting, or lighting. Does the Board have advice on these amenities?

(8) No details have yet been provided on management and maintenance. Does the Board have advice on these topics?

(9) Takes advantage of the unique historical features in its design or enhances the public's understanding of the site and its relationship to the Bay

(10) Provides clear connections for all users to the Bay from Clement Avenue, and otherwise maximizes the opportunities for the public to access and view the Bay

(11) Minimizes the potential for conflicts among pedestrians and cyclists within the shoreline open space area

(12) Designs the Bay Trail widths to adequately provide for the anticipated level of demand at this location and follows the best possible route through the project site

(13) Considers potential adverse effects to the proposed public access improvements from anticipated sea level rise, and designs appropriate responses to achieve resiliency to, or adapt to, these conditions

b. **Project Presentation.** Sean Murphy, Alameda Marina, introduced the project team. He provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of the context, the 25-year tidelands lease, and existing conditions of the proposed project site. He stated the seawall has outlived its useful lifespan and is one of the key infrastructure items that needs to be addressed.

David Burton, Executive Director, KTGy, the architects working on the Alameda Marina Master Plan, continued the slide presentation and discussed the site plan, access and pedestrian circulation, and graving dock area of the project site. Mr. Burton stated the Alameda Marina Master Plan was based on four core principles: to improve and enhance the maritime

and commercial core or the working waterfront, to reconnect the Alameda community to the activated waterfront, to reinvest in the site to modernize and restore the shoreline and infrastructure, and to create a new neighborhood that provides a diverse range of housing that will be attainable to the greatest number of the Alameda residents or individuals who wish to move to this area.

Bill Smith, Smith and Smith Landscape Architects, continued the slide presentation and discussed the open space program, public access plan, and working waterfront graphic.

- c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions:

Questions About the Working Waterfront:

Mr. Pellegrini referred to Slide 8, Access and Pedestrian Circulation. He asked for clarification about the second pedestrian path running east to west through the parking area adjacent to the dry boat storage on the slide. Mr. Burton stated it is the path of travel through the parking lot.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the multifamily townhomes around the graving dock include parking at grade level that is accessed from the extensions of the streets. Mr. Burton pointed to the entry, garages, and main entrances to the townhouses on the presentation slides. He stated there is a split between pedestrian access and vehicular access to the units.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the parking area adjacent to the waterfront park is for small watercraft access to the graving dock. Mr. Burton stated it could be for watercraft access or for members of the public who visit the green space. It is not meant to be a parking area for residents, but is meant for public access to the waterfront park and the graving dock activity areas.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there is any portion of the residential podium buildings facing the water where nonresidential activities would be anticipated or if the buildings from the ground up are intended to be residential. Mr. Burton pointed to buildings in the linear purple section on the presentation slides and stated they have ground floor areas meant for maritime and commercial use. He stated those are the only sections that have uses that are not residential. He pointed out a pedestrian access location through the middle of a building that lines up with the street for better access to the waterfront.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the existing ship maintenance facility is vacant. Mr. Burton stated the original boatyard operations do not exist today but the Master Plan will include a future boat repair use.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if the intent is for flexibility in the range of activities that will be planned within the purple area on the presentation slides. Mr. Burton stated that is the intent. He stated sailmakers, marine electricians, and rigging companies will be set up in this yard space or on the water side of the boatyard. Instead of one large boatyard, the intent is to have

multiple craftsmen who can continue their business or bring new businesses to the commercial core with a maritime focus to adaptively reutilize the historic buildings and repurpose other buildings on the waterfront.

Ms. Alschuler asked what is working about the working waterfront and if there is a goal for the amount of maritime uses that will be included. Mr. Burton referred to Slide 21, the Maritime and Commercial Core. He stated the dry boat storage area is an important component within the Master Plan and the boatyard is part of that working waterfront. There is a 530-slip marina and active users, primarily racers, want to keep their boats on land. On the western portion of the site with connectivity to the Grand Street Launch, access will be provided for as many as 60 boats, primarily sailboats. One of the important components of the dry boat storage area is the boat hoist that lifts boats in and out of the water. The hoists are there today. With the new seawall, a new hoist would be built to accommodate those users. The activity of those boaters/racers utilizing the new hoist adjacent to the Bay Trail is something the project proponents would specifically like comment on.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the boatyard will be fenced off from the Bay Trail. Mr. Burton asked Paul Houtz to discuss how the space is envisioned to be programmed and secured.

Paul Houtz, Harbormaster, Alameda Marina, pointed to features of the dry boat storage area on the presentation slides. He stated all security gates will be closed after hours. During the day, the gates will be open.

Mr. Burton added that the Bay Trail will not be fenced off because a certain amount of space is required to move the boats in and out of storage, and the Bay Trail is outside the boatyard fenced area.

Ms. McCann asked how the Bay Trail will connect to the Grant Street Launch. Mr. Burton stated it goes straight through. The plan is to obtain a right-of-way through there. The purpose of the fence around the dry storage area is to keep the public launch area open to the public 24 hours a day. The Grant Street sidewalk is five to six feet wide following the proposed project line. The Bay Trail will connect to that sidewalk.

Mr. Burton displayed a presentation slide and asked Mr. Houtz to discuss how the working waterfront will evolve into the flexible space that is inherent in the program of the proposed project. Mr. Houtz pointed out buildings to be refurbished and other features on the presentation slide. He stated there is an optional building in the plans to provide storage flexibility and plans to use the spaces between the docks to bring more services into the area.

Ms. Alschuler asked for more details on the Bay Trail around Building 19. Mr. Burton referred to Slide 10, the Public Access Plan. He stated it is a 16-foot-wide section that is shown behind the existing Building 19.

Ms. McCann asked if Building 19 is one of the amenity buildings. Mr. Burton stated it is currently a two-story wood building that sits on piles and is envisioned as part of the commercial maritime core. He stated the need for amenities for the marina itself for both public access and other ancillary public benefit areas. There is an existing building further to the western edge that is envisioned as a public restaurant to service the new neighborhood and marina. All public benefit spaces have yet to be identified.

Ms. McCann asked Mr. Burton to trace the path an individual with a boat moored in the marina would take driving in, unloading, and parking, and asked if there are wheeled trailers available to get to the amenity building or storage facility. Mr. Burton stated there are two main parking areas. Mr. Houtz stated the location has not yet been designed but he estimated the path of travel and parking while pointing out locations on the presentation slides. The parking area for the working waterfront overlaps with boater parking. A mule will be provided to help move the boats and wheeled carts will be provided to help move gear down to the docks and into the boats. Security gates will be provided along the waterfront.

Ms. McCann asked if a harbormaster's office and clubhouse will be included in the design. Mr. Houtz stated a clubhouse or recreation center and more boat storage will be part of the design, as well as a raised harbormaster's office so the harbormaster can see everything.

Questions About Other Uses:

Ms. Alschuler asked about public access amenities and views along the shoreline band. Mr. Burton referred to Slide 9, the Public Access Plan, and discussed Sections A through G, which were detailed in Slides 11 through 14.

d. **Section A, Bay Trail Connector, is near the launch facility and dry boat storage areas.** A gangway and new seawall will be in this location with a fill zone, fence, and Bay Trail that connects back to the launch facility and to the building, which will be the harbormaster building. The dry boat storage area will be fenced and will have a parking area beyond. The Bay Trail runs in front of the dry boat storage area beginning at 5 feet wide and will be 16 feet wide all the way to Section B.

e. **Section B, Maritime Plaza, varies.** The topography of the seawall moves a little bit to the eastern exposure, but the Bay Trail continues with the 16-foot width. The fill line will be raised to deal with Building 19, which is lower.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the white dashed line on the presentation slides. Mr. Burton stated it depicts the existing grade. He stated there is more engineering to do on the area.

f. **Section D, Wharf Promenade.** Ms. Alschuler asked about the residential building, whether the residential entryways face the waterfront, and if the parking structure is for the building. Mr. Burton stated it is a wrap building with a central parking structure that is

lined with apartments. There is a corridor system within the apartment building for access. Balconies and windows will face the waterfront with a landscape buffer but the units will not be entered from that side.

Ms. Alschuler asked about public access amenities and views along the shoreline band at the existing wharf location. Mr. Burton stated the current emergency vehicle access (EVA) road will be unified to be more of a pedestrian promenade experience that will be EVA-accessible.

Ms. Alschuler asked how many units face the wharf. Mr. Burton stated the ground floors of the residential buildings are for nonresidential uses. Ground floor units will not be exposed to parking or blank walls but will have open windows and balconies.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the townhouses. Mr. Burton stated the front doors for the end townhouse unit would face the street. Each townhouse unit gets its own private garage, which is accessible from the alleys.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the units by the dry boat storage area. Mr. Burton stated alleys go between each pair of buildings for access to the garages. The only place where garages are seen is in the small alley space.

Ms. Alschuler asked how many units are in each building. Mr. Burton stated from four to six units are in each building depending on the size of the building.

Questions About Water Activity

Ms. Alschuler asked what the members of the public who do not own a boat can do at the marina. Mr. Burton stated the graving dock is a teaching center with a nonmotorized watercraft launch and rental facilities.

Ms. McCann asked if swimming is allowed at the graving dock. Mr. Burton stated the graving dock is an area for teaching kayaking and boating activities. Swimming is not prohibited at this early stage but that may change as the project progresses.

Ms. Alschuler asked if any changes have been made to the Bay Trail within the project area. Mr. Burton stated the Bay Trail edge will be maintained and preserved but the design will not change the trail substantially.

Ms. Barton asked about the potential water taxi listed in the legend but not in Slide 10, the Public Access Plan. Mr. Burton stated the property is close to the Park Street Bridge. Prevailing winds and calm waters make the marina popular with sailors. A water taxi location within the marina would serve other modes of transportation as Clement Avenue is revitalized.

Ms. McCann asked about the pedestrian entries into the buildings along Clement Avenue. Mr. Burton stated the buildings have yet to be designed. He pointed out anticipated features on the presentation slides, such as main entry lobbies and articulated ends with visual interest.

Ms. Alschuler stated the drawings suggest a pier that goes out to an additional marina at the end of Harbor View Park. Mr. Burton stated it is taking the existing head-in marina and pushing it out. There is a fairly significant grade change at Section F because of the existing condition plus added sea level rise to the elevation of the floating marina. The plan is to push that stretch of 21 boat slips further out for better access.

g. **Public Hearing.** Seven members of the public provided the following comments:

Ms. Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Sandra Threlfall, Waterfront Action. Waterfront Action was concerned about the encroachment of the development into the 100-foot jurisdictional line, which could reduce public access to the shore, particularly in the southeast section, and that the Bay Trail ends too soon and should lead up to the military site in preparation for changes in the future.

Ms. Gaffney read the written comments submitted by Ben Botkin, Planner, San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail, as follows:

(1) **Facilities.** If there is a small craft put in, it should be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible with a low-float dock.

(2) **Paddleboards.** Consider putting in grab bars.

(3) **Gangways.** It is unclear how access for the shoreline will be provided down to the docks. Recommend that the gangway to the docks not include any 180-degree turns because it makes it difficult to carry boats down the gangway.

(4) **Short-term boat storage.** Consider short-term boat storage for day users and visitors. This would be a great destination and a short paddle from Grand Avenue or the Jack London Square Tidewater Boating Center.

(5) **Harbor View Park.** Provide long-term storage within the private areas near the dock. This will be a great asset for future residents.

(6) **Concessions.** Provide rentals as an important and practical way for individuals to access the water.

(7) **Parking Lot**

(a) Include at least two short-term loading/unloading spaces close to Building D to allow individuals to drop off their equipment.

(b) Consider adding a designated kayak laydown area in the parking lot loading/unloading area.

(c) Length of public parking should be at least four hours long to allow for sufficient time for paddlers to be in the water.

(d) Path of travel between the parking area, the loading zone, and the dock should be clearly marked and sufficiently wide for individuals to carry kayaks and not obstruct movement along the Bay Trail.

Dorothy Freeman, Save Alameda's Working Waterfront (SAWW), spoke in opposition to the proposed project. She stated she submitted her full comment to staff. She stated Svendsen's Boatyard provided service to not just Alameda's boating community, but for the boating needs of the Greater Bay Area for many decades. The proposed project has pushed Svendsen's out of the Alameda Marina and Alameda no longer has local services for sailboats and houseboats. The loss of the last boating services within Alameda has put the boating community in jeopardy. Many boats are leaving Alameda to berth in other places. The working boatyard space is not near enough to maintain a viable boatyard.

Ms. Alschuler asked what services Ms. Freeman was looking for. Ms. Freeman stated there has been an elevator that lifts houseboats out of the water for repair.

Peter Brand, Alameda resident, stated the developers are aware of what is important to the Board and are trying to push those buttons, and they are doing it but in much too small a way. He referred to Slide 6, the Area Vicinity Map, and stated the first thing to notice is the slide depicts the existing view. He pointed out that one of the items in the legend was buildings to be demolished and stated most of the existing 37 buildings will be demolished. He stated the project site is an existing working waterfront and recreational boating community. Slide 6 shows how much change this project will bring.

Mr. Brand stated the project proposes a five- to sixteen-foot Bay Trail. He stated the Board asked good questions about how the public will feel walking along the five-foot sections.

Mr. Brand stated 305 dry boat spaces are currently occupied with 60 proposed in the plan. He asked what this message is sending for the future. The only major boatyard south of the Bay Bridge will be shrunk to a fraction of what it is now.

Mr. Brand referred to Slide 7, the Site Plan, and stated the red dashed line is the shoreline band. He pointed out the housing that is in the shoreline band and how close it comes to the Bay Trail. He stated it will overwhelm the users of the Bay Trail. The Bay shoreline policy says all Bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay. It also says it should create a sense of place and should be designed in a manner that feels public. He stated the Bay Trail is the front yards or out the windows of 2,000 residents looking down on the public.

Mr. Brand stated experts say the proposed boatyard area is a fraction of what it is now and a fraction of what experts say they need. If they were going to put their businesses in that boatyard area, they need twice the space, a lift, and more access to the waterfront than is provided in the proposed plan.

Mr. Brand suggested that the housing be set further back instead of hovering over the public user, a wider sense of the 100-foot shoreline band, a larger boatyard, and more land storage for dry boats.

Nancy Hird, SAWW, Alameda resident, stated there is still a long way to go in the development of this project. One of the things the developer keeps saying is that there is 250,000 square feet of commercial space but what is not said very often is that they plan to put two to four stories in Building 19, if feasible. It may not be feasible for a number of reasons. Adding multiple stories will ruin the integrity of the building and it will lose its eligibility for national and state registries of historic places. She asked how the developer will find 250,000 square feet of commercial space without Building 19. This is important to maritime history and the maritime businesses that currently work throughout the whole space. Squeezing businesses into one small space is a concern.

Ms. Hird stated she also had concerns about the parking. She stated it sounds good to say the parking will be used by the commercial core during the day and the residents at night, but the reality is that she has tried to do business there on a Monday morning and cannot find parking with the current larger number of parking spaces. She stated it is not only the residents and boaters who will be using the parking but individuals using the water taxi. Also, the parking area is a long distance from the waterfront for boaters to walk while carrying their gear and weekend supplies.

Ms. Hird stated she also had concerns about the phasing. When the work will be done on the shoreline is not specific. She stated she would not like to see the city lose the promise of the new bulkhead being finalized because the developer is busy building the housing. The project site is going from a commercial area to a housing development and it seems that maritime issues take a back seat to the housing.

Lee Huo, Bay Trail Planner, San Francisco Bay Trail, asked that the Board and project representatives think about engaging and embracing three general concepts when designing and implementing the San Francisco Bay Trail:

(8) What is the appropriate width for the capacity of individuals that will be utilizing this trail once the project is implemented and also once the Bay Trail system is completed?

(9) What are the crossings with the Bay Trail? Can individuals navigate the Bay Trail freely without creating safety issues? It is important for the design to prevent conflicts along the trail.

Mr. Huo stated he had concerns with the new boat hoist because of the activity that can be involved in moving it from point A to point B.

(10) Is the Bay Trail located near the Bay shoreline so individuals can experience the San Francisco Bay?

Mr. Huo stated the Bay Trail is currently designed 70 to 90 feet away from the shoreline at the Harbor View Park area. He suggested that it be moved closer to the Bay. There is another, narrower pedestrian path that is proposed near the shoreline in the current design, but the Bay Trail is on the landward side of the park.

Mr. Huo asked that the Bay Trail be implemented all the way to the edge of the Naval yard along with the interim connection to Clement Avenue.

Joanne Martin, Alameda Marina resident, stated she lives and works at the Alameda Marina. She spoke in support of the proposed project. The buildings at the marina are aging and need renovating. She stated it is good that there was an extensive architectural study done and that the project will keep some of the historic buildings. She stated her only concern was preserving Clement Avenue as a trucking route so business and boats at the marina can continue being trailered up and down in the future. She stated the project design is a great way to restore the shoreline.

Ms. Alschuler asked for clarification on items that came up during public comment:

Ms. Alschuler asked if the project site is publicly accessible on the eastern side. Mr. Burton stated it would be. There is a wide band there.

Mr. Smith stated there is a four-foot area down by the rail, an eight-foot area up above, and sixteen feet on the left side. The idea is to include a variety of different walkway systems knitted throughout the development.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the 37 buildings onsite are currently in use. Mr. Burton stated the buildings have a variety of uses; some are for storage and others are vacant. Building 19, which has a 30,000-foot footprint is vacant. The storage-type use will not be part of the Master Plan.

h. **Board Discussion.** The Board responded to big-picture items as well as to the questions from the staff report as follows:

Big Picture Items:

(1) Within the 100-foot shoreline band, there are fairly long stretches of unbroken residential space, the commercial core, and a large parking zone. Are there suggestions for punctuating it? What is the point of view on this amount of residential space?

Mr. Pellegrini stated it is hard to measure the future potential for working waterfront activities. He pointed out that most of this area has already been zoned mixed-use, which does not provide any intent to preserve working waterfront activities. The ideas about preserving, extending, or expanding working waterfront uses beyond what is shown in the application are not the intention of the city of Alameda to perpetuate.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he does have concerns, particularly about areas within the 100-foot shoreline band, of giving them a way to low or moderate density residential uses. This is a prominent, large, contiguous site and it seems to be a missed opportunity to assume that the highest level of public access possible is the Bay Trail configuration that is backed by two- to three-story residential buildings.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he struggles with that. He is looking for something more public, whether that is the frontage or the way the ground floors are treated, or the extension that is a potential mixed-use zone that would go east-west. He stated the Board needs to think about the residential community's strong public face to the Bay Trail. He stated he could not imagine this kind of intense activity with traditional residential townhouses behind it. There is a mismatch, which is hidden by trees on the slide. He stated he is struggling to resolve the nature of the public access and the intensity and nature of the uses behind.

Ms. Alschuler stated the 100-foot shoreline band is important. Over the years it has been easier for projects to put nothing within that band. The Board has tried to make the 100-foot band a place of activity that invites the public to the water and the Bay Trail. She asked if it was possible, without losing the economic value of housing on the site, to make improvements for public spaces, move the density, and include amenities that bring the public to the location, especially on the eastern side of the site.

Ms. McCann stated introducing a large park is not necessary because the working waterfront is an incredible amenity. The graving dock is an amazing resource and a fascinating, historic element. She stated it has a strong working waterfront core, which is exciting, but she suggested another node or other places, such as at the end of the graving dock where there was an east-west axis between Building 19 and other amenity buildings, coming through with a commercial use that would begin to tie it together.

(2) Should the visitor parking be closer to the shoreline or could some of the public parking be moved further back?

(3) What is the point of view on the width and position of the Bay Trail?

(4) How can the interface along Clement Avenue be as friendly as possible? Can it be enhanced even though it is a truck route?

Ms. Alschuler added another big picture item:

(5) Water recreation and public access to use the water.

Questions from the Staff Report/Physical and Visual Access:

(6) Is the proposed public access, in terms of area and the amenities provided, sufficient to accommodate the expected level of use from new residents, employees, and visitors to this segment of the shoreline?

Mr. Pellegrini stated the site is connected to the city of Alameda by Grant Street, the primary vehicle and bicycle access to the site. Willow and Chestnut Streets are also important connectors. It is interesting that the hierarchy of the site is not organized around those notable points of entry.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the spaces around the maritime center and the hardscape environment with boats pulling in and out are exciting, and people will be arriving to access businesses and for public activities. The way it is currently designed is the primary entry point for individuals on the western half of the project. He suggested those details be more developed to create a more engaging space that is not available there today while keeping its maritime toughness.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there is an intention to restrict uses and if there is a commitment to keep the commercial area maritime-focused.

(7) Does the design of the public space take advantage of the Bay setting, and does it provide for adequate opportunities to get close to and experience the water?

(8) Does the design include the appropriate sort of amenities for the public at this location, and will it feel inviting to the public?

Ms. McCann stated the U-shape of townhouses and buildings is quiet and privatized. She suggested getting more activity there.

Ms. McCann asked about the best uses to adjoin Chestnut Street, which is limited to emergency vehicles currently, such as housing, ground floor, working waterfront, or commercial uses with housing above. She suggested amenities for the 2,000 residents, such as a neighborhood grocery.

(9) Does the design create clear delineations between public areas and private development? Are there areas of potential conflict between these uses, and if so, how could they be resolved?

Ms. McCann suggested including some sense that the working waterfront is pervasive throughout the entire site rather than the residential neighborhood area and the working waterfront area being unmixed.

(10) Is there adequate and appropriately sited public parking provided for the public amenities at the site?

Ms. McCann stated she understood the importance of being able to walk from the parking lot to the marina, but she asked if it could be more creative with the housing at the western end of the site. She suggested more variety instead of a strip of parking and a strip of housing. Parking along the western edge would be fine.

Ms. Alschuler suggested gathering places and further connections on the eastern side of the project and moving the parking for a broader experience through the 100-foot band.

(11) Will adequate public access areas be provided with each phase of development?

Ms. McCann asked for more detail on the phasing of the project.

(12) No details have yet been provided about site furnishings, signage, planting, or lighting. Does the Board have advice on these amenities?

(13) No details have yet been provided on management and maintenance. Does the Board have advice on these topics?

Sense of Place and Historical Interpretation:

(14) Does the design take advantage of the unique historical features in its design, or are there additional opportunities to enhance the public's understanding of the site and its relationship to the Bay?

Ms. Barton stated she hoped to keep the grittiness of the working waterfront instead of something too tidy and commercial. She suggested extending it east and west from the maritime area. She suggested holding the edge and not introducing riprap or revetments of other kinds - the seawall edge adds to and supports the character. A large part of the project will be lost without that character.

Ms. McCann stated retaining the historic character of this working waterfront has to do with materiality of everything, including the site furnishings, which are yet to be designed.

Ms. Barton suggested, instead of the term "historic interpretation," it should be "rehabilitation for new use." The historic aspects should be as authentic as the site is now where possible by retaining the sense of grittiness and including materials similar to what is there now and not glorifying it.

Ms. McCann stated she liked that the proposal does not propose changing the existing shoreline but maintains its authenticity. She stated she also liked the retention of the graving dock and the preservation of some buildings, but she particularly liked that the shoreline has a lot of differentiations; the point of view is constantly changing, turning a corner, and moving along. That makes for an interesting experience for users of the Bay Trail and makes it special.

Circulation:

(15) Does the proposed project provide clear connections for all users to the Bay from Clement Avenue, and otherwise maximize the opportunities for the public to access and view the Bay?

Ms. McCann stated she liked that there are additional connection points built in. That does a lot to increase the permeability of the plan. She suggested that the next presentation show how the design will encourage the public to come into the site from Clement Avenue so it does not look like a private residential community.

Ms. Alschuler stated the sections show that a bicycle track will connect at Clement Avenue. Mr. Burton stated the bicycle track is intended to connect at Clement Avenue and, just off the presentation slide, connect to the new Jean Sweeney Open Space Park, which has a bicycle trail running through it that is currently being built. The bicycle track will connect to Atlantic Avenue, Ralph Appezato Parkway, Alameda Point, and Seaplane Lagoon.

(16) Does the design minimize the potential for conflicts among pedestrians and cyclists within the shoreline open space area?

Ms. Barton stated the hoist needs more space.

Ms. McCann asked to see greater detail in the hoist area.

(17) Is the Bay Trail, which ranges from 5 to 16 feet in width, designed to adequately provide for the anticipated level of demand at this location, and does it follow the best possible route through the project site?

Ms. McCann asked if the Bay Trail at the hoist area is the location that is five feet wide. Mr. Burton stated from the harbor master's building to the western edge is five feet wide. The Bay Trail for the balance of the property is sixteen feet wide.

Ms. McCann stated that will be a choke point. Boaters hoisting their yachts out of the water will block traffic.

Ms. Alschuler agreed and stated it is the welcome point to the project but it does not feel welcoming at the narrow area.

Ms. McCann suggested doing something with the seawall.

Ms. Barton agreed and suggested taking the seawall out into the water rather than reducing the dry boat storage. The Bay Trail should be brought to the water's edge as much as possible. She also asked if the Bay Trail could wrap around the eastern edge of the graving dock. She asked that the Bay Trail plan for continuation at the property line for a future connection.

Sea Level Rise:

(18) What are the potential adverse effects to the proposed public access improvements from anticipated sea level rise, and what are appropriate design responses to achieve resiliency to, or adapt to, these conditions?

Ms. Alschuler asked for information about the plan for when sea level rise is greater than 36 inches.

Ms. Pellegrini stated the long-term flood strategy would be to add infrastructure to the edge that would stop water incursion. He stated it would be helpful to understand how that would be funded in the plan. It would also be helpful to understand how the proposed ground floor of the buildings will be related to the BFE. If the residential buildings are at that level, it is better to raise them now. It is a challenge because the area historically was in the water. The question about how much to raise the area is an issue.

Ms. McCann asked if the site is being kept for the quality of soils underneath. Mr. Burton stated it would be remediated based upon the residential and commercial uses. There are heavy leads because of the prior boatyard activities. It is all remediated, not capped.

Ms. McCann asked about the original shoreline versus the fill for the war effort. Mr. Burton stated the shoreline band on the eastern edge is all fill. Earlier plans showed density at the eastern edge bracketing around the graving dock but the bearing pressure and pile depths increased the cost of construction on that side.

i. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Burton responded positively to the Board's discussion and suggestions. He stated the design team will take the Board's comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design.

Mr. Burton responded to Mr. Huo's question of why the Bay Trail is inland at Harbor View Park area. He stated it is a relic of the past. He stated the project team has been working with the city of Alameda to move the Bay Trail closer to the shoreline. The challenge has been one of staffing more than anything. The city of Alameda wants to go through the process of creating a bicycle plan before they officially ask for a realignment of the Bay Trail. The process is ongoing.

j. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board made the following summary and conclusions:

(1) Include a way to connect the gritty nature and maritime focus all the way to the eastern edge in some way.

(2) Move the Bay Trail closer to the water.

(3) The ideas for the grading dock are wonderful.

(4) A water taxi is a great idea, but the location may need to change for better public access.

(5) The responsibility of the development is to show how the public will feel invited to enter into the site unlike the wall that is currently there.

(6) Include learning about the services planned for the site at the next presentation.

(7) Include city of Alameda participation at the next presentation.

Mr. Burton stated the design team has been working with the city of Alameda staff and assured they will be in attendance at the next presentation.

The Board requested to see this project again.

5. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with no corrections at the
Design Review Board Meeting of April 9, 2018.