

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

July 26, 2013

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst [415/352-3643; ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov]
Michelle Burt Levenson, Permit Analyst [415/352-3618; michellel@bcdc.ca.gov]

SUBJECT: Cardinal Point II, Senior Housing Facility, 2400 Mariner Square Drive, City and County of Alameda (for Board consideration on August 5, 2013)

Project Summary

Project Applicant: Oakmont Senior Living, LLC

Project Representatives: William Mabry, Oakmont Senior Living, LLC, David Moyer, Oakmont Senior Living, LLC, Pete Wurtz, Landesign Group, and Tom Jones, Brelje & Race.

Project Site. The proposed project site is located at 2400 Mariner Square Drive, in the City and County of Alameda (Exhibits 1, 2-2 and 3-3). The 40,027-square-foot site currently contains a vacant restaurant structure and parking lot, as well as a public access path and landscaping that was required under the BCDC permit previously issued for the restaurant (see photos on Exhibit 4-4). The shoreline at the site is approximately 253 feet long and slopes gradually to the Bay. The site is bordered by the Bay to the east, the Cardinal Point I Senior Housing facility to the west, the Barnhill Marina to the south, and the Mariner Square Waterfront Esplanade and a marina to the north (Exhibit 3-3).

Proposed Project and Public Access. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing restaurant and parking lot, and construct a three-story, 42,000-square-foot assisted living facility for seniors. The building would contain 52 assisted living units as well as dining rooms and associated kitchens, a café, entertainment and activity rooms, administrative offices and other associated amenities. While the development would be associated with the neighboring Cardinal Point I facility to the west, the proposed Cardinal Point II facility would function and operate independently. At its tallest point, the building would be approximately 35 feet. (Exhibits 5, 6 and 16)

The project would include reconstructing the existing public access area by installing a new, 243-foot-long, 8-foot-wide pathway paralleling the Bay that would connect with an existing pathway to the southeast and a sidewalk to the west. New landscaping is proposed within the 19,052-square-foot public access area and a 448-square-foot overlook would be installed along the Bay shoreline. The distance from the top of bank to the edge of the building would range from approximately 37 to 48 feet (Exhibits 7 and 17).



Making San Francisco Bay Better

Bay Plan Policies. The *San Francisco Bay Plan's* policies on Public Access state that “in addition to the public access to the Bay provided by waterfront parks, beaches, marinas, and fishing piers, maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline, whether it be for housing, industry...”. The policies also state that the *Public Access Design Guidelines* should be used as a guide for siting and designing public access consistent with a proposed project. These guidelines state that the public access improvements should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline. The *San Francisco Bay Plan's* policies on Appearance, Design and Scenic Views further state that “all bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay” and that “maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas, from the Bay itself, and from the opposite shore.”

Board Advice. The Board’s advice is sought on the following three issues:

1. **Does the project provide adequate, usable and attractive public access?** The Board should advise on whether the size and configuration of the proposed public access is adequate, given the size of the proposed building, the proposed use (senior housing), and the existing shoreline access to the north and south. The Board should also advise on whether the proposed public access amenities, such as seating, trash receptacles, and landscaping are sufficient and appropriate for the anticipated use.
2. **Are the connections to the proposed public access adequate to lead the public to and along the shoreline?** The Board’s view is sought on whether the access is sufficiently wide, inviting, and interesting given the nature of the site. The Board should advise on whether the proposed public access provides a clear and continuous connection with neighboring public access.
3. **Is the separation between the private outdoor spaces and the public access areas appropriately designed to create a sense of comfort for all users?** The Board should advise on whether the public would feel welcome and comfortable in the proposed public access areas.