

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

September 26, 2013

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; lgoldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of August 5, 2013 BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** The Design Review Board's Chair, John Kriken, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:35 p.m. Other Design Review Board members in attendance included Karen Alschuler, Stefan Pellegrini and Gary Strang. BCDC staff in attendance included Brad McCrea, Bob Batha and Michelle Burt Levenson.

2. **Approval of Draft Minutes for June 10, 2013 Meeting.** The Board approved these minutes with some minor corrections and additions submitted by John Kriken.

3. **Cardinal Point II, 2400 Mariner Square Drive, City and County of Alameda (First Review)**
The Board conducted their first review of a proposal by Oakmont Senior Living to construct a 42,000-square-foot assisted living facility with 52 living units, associated dining areas, kitchens, a café, entertainment and activity rooms, and administrative offices. The proposal includes reconstructing the existing public access pathway with a new, wider pathway, installing new landscaping and constructing a 448-square-foot overlook.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Michelle Burt Levenson introduced the project and the issues identified in the staff report. Brad McCrea provided an overview of the urban fabric in the project vicinity, and identified existing and proposed public access in the general area.

b. **Project Presentation.** Bill Mabry, Director of Cardinal Point I, introduced the project design team and provided a project overview, including a description of current uses (e.g., vacant building) on and adjacent to the site. Mr. Mabry described how the proposed facility would be focused on Alzheimer care and while it would be affiliated with the senior-living facility located across Mariner Square Drive from the project site (e.g., Cardinal Point I), it would be operated independently from that facility. Mr. Mabry described how the project proponents have been working with staff to relocate the proposed building away from the Bay's edge and to determine which trees to remove in order to open views to the Bay from the site. Mr. Mabry stated that with the proposed project, 48 percent of the site would be dedicated for public access. The project design team described the planting (e.g., mostly native plant species along the Bay and ornamental species closer to the proposed building) and the elevations of the site with respect to sea level rise projections.



Making San Francisco Bay Better

DRB MINUTES
August 5, 2013

c. **Reviewer Questions.** The Board members asked the following questions:

(1) Ms. Alschuler asked whether any Bay fill or access to the boats in the neighboring marina were proposed with the project. Ms. Levenson replied that neither fill nor access to the boats was proposed.

(2) Mr. Strang asked about the location and extent of fencing proposed. The project proponent stated that three types of fencing were proposed: a wooden fence (around the building), a partial stone and railing fence, and an all-railing fence.

(3) Mr. Kriken asked about the adjacent docks and how the docks were managed. The proponent stated that two marinas exist adjacent to the site: the Barnhill Marina to the south and John Berry's marina directly bayward and to the north. Mr. Kriken requested details about the finished floor height of the building and whether the building had been designed to account for sea level rise. The proponent responded that the finished floor height had been established given sea level rise projections into 2050. Further discussion ensued regarding sea level rise and the project. Mr. Batha reiterated that the Bay Plan policies on Sea Level Rise pertain to the public access portion of the project only. Mr. Batha stated that the permit issued for the project would contain requirements that the permittee maintain the public access associated with the project for the life of the project.

(4) Mr. Pelligrini inquired of the trail lighting proposed with the project and the remnant foundation on the adjacent site. The proponent stated that new, low bollard lighting would replace the existing lighting and that the remnant foundation was a former restaurant that had succumbed to a fire.

d. **Board Discussion.** The staff stated that a letter had been submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Bay Trail regarding the project. In particular, the letter states that the project would reconstruct a portion of the Bay Trail through the site and while the Bay Trail supports public access improvements along this portion of the Alameda shoreline, it was concerned that the proposed path dimensions were not adequate given the long-term vision and anticipated use of the trail. Discussion ensued regarding the letter. The proponent stated that it has been working closely with the City of Alameda regarding the project and associated public access, and that it was unclear whether the Bay Trail extended through the site. Mr. Kriken stated that it was difficult to advise on the dimensions for the pathway knowing that the City of Alameda is also in the process of reviewing the design for the path. Mr. Kriken stated that he believed that 8 feet was an adequate width if there were alternative routes for bikes in the area. Mr. Kriken commented on the unique and pleasant views to the Bay from the site. Mr. Kriken suggested that a more "nautical" theme be applied to the proposed railing and fencing.

Mr. Strang asked whether a railing was needed along the overlook and the northern perimeter of the site. Mr. Strang stated that the use of railings at the site should be reduced and minimized in height as much as possible.

Ms. Alschuler stressed the importance of public access in the area and the need to provide access to boats. Ms. Alschuler stated that she believed that public access to the Alameda shoreline will only increase over time. She stated that a 12-foot-wide path should be implemented at the site due to the anticipated type of uses (e.g., bikes, pedestrians), non-ambulatory uses (e.g., wheelchairs, walkers) and the sheer increase in use over time. She stated that safety and security along the public access pathway was important and that a wider path was needed.

Mr. Pelligrini inquired as to the opportunity for passing areas along the public access path.

Mr. Kriken pressed for alternate bike access and stated that bicycle use should be directed off of the site.

Mr. Strang commented on whether there would be requirements for the adjacent abandoned parcel in the permit for the project. Mr. McCrea stated that the permit issued for the project would contain requirements requiring the permittee to make the public access on the subject site available to a future public access connection with the adjacent site.

Mr. Kriken suggested that a permeable surface be installed adjacent to the proposed path to provide an increase in path width.

Mr. Strang asked whether the overlook could be simplified and widened by removing an existing tree thereby providing more space along the trail for the anticipated uses.

Ms. Alschuler stated that the public access should be designed for resiliency in response to future sea level rise.

e. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Mabry stated that he would continue to work with staff and the City of Alameda regarding the Bay Trail requirements for the site.

f. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board concluded its review with the following comments:

(1) The proponent should continue to work on the dimension and shape of the pathway and observation platform to accommodate the anticipated public access use at the site.

(2) The railing should be minimized and reduced in height as much as feasible.

(3) Bicyclists should be encouraged along a different route rather than through the site.

(4) The public access should be designed for resiliency in response to future sea level rise.

(5) The path design should continue to be explored and designed to account for future public access connections

(6) Another review of the project was determined not to be necessary.

4. **Adjournment.** Mr. Kriken adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ELLEN MIRAMONTES
Bay Design Analyst