

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 September 12, 2016 BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Karen Alschuler called the meeting to order at the Milton Marks Conference Center – San Diego Room, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, at 5:33 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Cheryl Barton, Tom Leader, Jacinta McCann, Stefan Pellegrini, Michael Smiley, and Gary Strang. BCDC staff in attendance included Erik Buehmann, Tinya Hoang, Brad McCrea, and Jaime Michaels. Also in attendance were Cynthia Battenberg (City of San Leandro), Scott Cooper (Cal Coast Companies LLC), David Gates (Gates and Associates), Jacob Petersen (Petersen Studio), and Benedict Tranel (Gensler).

a. **Housekeeping Items.** Jaime Michaels, BCDC Chief of Permits, reviewed the following items:

(1) The Bay Design Analyst position will soon be filled. Staff will keep Board members posted.

(2) The applicants for the proposed hotel at Harbor Bay Island in Alameda will return to the Board for further review and input in upcoming months.

(3) The Commission will hear two projects at Thursday's meeting – the Treasure Island Development project and the pedestrian/bicycle lane project on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge.

(4) The next Board meeting will be on Monday, October 17, 2016.

2. **Approval of Draft Minutes for July 11, 2016, Design Review Board Meeting.** Ms. Barton asked to strike the first sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 3.

MOTION: Ms. McCann moved to approve the Draft Minutes for the July 11, 2016, Design Review Board Meeting as revised. Mr. Leader seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

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



3. **Burlingame Point, City of Burlingame, San Mateo County; BCDC Permit No.**

2013.001.01. The Design Review Board will review a revised proposal to construct a campus with six buildings, a realigned road, publicly-accessible shoreline areas, shoreline protection improvements, and a bicycle/pedestrian path bridge, at an approximately 20-acre site, located at 300-333 Airport Boulevard in the city of Burlingame, San Mateo County. The activities proposed include construction of the public access areas, sections of outdoor dining areas, a portion of the realigned roadway, and the shoreline protection.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Erik Buehmann, the BCDC Principal Permit Analyst, introduced the project and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including the adequacy and scale of public access, the compatibility of public and private uses, and the appropriateness of the choice of paving and plantings.

b. **Project Presentation.** Benedict Tranel, a Principal at Gensler, the architect for the project, presented a brief overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the vicinity, site plan, structures kept and changes made to the previously-approved plan, shoreline access and circulation, public access and open spaces connecting to the Bay Trail and the water's edge, pedestrian promenade, and the new pedestrian bridge of the Burlingame Point project. He stated one of the great opportunities of the site is that it fronts the Bay and is close to Coyote Point. He noted that the surface asphalt was reduced by approximately 25 percent in the new design.

Jacob Petersen, founder and principal at Petersen Studio, the landscape architect for the project, continued the slide presentation by detailing the 100-foot setback areas within BCDC jurisdiction, the range of amenities and experiences on the east and west shoreline, and the differences in character that were intentionally created within the shoreline edges.

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

Mr. Leader asked about the daylighting of the parking garage on the east and west side. Mr. Tranel stated the previously-approved design hinted at potential daylight access and ventilation into the garage. The updated design is a fully naturally-ventilated garage with fans to move the air so it does not feel like it is underground, with natural daylighting along the edges. The eastern and western open edges allow airflow to pass through, which is an energy-saving strategy.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the flow-through planters. Mr. Petersen stated they help meet the requirement to treat stormwater. Mr. Tranel stated 100 percent of the stormwater runoff at the site is treated.

Mr. Smiley asked about the surface parking areas and if there is an idea for a future phase on that parking. Mr. Tranel stated the surface parking is convenience parking near the building to primarily be used by visitors. There is no future phase planned.

Mr. Smiley asked if the applicant controls the adjacent parcel to the north. Mr. Tranel stated that parcel, known as 350 Airport Boulevard, is not controlled by the applicant. There was a previous study to put two office buildings side-by-side on the parcel.

Mr. Strang asked if the stormwater treatment requires pumping out. Mr. Petersen stated pumping will be required in the underground garage.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there is an entity in place to ensure weekend events at the site. Mr. Tranel stated the client entity is Genzon, which is forming a project management group to run this. For example, the event lawn is an area that can be rented out. Mr. Petersen stated that sort of facility can be popular because there are not many open spaces on the waterfront to set up an event with panoramic views of the San Francisco Bay.

Mr. Smiley asked why Airport Boulevard curves through the site. Mr. Tranel stated the previously-approved project had an S-shaped curve through it; this was kept in the current design to maintain the project momentum.

Mr. Pellegrini asked how the Bay Trail transitions off the site to the southeast. Mr. Petersen stated it is widened through the project and then transitions to the existing sidewalk condition that is there today.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there is potential to extend the walking path southward on the western side along the channel. Mr. Petersen stated there is an existing cow trail along the waterfront that crosses private property. The project provides access to that southern edge but will require a contiguous improvement to connect it to the pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the width between the buildings in the central plaza area and the height of the buildings. Mr. Petersen stated it is 105 feet between the buildings. The buildings vary in height from five to eight stories. The height of buildings one and two is approximately 100 feet, building three is approximately 130 feet, and building four is approximately 150 feet to the top of the mechanical screen.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the safety maintenance setback along the channel and the dimensions of the coastal planting zones. Mr. Petersen stated the coastal planting strip is approximately 35 to 40 feet. There is approximately 15 feet of planting beyond and approximately 25 feet to the right of the safety rail.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if prevailing wind studies were reviewed, taking into consideration the impact of lining the buildings up as presented along the central plaza. Mr. Tranel answered in the affirmative and stated the previously-approved project had done wind studies as well. One of the requirements was to preserve the wind environment over the open water to the east for wind surfers. The proposed project does not impact previous wind patterns on the water to the east of the project; however, pedestrian comfort parameters have been established across the site. Mr. Petersen stated the cypress trees provide a sheltered environment along the western waterfront.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the linear treatment on one side of the channel versus the other and the line of cypress trees. Mr. Petersen stated it is a 100-foot linear channel with artificial fill. Straight lines go well with straight lines. Straight paths give an opportunity to focus on the beauty of the space.

Ms. Alschuler asked about the vision of bicycles on the site in relationship to the existing paths and how they will change, about the choice of decomposed granite paths on the west side that is not for bicycles, and what bicycles will do at the pedestrian bridge. Mr. Petersen stated the stabilized decomposed granite path along the casual, naturalistic western shoreline edge can be used by most recreational bicycles and is meant to be a slower, more intimate experience. It was important to contrast the wider asphalt path on the eastern waterfront, which is the primary Bay Trail and multipurpose path.

Mr. Pellegrini asked why the raised crosswalk that connected the Sanchez Channel to the pedestrian bridge at the northwest corner in the previous proposal was not carried over. Mr. Tranel stated there are two locations with signalized intersections on the project. Since there is no traffic signal on the northwest corner, the crosswalk was removed for pedestrian safety.

Mr. Smiley asked if bicycles will be limited in the central promenade area. Mr. Petersen stated the central promenade section has bicycle racks at both of the lobby plazas. Slow bicycle traffic is invited through the site along the promenades.

Mr. Smiley asked how to discourage bicyclists from speeding through the plazas. Mr. Tranel stated the plazas are made of pavers and are not designed as a part of the bicycle trail. Also, there are tables, chairs, pedestrian traffic, and cross traffic in the plazas and clearly marked bicycle trails outside the central zone. Mr. Petersen stated there will be onsite operations workers patrolling the campus to speak to bicyclists or skateboarders who may misuse the campus.

Mr. Leader asked if the embankment on the Sanchez Channel is the project's responsibility. Mr. Petersen stated the embankment will not be replaced, just as it was not in the previously-approved project; however, the whole shoreline is being rebuilt on the eastern side.

Mr. Strang asked if the project is over-parked. Mr. Tranel stated the proposal stayed within the number of parking spaces allowed in the previously-approved project and planning code and is not over-parked at 2,318 spaces.

Ms. Alschuler asked about public parking spaces. Mr. Petersen stated there are spaces available at both sides of the project allowing access to the Bay Trail.

Mr. Smiley asked what will happen to the parking along the temporary trail. Mr. Petersen stated that area is on state-owned property. Parking will remain after the trail is made permanent.

d. **Public Hearing.** Mr. Buehmann summarized the emailed comments from San Mateo County and the Bay Trail Project. The county plans to redevelop the Bay Trail to the south of the property along Coyote Point. The county and the Bay Trail Project ask if it is possible for this project to include improvements to the gap on the southeast side of the site between the property and Coyote Point.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board members discussed the following:

(1) Do the redesigned shoreline public access areas provide adequate pedestrian and bicycle connections to and along the shoreline and is the choice of paving appropriate for the use at the site?

Mr. Smiley asked about the connections to and through the site and views through the site. There is a chance that one developed project can start to shape what happens with the next one. He suggested a more orthogonal orientation to the street instead of coming in on a curve. If the turn south from Sanchez Channel was orthogonal, that would set up a natural intersection to an extension to the north for future development. It would also give more sense to the relationship of the Caltrans right-of-way and the ability to cross mid-site where the temporary Bay Trail becomes permanent and becomes part of the east-west connection to this community.

Ms. Alschuler stated there is no plan for a road on the east to open this project up to a major public space. She hoped that corner would become a better companion to Coyote Point on the other side in the future - a significant public space on the water and a feature that could continue. A pedestrian and bicycle area would be more powerful north and south. She suggested perhaps combining these two ideas.

Ms. McCann stated the unit pavers that come across the asphalt waterfront trail invite individuals to enter the development. Ms. Alschuler stated the northeast corner does not have that because it is parking area. She asked if there is something that can be done to the northeast corner to invite the public in.

(2) Does the modified project design provide adequate, usable, and attractive public access space appropriate to the scale of adjacent authorized development and the site in its entirety?

Mr. Strang stated the project provides an amazing number of amenities in the given space available to the public, which is commendable. He asked how much the sightline into the garage through those open spaces impacts the experience. Mr. Leader stated it feels like a moat, although it is understandable to try to get as much ventilation as possible into the garage area.

Ms. Alschuler stated the recommendation is to try to do something to screen the pedestrian view into the garage area. Ms. McCann suggested this can be accomplished by increasing the height of the planting.

Ms. McCann suggested adding bicycle racks along the trail.

(3) Does the addition of a 30-foot safety and maintenance setback diminish the public access along Sanchez Channel? In addition, do the planting setback areas and areas open to the underground parking lot adversely affect the public's use of the shoreline areas?

Mr. Leader questioned the impact of the existing BCDC permit along the hazardous edge. Ms. Michaels stated the existing permit does not address the shoreline protection system built by Caltrans many years ago. An engineering analysis determined it was sound for the development but the safety component of the edge was not discussed.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he does not have a problem with the security barrier on the western edge but would have concerns if this becomes a leftover space that is not beneficial to public access, especially if it is difficult to get there from the roadway system or the Bay Trail. There may be opportunity for the building in the northwest corner to spill out onto that space with better frontage or to interface better, but it is separated by the recessed parking deck. It may be nice to have a calmer path along the western side of the project, but it is not clear where it would go.

Ms. Alschuler asked Mr. Smiley if he wanted to raise the question about the potential change in the roadway. Mr. Smiley stated he strongly recommended it. Everything has been changed except the roadway. Ms. Barton stated it is part of the permit and is too late to change at this point.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed about changing the roadway but questioned the purveyance in this situation. It is unfortunate that the five-lane curvilinear arterial remains only because it was part of the old design and old Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that has already been signed off by the jurisdictions.

Ms. Alschuler suggested requesting performance requirements that the design has to work for development of the site to the north in a logical and safe way; indicate how that could happen with the current or an adjusted plan; and that an easier pedestrian connection is needed to make it interesting to take the safe path.

Mr. Smiley stated those actions are workable in the current design by curving off that road. It is worth adding a view corridor to the north.

Ms. Barton questioned whether a condition can be added about an undeveloped piece of the property. Ms. Alschuler gave the example of the Bay Trail and how it will continue through in the future. Mr. Smiley stated how one property is developed often dictates what happens to another property, especially in this type of circumstance.

Mr. Pellegrini stated his concern about the dimensional qualities and the wind and other environmental conditions on the edges of the property.

Mr. Strang stated his concerns that the site requires a lot of maintenance to keep it functioning and looking good and that there is not a passive means for water removal from the parking garage in case of a power outage.

(4) Is the planting plan appropriate for the public access area, including the row of trees along Sanchez Channel?

Several Board members spoke in support of the choice of trees along the channel.

f. **Applicant Response.** The applicant offered clarifying points to questions raised by the Board:

The access to 350 Airport Boulevard to the north would be through the signalized intersection that has been provided.

The access corridor on the northeast corner of the site is off the property and the California state lands, which precludes the ability to restructure that road and provide access to the fisherman's wharf parking.

There are approximately 146 bicycle parking spaces below-grade, along the Bay Trail, and in front of the office entrances.

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

The Board recommended reconfiguring the road design and the entry into the 350 Airport Boulevard property.

The Board emphasized the need for improved pedestrian connections at the northwest corner.

The Board's question about bicycle parking may have been addressed during the applicant's response.

The Board recommended that the applicant include a better understanding of the central connection and its relationship to the edge of the Bay.

The Board expressed concerns regarding the maintenance required for the site, features, and programming. Ms. Michaels stated this will be a condition of the permit.

The Board recommended possibly raising the height of the berms to provide coverage of the cars in the parking garage from the public area, as long as it does not affect the drainage.

The Board emphasized the importance of including historical reference at the site and programming that is inviting and accommodating to the public.

The Board would like to see something that helps the continuation of the Bay Trail since it is such a short link.

The Board felt that the paving was appropriate.

4. **San Leandro Shoreline Development Project, City of San Leandro, Alameda County (Second Pre-Application Review).** The Board reviewed the second pre-application proposal by Cal Coast Companies, LLC, and the City of San Leandro for the San Leandro Shoreline Development project located at the San Leandro Marina. The proposed project, which has been modified since the Board's last review, includes a hotel, housing, restaurants, a service building, an office building, and a parking structure. Public access improvements include a public promenade, a pedestrian/bicycle bridge, floating boardwalks, parks, piers, plazas, a beach, and a dock.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Tinya Hoang introduced the project and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including the adequacy and design of public access, public access connections, public views, recreation, parking, and sea level rise and flooding as identified on pages 4 through 8 of the staff report.

Ms. Hoang also summarized comments received from a member of the public voicing opposition to the project and from Bay Trail staff suggesting that the proposed trail circulation run along the shorelines of Mulford and Pescador Points, including the Interior Basin, that the trail system and bridges be accessible by both bicyclists and pedestrians, that the previously-proposed 20- to 25-foot-wide trail be kept in the proposed project design to accommodate future use levels of the trails at the site, and that a trail connection be made at Pescador Point to connect to the trail in front of the Marina Inn and Horacio's Restaurant with the trail adjacent to the condominiums.

b. **Project Presentation.** Cynthia Battenberg, Community Development Director of the City of San Leandro, introduced Scott Cooper, Acquisitions Director of Cal Coast Companies, LLC, and David Gates, of Gates and Associates.

Ms. Battenberg summarized the background, history, community outreach, and feedback received to date. She stated the meeting with BCDC staff has changed the project in many positive ways.

Ms. Battenberg provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the location, existing conditions, boat harbor occupancy, BCDC 100-foot shoreline band, the San Leandro Marina coverage, the design presented to the BCDC BOARD in April, changes made based on BOARD input, and functional relationships of the San Leandro Shoreline and Marina. She stated boating operations cannot be subsidized by developing the land and remain cost-prohibitive due to high dredging costs. She asked for direction from the BOARD on where the buildings can be located so work can begin on the architecture, design, and development agreement.

David Gates, of Gates and Associates, stated the site is flat, orthogonal, and riprap-edged and includes opportunities to reach the water. The goal is to soften the edges to increase the aesthetic value and accessibility of the location.

Scott Cooper, of Cal Coast Companies, LLC, stated one of the changes made, based on BOARD suggestions in April, was to push the apartments further south to maintain the view corridor on Marina Boulevard.

Ms. Battenberg described in further detail the changes to the site plan, including moving parking under the residential units, a combined restaurant and banquet facility, moving the hotel to the corner, moving the restaurant at the tip of Mulford Point to create more parks space, moving back the roundabout on Pescador Point and breaking up the condominiums and the boat rental.

Mr. Gates continued the slide presentation and provided an overview of changes made to the design since April, Bay Trail connectivity, public parking, open spaces, wind impact, and next steps of the proposed San Leandro Shoreline project. He referred to Slide 8, depicting the changes made since April, and stated Nadel Inc. and BKF Engineers, the architects and civil engineers added to the team, have created the real-function footprints and hybrid diagram presented to the Board today.

Mr. Gates highlighted the new grand entrance and road pattern that orients visitors to the different uses of the site. The changes did cause a loss of softening of the edges but retaining some of the current boat slips will help accommodate that. The engineers and Moffatt Nichol will be required to assess that possibility.

Mr. Gates described, in detail, the circulation through the site, the views, the various improved public spaces, the pond and beach areas, the parking, the woonerf and plaza in front of the hotel, the water steps. He stated that there would be shoreline public access that would be 20 to 30 feet wide, while some areas would be as narrow as 16 feet.

Mr. Gates stated the goal today is to seek approval of the massing, use patterns, circulation, open space systems, and visual structure of the plan so more detailed architecture can begin.

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

Mr. Leader asked about harboring boats in the Interior Basin. Ms. Battenberg stated dredging the two-mile channel that goes out to the Bay is cost-prohibitive. The Interior Basin will no longer harbor boats. Hand-powered watercraft will be encouraged in the Interior Basin.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the bridge has been raised to accommodate hand-powered watercraft traffic. Ms. Battenberg stated that issue requires further study but the goal is to allow individuals to pass under the bridge while standing on paddleboards; boats would not go into the basin.

Mr. Leader stated sediment will accumulate over time and asked about the future vision. Ms. Battenberg stated there have been a number of studies done that concur that it will reach a static point. Dredging may be necessary only near the mouth of the Interior Basin.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the large floating dock area is for hand-powered watercraft. Mr. Cooper stated the vision is to create greater opportunity for the public to go out to the water by building decking over existing boat slips with seating areas.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if fill will be part of the permit once the design is fleshed out. Ms. Battenberg stated that there is currently 3.25 acres of fill, most of which will be taken down. Mr. Cooper referred to Slide 10 and stated the red line designates the shoreline. Fill will be added to tight areas.

Mr. Strang asked if the site will also be raised. Mr. Cooper stated that BKF is studying it right now, and it would probably be raised approximately three feet. Mr. Strang suggested dotting in the existing grade to show the before and after. Ms. Alschuler stated that, as the land

is raised on these narrow pieces of land, built area would start to be lost. Ms. Battenberg replied that the Board previously indicated that there was flexibility in the amount of public access on the interior, which could provide area. Ms. Alschuler called attention to the comments from Bay Trail, which desires access on the inside and outside of the lagoon. Ms. Alschuler asked about Slide 20, which states the central bound sea level rise by 2100 is 36 inches from baseline year 2000. Mr. Cooper stated Cal Coast followed city engineer figures. Ms. Alschuler stated the BOARD would like to see what Cal Coast has in mind as things progress and how it affects public access.

Mr. Pellegrini stated the Bay Trail is currently running along Monarch Bay Road. Portions of the trail exist as a Class 2 bicycle lane, but there are also portions that allow off-road travel in the park area that is adjacent to the street. Ms. Battenberg stated that section is just south of the site.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if improvements are planned along the Monarch Bay Road bicycle route that would be seen as part of this project outside of the roundabout. Ms. Battenberg stated the hope for a separate Class 1 bicycle lane on the inland side of Monarch Bay Road.

Ms. Alschuler raised the issue of views at the hotel, and recommended that the public be able to go through the hotel and not to count on the use of glass doors for views; it would be important for people to walk through to the public space.

Ms. Alschuler asked for clarification on the office and parking structure, and stated that it would be undesirable to have the structure facing the lagoon. She also suggested looking into a realistic program that would be viable and that fits on the site.

Ms. McCann stated it would be helpful to see site-planning diagrams for buildings and parking structures rather than fleshed-out drawings. She suggested Granville Island as a model for a seaside village development. She also observed that parking gets in the way of double-sided street development. She suggested thinking of more different ideas.

Ms. McCann suggested considering cutting through at the northern end of the basin and creating an opening that flushes and bridging across to create a distinctive character of crossing the water to get to the hotel on the north side. Cutting the channel through may create a soft wetland edge for kayaks and canoes. This will create ecological value as well as the ability to flush it.

Mr. Smiley indicated that the "Texas Wrap" of the parking garage is usually for residential uses. He also stated that, while the changes to the site plan are an improvement, the project feels suburban. He expressed interest in the idea of a village with two sides of pedestrian space. He suggested the lessons learned from Jack London Square.

Mr. Leader suggested that an ecological program could be developed for the basin with tidal wetlands and reefs. He also suggested having a "kayak playground." Ms. McCann suggested a building-edged road at the southeast corner so that the feeling is not so suburban.

Mr. Cooper stated a traffic engineer has been engaged to do a shared parking analysis. The challenge is how to have a successful office complex with enough available parking spaces. Ms. Alschuler suggested that parking could be used for other uses on the weekends during active times. Ms. McCann suggested thinking about access, transportation, and shared parking; the area is bike-able and make use of bus service. Ms. Battenberg stated that they would mandate a shuttle from the BART station and the site is five minutes from the Oakland Airport.

Mr. Pellegrini stated that, during his visit to the site, he was struck by the number of users that were attracted to the shoreline. He recommended maximizing public connectivity from the edge of the site to the interior. Mr. Pellegrini also suggested extending the public street, with vehicles, sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides, into the site, to create a two-sided experience, that would make it feel like a real street as opposed to feeling like a parking lot. He observed that there are a lot of households nearby and that improved access would encourage locals to come.

Mr. Smiley stated sometimes projects are constrained. He suggested using this project as a chance to try to use all the fill to turn this area into a special place rather than moving it. He suggested that the BOARD review the study from Moffatt Nichol Engineering to see the different ways that water can move. Ms. Battenberg stated they have done studies in the past that indicated it will stay the way it is. It may silt up at the mouth but high tide will flush it out and stabilize it.

Brad McCrea, the BCDC Program Director, stated most of this area is four feet deep at lower tides. He stated staff has been struggling with a particular corner. There is an effort to share the space in the corner with both public and private areas. The down side is the view is lost at this point and there are conflicting uses that need to be sorted out. The other side is that it is activated and is a better place to hang out because of the shelter of the building. He asked for feedback on that corner.

Mr. Strang suggested a view analysis to provide a better understanding of the primary orientation of the environmental factors that would affect that building and location versus the others. Also, he asked where bicycles enter the site, how wide the lane is, and what the sense of destination at that particular corner is. He suggested a zoomed-in view of those areas.

Mr. McCrea explained that the views across the Bay can be hazy, but Downtown San Francisco is visible, and that the hotel would have those views.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested the Ritz Carlton in Half Moon Bay and the boat house at Lake Merritt as examples where public access adjacent to private spaces has been done well, and emphasized bringing the public street into the site.

Ms. Alschuler suggested being careful of the roadways, thinking of them as small access lanes without parked cars lining the roadways, and suggested nodes of parking.

Ms. Alschuler stated that the lagoon should be focused on recreation, and Mr. Leader recommended a strong, coherent identity. Ms. Alschuler suggested programming around the edge of the lagoon, on the weekends for families.

Mr. Gates stated there are four things mentioned by the BOARD that would be nice to include but will be a challenge due to regulatory and cost issues. He asked for input on the following:

(1) Fill – yes or no and how much?

(2) How to get to the water, which has to do with fill and how much freedom there is with flood levels. Currently, existing slips are being used.

(3) Scale – the BOARD keeps describing fractured, small New England villages when there is a 450-foot-long building and parking structure. There is not a lot of room to create fracture.

(4) How critical is it to make an alley-through parking into a living street with activities and storefronts?

Mr. McCrea suggested that staff work on the fill issue with the applicant to bring to the Commission.

Mr. Smiley suggested letting the design drive the direction of the quantity and type of fill. Mr. Gates stated the design has driven the direction. The parking pattern cannot be changed. He suggested slicing out some of the riprap, scaling it back, and pushing it out to allow access to the water.

Ms. McCann suggested breaking the parking with phasing. The shared parking study is important. It is not uncommon for hotels to valet park to decrease the number of needed parking spaces.

Mr. Cooper stated that the number of parking spaces is currently under code. Ms. Alschuler stated the need to consider daily use and special events use.

Ms. McCann encouraged including a water plan with the land plan to optimize the public venue.

d. **Public Hearing.** René Mendieta, of the Shoreline Development Citizens Advisory Committee of San Leandro, asked about the desire to give people access to the water as if they were at an ocean beach. The outer edge of the riprap acts as a protective barrier, especially during stormy weather. The lagoon is protected and the waves are not as high, but there is still a lot of that rock. A lagoon view for the buildings is a nice feature, but individuals should not expect it to be like a beach.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board members discussed the following:

Mr. Strang asked if the auto access on the north of the roundabout is fixed by the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Mr. Cooper stated a roundabout is necessary.

Mr. Strang stated there were issues with the curve in the road, and suggested a simpler side organization may be more efficient so the parking lot on the southwest portion does not need to be moved, and would provide an urban feeling street. He stated the concern that cars may shut down the street as they back out from straight-in parking.

Ms. Alschuler agreed that separate pods of parking breaks it up. She stated she likes the turn-in because it affords views of the Bay and the hotel.

Ms. Barton stated the architecture can do a lot more to pull everything together.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is not about rigidly having the Bay Trail on both sides of everything. One Bay Trail that takes in all the amenities and has room for bicycles and pedestrians will make one great experience. Mr. Gates stated that would allow the architecture to be moved closer to the water. It would free up the architect to move things around.

Ms. McCann agreed but cautioned against taking out too much public access on the hotel corner because of the prime viewing location.

Mr. Smiley stated Slide 9, the Functional Relationship Diagram, is the most helpful, except it is difficult to distinguish street from Bay Trail.

Mr. Gates stated the building blocks are what they are, but they do not come together to create a greater whole. They exist as individual elements and there is no community because they do not talk to each other. Part of that is because the parking is so large that it does not give the room to create the interspace that is the exciting part of the community.

f. **Applicant Response.** The applicant responded positively to the Board's discussion and suggestions.

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

Ms. Michaels stated there are many comments about the big picture of the site. Some of the questions raised may be digging in a little too deep at this time. She suggested that staff continue to work with the applicant to talk more about the big picture issues – massing, site design, placement of the buildings, parking – and then come back to the BOARD with more particular questions for more feedback.

5. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Chair Alschuler adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with no corrections at the
Design Review Board Meeting of October 17, 2016