

Planning Commission

Meeting Date: October 21, 2015

Item 6: Shoreline Park Final Development Permit Application

Attached, please find meeting notes for:

- LPAB, October 12, 2015
- PRAC, October 14, 2015

These meetings occurred after the Planning Commission report was finalized for publication. The draft notes are specific to agenda items relating to the proposed Shoreline Park Final Development Permit application, and are provided to ensure that the Planning Commission is fully informed of the discussion and motions made by advisory boards and commissions as pertains to their consideration of the same application.

LPAB

October 12, 2015

Item #1: Shoreline Park FDP

Notes prepared by Catherine Payne

Speakers:

- John Sutter: Wharf area will feel vast, empty, boring; this is an important site and this is the moment to design it and get all facilities in (now or never)—once residents move in, they may want to protect views and/or complain about noise related to future additions to park; Need shade and wind buffers; Ensure adequate park and event management; Provide electrical infrastructure to support events; like the bike path.
- Naomi Schiff: Not enough information available regarding historic interpretation/references; public review process inadequate; pergola should be symmetrical with 9th Avenue Terminal and relate more directly to the historic structure; Need to provide historic references/interpretation, shade, wind buffer, restroom on western edge of park; LPAB should have opportunity to review park plans again; LPAB should advise Planning Commission to ensure clarity regarding historic interpretive features.
- Daniel Franco: Site is subject to sea-level rise; Preservation is development; Park should be restored wetlands; Need funding to manage park.
- Leo Charnet: Need shade structure; wood deck will rot; park "lost opportunity".

LPAB Discussion:

- Brikholz: Not enough detail; What is the façade treatment of the building? What is the design of the commemorative markers? How are the storefront canopies detailed? How will building be painted? Wood decking is not adequately articulated; Need restrooms at western edge of park; How will park programming be accomplished? Protect park users from resident complaints (regarding noise, leeches and smoke);
- Buckley: Need more information about architectural details; Leave columns and use to provide structure for wind buffer and shade devices; Keep column bases as seating; Incorporate more of existing facility into park design.
- Casson: Bring FDP back to LPAB with more information regarding paying homage to 9th Avenue Terminal; Use the space to tell the story of the place; Address sea-level rise; Address operating park missed opportunity in terms of design;
- Andrews: Pergola should be designed to truly mark the end of the building; need more information regarding historic preservation and interpretation; keep columns (provide an urban amenity); LPAB should review this again.

Moved:

- Direct staff to submit landmark application to the LPAB for consideration upon delivery of Shoreline Park improvements;
- Find the proposed Shoreline Park Final Development Permit application not in compliance with design review requirements until adequate design detail is provided regarding: building facades, details, windows, paint treatment, storefront canopies, 9th Avenue Terminal materials to be reused, pergola structure and wind and shade devices; and
- Request the Planning commission to require further LPAB review prior to considering approval of the Final Development Permit application.

PRAC

October 14, 2015

Item J: Shoreline Park FDP

Notes prepared by Catherine Payne, Bureau of Planning

Speakers:

- John Sutter: Park is vast and empty; Changes are positive but not enough; Need more imaginative shade structures; Once park is built, it will be near impossible to make changes; Need wind break; Proposed FDP includes less vegetation than shown in FDP; All Brooklyn Basin parks should be considered together; Need more restrooms; Need better access; Need park/programming management.
- Aileen Frankl: Applicant should revise 2006 feasibility assessment to reflect current economic times; Should not reuse 9th Avenue Terminal wood as decking (not appropriate use); Park should have more vegetation; Park design should be richer in amenities and variety of features; Developer should program park in perpetuity.
- Carolyn Kim: Plans should address sea-level rise; Need more restrooms; Need public transportation; Park plans should prioritize wildlife habitat (no playing fields at Estuary Park and specifically provide habitat near 5th Avenue); Park plans should be reviewed by California Native Plant Society and California Department of Fish and Game.

PRAC Discussion:

- Manning: Unimaginative design; When built will feel vast; Control for trash and tobacco pollution entering bay from park; Address sea-level rise; Interpretive elements within the park; Ask Planning Commission to delay vote and request that it go back to PRAC for further review and consideration.
- Dubois: Need more trees, green space, restrooms, shade; Maintain more of the 9th Avenue Terminal; Trouble with this is last opportunity to review Shoreline Park design; PRAC should consolidate comments and provide "white paper" for future subcommittee to use in their review.
- Rosenbloom: Can PRAC have commissioners on any future subcommittee? Park should serve local community as well as region.
- Kadera: Design should include a variety of ways for all people to access the water (including wheelchair access); Include changeable signs to announce events and activities at park; Supports project (in particular: manzanita trees for visibility, emphasis on public art); Supports staff recommendation regarding committing developer to park programming.
- Garbin: Consider sustainable design features such as on-site water channeling for irrigation purposes, living walls and drought-tolerant plants to support Oakland as Green City; Design is not innovative in terms of bringing built and natural environments together; Design is conventional and stark; Consider vertical gardens, moveable furnishings and living walls.
- Wu: Park should be a destination; Plans appear to appeal to a homogenous group (illustrations and photos lack diversity); Would park appeal to a diverse range of users that reflect Oakland?
- Chair Miller: Consider further non-discretionary review by PRAC; Design indicates a vast canvas; Not enough public art (could include a feature similar to Uptown Temporary Art Park, in addition to proposed public art locations).

Moved (7 to 1 vote):

- Find that the Shoreline Park Final Development Plan is in substantial conformance with the Preliminary Development Plan;
- Find that the Shoreline Park Final Development Plan meets the Oakland Municipal Code chapter 17.136.050-Regular design review criteria; and
- Request the Planning Commission to delay a decision regarding the Shoreline Park Final Development Permit application in order for the PRAC to provide additional input and remain engaged as the process moves forward, regarding the following concerns:
 - Assurance that the proposed design includes features to reduce the potential for water pollution from trash (including tobacco);
 - Inclusive design, so that the park feels like a welcoming space for Oakland residents, of all income groups and cultural backgrounds;
 - Green design, such as green walls and green roofs ;
 - Interpretive elements to address sea-level rise;
 - Additional moveable furniture;
 - Continuity of park programming;
 - Provision of children's play areas (potentially within the development itself and not necessarily in the Shoreline Park);
 - Universal water access;
 - Wayfinding signage
 - A substantial increase in the amount of public art, potentially including art in the water;
 - Adequate provision of restrooms;
 - Adequate shade devices;
 - More imaginative design and features;
 - Addressing public comments submitted to the PRAC following publication of the staff report; and
- Request the Planning Commission to include PRAC representation on a DRC subcommittee to conduct further design review and reporting, should the project be approved with a DRC subcommittee.