

Location:	Jack London Square (area bound by the Oakland Estuary, the Embarcadero, Clay Street and Alice Street, plus one block bound by the Embarcadero, Harrison Street, 2nd Street and Alice Street)
Proposal:	Second Meeting to Review the Design of the Jack London Square Redevelopment Project. The project would intensify the retail, dining, and entertainment uses within Jack London Square, resulting in approximately 1.2 million new net gross square-feet. To accommodate the intensification of existing uses at Jack London Square, the project could also include demolition of up to approximately 161,800 square-feet of existing commercial space.
Applicant:	Jack London Square Partners, LLC (Stuart Rickard, Project Manager)
Owner:	Port of Oakland.
Case File Number:	ER03-0004
General Plan:	Mixed Use Waterfront/Estuary Plan Area
Zoning:	C-45 Community Shopping Commercial Zone; R-80 High-Rise Apartment Residential Zone; and M-20 Light Industrial Zone
Environmental Determination:	A draft environmental impact report has been completed. The public comment period ends on October 24, 2003 at 4:00 p.m.
Service Delivery District:	1-West Oakland
City Council District:	2
Staff Recommendation:	No action will be taken; discussion only of Design Review issues.
For further information:	Contact Development Director Claudia Cappio at 510-238-2229 or Contract Planner Diane Henderson at 415-457-0525

SUMMARY

This meeting is the second design review session for the proposed Jack London Square Redevelopment Project. The first meeting, held on September 24, 2003, focused on site planning and broader overall design issues such as massing, height and view corridors. This meeting will focus on the nine proposed building sites and the specific building designs and issues for each site.

The environmental review process is underway. A Draft EIR was published on September 8, 2003; the comment period ends on Friday, October 24, 2003 at 4:00 pm. The Planning Commission held a public hearing to solicit comments on the DEIR on October 1, 2003. The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) also reviewed the DEIR and the project at their October 6, 2003 meeting.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would redevelop areas within Jack London Square. The project would intensify existing office, retail, and dining establishments by providing new construction on nine

development areas (labeled Site C, Site D, Pavilion 2, Water I Expansion, 66 Franklin, Site F1, Site F2, and Site F3) as well as add retail and possibly residential uses on an adjacent full block (labeled Site G) on the project area site plan (attached). For certain sites, the proposal includes multiple development options (“variants”) to allow flexibility in the development of these sites as shown in the project description matrix in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). The project would be connected into the existing utility infrastructure. The project would also include a peak-hour shuttle between the project area and the Oakland 12th Street BART Station.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) contains a detailed analysis of 1.2 million square feet of mixed use development. A modified project, as described in Alternative 2 (Modified Development Alternative) in the DEIR, is being considered by the applicant because it would mitigate some of the environmental impacts of the proposed project and would be more consistent with the Estuary Policy Plan. At this time, the applicant has submitted a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application within the same development envelope as the November 2002 project (1.2 million square feet.) However, the plans submitted for Design Review in early September show a project substantially scaled down (approximately 690,000 square feet.) These Design Review plans do not reflect the building massing and bulk that would result from the 1.2 million square foot project. The set of plans attached to this staff report contain both the proposed Final Development Plan (FDP) for each site as well as present simple representations of the maximum building envelope being requested under the PUD.

Summary of the Modified Development Alternative

The Modified Development Alternative would result in up to approximately 1.1 million new net gross square feet and would allow demolition of up to 131,800 square feet of existing space. The reduction in office space from the November 2002 application would be reflected with the removal of the third floor on the proposed building for Site C, making the building a two-story structure. The reduction in retail space would occur by not constructing a full-site building at the Pavilion 2 site and instead providing retail extensions and/or kiosks within the existing plaza to the south of the Barnes and Noble bookstore. Retail would be further reduced with a change in the building footprint of Site F1, in the area immediately around Heinold’s First and Last Chance Saloon.

The Modified Development Alternative would allow office uses to be located within the development on Site C, Site D, 66 Franklin, Site F1, and Site F2. The movie theatre would be located on Site D, and the 250-room hotel would be located on Site F3. Retail and restaurant uses would be integrated into every development except on Site G, which could contain residential uses above a parking structure containing about 743 spaces and a supermarket on the ground floor. The remaining new parking (up to 550 spaces) would be integrated into an office and retail development on Site F2.

In the Modified Development Alternative, the proposed Site F1 building, which would contain office and retail uses, has been redesigned to pull the structure away from Heinold’s First and

Last Chance Saloon, an historic resource. Although still incorporated into the design of the building on Site F1, physical space around Heinold's First and Last Chance Saloon would be increased such that the structure would be discerned separately. The Site F1 building would incorporate an open, glassy atrium space and be transparent on the south and west facades of the historic resource. The atrium roof would extend above the saloon's roof, leaving a large open area around the small structure, although it would still be surrounded on three sides and overhead with the new Harvest Hall.

Summary of Design Review Application

The applicant has submitted Design Review drawings for individual sites and for the common areas. These submittals illustrate a project that is somewhat less intensively developed than that which was studied in the Modified Development Alternative contained in the DEIR. The applicant has stated that this difference reflects the evolution of the design of the project. The specific elements of each site are discussed in detail below.

The plans submitted include an analysis of the mass and bulk of the Modified Development Alternative versus the Design Review proposal. The analysis is expressed in drawings that superimpose the potential mass and bulk of the Modified Development Alternative in the form of a black outline on the architectural elevations of the Design Review drawings. While the applicants are seeking approval of a Planned Unit Development that allows the development analyzed as the "worst case" in the DEIR, they are seeking Design Review approval, on a site-by-site basis, of the specific drawings set forth in the Design Review application.

A written comparison of the November 2002 submittal, the Modified Development Alternative and the Design Review application is provided in Attachment B to this report.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS AND POLICIES

A summary of the relevant General Plan, Estuary Policy Plan and Zoning Code provisions is contained in Attachment C of this report.

DESIGN ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

During the past year, Staff has met with the Applicant to evolve and refine development plans and concepts. In September, 2003, the Applicant has submitted refined Design Review drawings that are more consistent with the Modified Development Alternative studied in the DEIR, and thereby reduce the mass and bulk of the proposed development when compared with the visual simulations contained in the DEIR.

The Design Review Committee held the first preliminary design review meeting on the project on September 24, 2003; the Planning Commission received public comment on the DEIR on

October 1, 2003, and the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board held a meeting on the DEIR on October 6, 2003. The major public comments to date can be summarized as follows:

- Concerns about impacts to Heinold's First and Last Chance Saloon.
- Comments about unifying and expanding the historic elements pertaining to Jack London's life and times in this area.
- Potential conflicts with the proximity of the turn-arounds at the base Washington Street and Broadway to Water Street.
- Promoting a pedestrian-friendly orientation for Water Street.
- Visual access to the Estuary; maintenance of and enhancement of major view corridors, particularly from the existing street grid intersection the Embarcadero (Broadway, Webster, Franklin, etc.)
- Concerns about the mass and height of the parking structure on Site G in relation to the adjacent mixed use and housing projects.
- The quality and quantity of the open space proposed for the development, particularly in relation to accommodating large crowds and annual events.
- Phasing parking and other improvements to accommodate the development and minimize impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.
- Concerns about detrimental impacts on other retail opportunities in downtown Oakland due to the amount of retail proposed for the development.
- Project's effects on the Produce District and Waterfront Warehouse District.
- Bay trail and shoreline access.
- Traffic impacts.

The following section of the report outlines, on a site by site basis, the major design issues that Staff views as important for the Planning Commission to review and consider as the project review moves forward. Commissioners may also highlight other issues that should be considered and addressed in more detail. It is critical at this step that direction is provided to the applicant so that a final set of Design Review drawings can be returned for full at the Planning Commission.

1. Site C

The PUD envelope (and as described and analyzed in the DEIR) for Site C is a 3-level, 58-foot high structure, up to 48,000 gross square-feet in size. The Modified Development Alternative analyzes a building that is reduced by one level with a maximum height of 44 feet, and a maximum size of 33,000 square-feet. The Design Review submittal is similar to the Modified Development Alternative, proposing a two-level structure which further reduces the building's mass with a maximum height of 34 feet and maximum building size of 28,400 square-feet.

The proposed structure would be located across Water Street from the existing ten story Port of Oakland Building. The lower profile of the proposed building would provide an attractive contrast to the mass and bulk of the Port building. The proposed structure would be a pavilion-

type building, constructed primarily of glass, with exposed steel, wood screens, metal columns, and a v-shaped roof. The design of the building has somewhat of a nautical theme, appropriate for its waterfront setting at the westernmost point of the development, adjacent to the Estuary. The building would front on the open West Green, allowing uses to take advantage of the magnificent views to the water, with the opportunity for outdoor seating at the ground level and an observation deck with possible outdoor dining at the second floor. The proposed location, shape, design and uses of the proposed structure for Site C would draw the public to the adjacent West Green.

ISSUE: Does the structure, as proposed, appear appropriate in scale, form and detail?

Staff comments: The elegant v-shaped roofline should be preserved. With the proposed design, the West Green and water views are opened up and expansive. The degree of step back should be proportional to the base and second level.

2. Site D

The PUD envelope for Site D is a 7-level, 150-foot high structure, up to 214,000 gross square-feet in size. The Modified Development Alternative analyzes a building of the same height and size. The Design Review submittal substantially reduces the building's mass and bulk with a two level building with a maximum height of 78 feet and maximum building size of 43,700 square-feet.

The structure proposed for Site D would house the cinema, appropriately located across Embarcadero from the existing cinema. The building would be concrete block, with a 2-level lobby with large skylights above.

ISSUE: Should the cinema building on Site D be taller? Are the differences in mass such that different design elements are desirable or necessary for the larger option?

Staff comments: Staff views the larger building mass option at this site as an exciting opportunity to create a signature entertainment presence through color, lighting, signage and other design elements to create visibility and interest. In either option, the building marquee should be increased in height and width to provide a substantial visual anchor statement. The increased height and width of the marquee would add variety to the design of the building and surrounding structures, breaking up the mass of the building, while creating an exciting visual presentation. In addition, more detail is needed regarding the quality and combination of exterior materials that will be used to "decorate the box" in order to provide as much architectural interest and articulation as possible.

ISSUE: The lobby entrance is should be more strongly emphasized.

Staff comment: The entrance should be more strongly emphasized, in part through the comments already identified about a more prominent marquee. The use of different paving or other entry features is also encouraged. This would not only add visual interest to the appearance of the building, but it would also create an inviting draw and a stronger statement of arrival for the cinema.

3. Pavilion 2

The Modified Development Alternative presents a building that is reduced by one level with a maximum height of 24 feet, and a maximum size of 15,000 square-feet. The Design Review submittal is similar to the Modified Development Alternative, proposing a 24-foot high, single-story structure which further reduces the building's mass with a maximum building size of 9,650 square-feet, compared to the project alternative studied in the DEIR.

The proposed Pavilion 2 development would create two 4,825 square-foot pavilions south of the existing Barnes and Noble building. The buildings would be designed with a kiosk theme, with glass and aluminum storefronts opening to Water Street. The proposed design retains the vehicular turn-around at the base of Broadway. An option in the PUD would be to unify these two buildings if a retail or other use warranted it.

ISSUE: The design review development option is superior at this site and should be limited accordingly in the PUD, providing flexibility to unify the two building elements if desired.

Staff comment: The lower profile will serve as a visual relief to the taller building masses on either side of this site. In addition, the maintenance and enhancement of the Broadway view corridor is important.

ISSUE: Is the proposed location of Pavilion 2, adjacent to Water Street and the proposed turn-around at the terminus of Broadway acceptable?

Staff comments: We are concerned with the proximity of the proposed turn-arounds at the base of Broadway and the base of Washington to Water Street, and believe that they should be pulled back towards Embarcadero, to assure a primarily pedestrian-friendly orientation for Water Street. In addition, one of the valet access points should be eliminated. With the existing subterranean garage entrance on Broadway, the likely one eliminated is on Franklin.

ISSUE: The proposed development at Pavilion 2 should be further enhanced with a variety of ground level architectural features and forms.

Staff comments: Staff is pleased with the basic relationship that has been created between the new building forms and existing important features in this location, such as the tile walls. The

design details should be further identified to provide ground level interest and attraction within this main gateway area.

4. Water 1 Expansion

The DEIR project for Water 1 Expansion is a 2-level, 44-foot high structure, up to 26,000 gross square-feet in size. The Modified Development Alternative analyzes a building of the same height and size. There is no Design Review submittal for this site at this time. The Applicant is proposing that an FDP would be filed and reviewed sometime in the future.

5. 66 Franklin

The DEIR project for 66 Franklin would remove the 93,800-square-foot building and replace it with a new, 9-level, 135-foot high structure, up to 215,950 gross square-feet in size. The Modified Development Alternative analyzes a building of the same height and size. The Design Review submittal would retain the existing 3-level, 50-foot tall structure, further reducing the building's mass and bulk with a maximum building size of 93,8000 square-feet.

The Design Review submittal for 66 Franklin proposes to retain the existing building, by removing the aluminum siding and returning the exterior to the original concrete industrial form.

ISSUE: The scale and mass of the building envelope proposed for the PUD would result in a completely different building typology from the renovation and rehabilitation of the design review project. While one or two floors added above the existing building may be successfully achieved, staff does not believe that an addition up to the maximum building envelope shown would be appropriate given the existing structure, form, solid to void proportions and scale of the existing building.

Staff comment: The future design of the larger building envelope, if pursued, must follow a strict set of guidelines and standards. To simply "grow" the existing, smaller building into a larger envelope is unacceptable. Window type, concrete finishes, vertical and horizontal elements are all important figuring out at a larger scale. Therefore, staff recommends that if more than two levels are added, the PUD should require demolishing the building and designing a new structure at the larger scale.

6. Site F1

The Modified Development Alternative analyzes a building that is the same height, but slightly reduced in size by 10,000 square-feet, to a maximum size of 257,000 square-feet. The Design Review submittal further reduces the building's mass and bulk with a five level building, at a maximum height of 108 feet and maximum building size of 166,000 square-feet.

Building F1, the Harvest Hall, is the retail centerpiece of the proposed development. This building would be constructed of brick with large openings at the ground level, reminiscent of

the concrete industrial buildings in the Jack London area. The tall roll-up doors at the ground level would remain open during the day, providing views through the building from Embarcadero to Water Street. The building has been designed with a transparent edge at the East Green, providing a smooth transition from the open Estuary and adjacent green to the development.

Site F1 includes Heinold's First and Last Chance Saloon, an historic resource. The Design Review submittal redesigns the Harvest Hall building such that it would provide a more open and transparent atrium around the historic resource than the November 2002 submittal. Heinold's First and Last Chance Saloon would be discerned more clearly as a separate structure since there would be physical space between the historic resource and the new building. It should be noted that the landmark designation applies not only to the building, but to an area extending 20 feet out from the building as well.

Staff has continued to work with the Applicant to explore options to treat Heinold's so that the identified significant and unavoidable historic impact can be reduced to a less than significant level. These include:

- Stepping back the glass walls completely so that the building is freestanding, with the roof structure overhead.
- Pulling back the glass walls and the roof structure.
- Creating more of a Jack London interpretative in the area around Heinold's and Jack London's cabin, and unifying the existing art and sculpture elements in the area.

Staff comment: Any direction regarding the approach to be used to establish Heinold's as a distinct and separate structure while still maintaining a link to the Harvest Hall building would be welcome.

ISSUE: The preservation of Heinold's First and Last Chance Saloon should incorporate other Jack London memorabilia, including Jack London's cabin, wolf, wolf tracks, etc.

Staff comment: The preservation of Heinold's provides a unique opportunity to create an attractive outdoor use area that would incorporate other elements recognizing Jack London's contributions. Staff believes that the area around Heinold's should be attractively designed to create an outdoor use area that incorporates other Jack London memorabilia, including Jack London's cabin, wolf, wolf tracks, landscaping, tables and benches as appropriate.

7. Site F2

The DEIR project for Site F2 is a 10-level, 153-foot high structure, up to 421,000 gross square-foot in size. The Modified Development Alternative analyzes a building that is reduced in height by 2 levels, to a maximum height of 125 feet, and reduced to a maximum size of 398,000 square-foot. The Design Review submittal reflects the same height as the Modified Development

Alternative, but further reduces the building's mass and bulk with a maximum building size of 271,000 square-feet.

This building would be constructed of concrete with metal panels and canopies. The building has been designed with a stepped profile to provide visual interest and reduce the impact of mass and bulk. The building would house commercial uses as well as a parking garage. The office entry would be from Harrison Street, while access to the garage would be from Alice Street. Pedestrian bridges would connect this structure to the parking garage on Site G and to the Harvest Hall on Site F1.

ISSUE: The overall building massing presented in the design review package is substantially different than the PUD maximum envelope and could result in a large, uniform building mass that would not provide sufficient articulation and silhouette against the skyline. Further work needs to be completed on the overall mass of the different building forms that would be allowed under the maximum building envelope.

ISSUE: Are upper level pedestrian over crossings acceptable?

Staff comment: The pedestrian over crossings are acceptable, provided they do not detract from pedestrian movement and pedestrian-related commercial activities at the street level. The over crossings must be commensurate in quality and design as the one that currently exists at the Amtrak station. There should be consistency with others, resulting in civic imagery that builds on key physical features in this area.

8. Site F3

The PUD project for Site F3 is a 13-level, 175-foot high structure, up to 220,000 gross square-feet in size. The Modified Development Alternative analyzes a building of the same height and size. The Design Review submittal removes one level while retaining the same maximum height of 175 feet and slightly reduces the maximum building size to 218,000 square-feet. These changes have a minor, if any, change in the overall design, massing and character of this building.

Site F3 would house the waterfront hotel proposed for the development. At 175 feet, this structure would be the tallest building and would become a signature part at this end of the Jack London Square District. The building has been designed to step mass away from the Estuary, and provide a key visual access point between the more urban frontage of the Jack London District and the more natural character beyond the hotel. The concrete building would be accented with aluminum-clad columns, a glazed aluminum window system, aluminum panels and a metal and glass canopies.

Vehicular access and entry to the hotel would be on Water Street. The street-level lobby would be a tall, dramatic space with views out to the water. A restaurant with outdoor dining, fitness

center and outdoor pool would occupy the ground floor, while the majority of the guest rooms would be located in a tower element adjacent to Alice Street.

ISSUE: Should the tower element of the hotel be increased in height?

Staff comment: We believe that the Applicant should have the flexibility to increase the height of the hotel, to a maximum height of 205 feet (an addition of 30 feet over what is currently proposed. If the Commission concurs, a confirmation of no further impact with regard to shade, shadow and wind would need to be completed. The hotel should be clearly recognized as the signature piece of the development, and increasing the height of the upper tower element, perhaps by reducing the mass of the upper portion of the building, would help to achieve this visual statement.

9. Site G

The PUD project for Site G is an 8-level, 111-foot high structure, up to 420,000 gross square-feet in size. The Modified Development Alternative analyzes a building of the same height and size. The Design Review submittal shows one level removed and reduces the maximum height to 74 feet while maintaining the maximum building size of 420,000 square-feet.

Site G development would include retail at the street level and a six-level parking structure, including roof-top parking. The structure has been designed with retail at the street level and the parking structure above it, to minimize the impact of a large parking garage at this location. A pedestrian over crossing is proposed from the garage on Site G over the railroad tracks to the proposed structure on Site F2.

The proposed structure has been designed with a pedestrian orientation along Second Street, with a pop-out 28-foot high metal store front, with precast concrete above it. Access to the retail would be from Second Street; vehicular access to the garage would be at the corner of Harrison and Second Streets. The exterior stairs and pedestrian bridge would be constructed of metal. In addition, a new canopy, integrated into the building's architecture would replace the existing Amtrak canopy adjacent to the railroad tracks.

ISSUE: The proposed parking structure will be a large building block in this location and will include rooftop parking.

Staff comment: The building's architecture needs to be further developed to include a more substantial architectural element along the top of the building. The rooftop parking should also include screening, incorporated into the overall design, to obscure the cars and headlights.

The main design issue with this building, like the theater, is the most successful means of "decorating the box," given the fairly box-like nature of a garage structure. The ground floor edge of this building has been appropriately detailed. The essential geometric shape of the

building can be more finely reflected with further patterns, recesses, and color and materials variations to produce more of a rhythm across the facades. The overall mass of this building appears acceptable, particularly given the recent buildings at The Sierra (3rd and Oak) and Second and Jackson.

ISSUE: The mass and bulk of the wall of the garage structure adjacent to the Amtrak station needs further refinement.

Staff comments: The large wall adjacent to the Amtrak station affords a unique opportunity to incorporate art into the development. Staff believes that an attractive and substantial mural or frieze would break up the mass and bulk of the structure as viewed from the Amtrak station, while providing an interesting façade for the large structure.

10. Open Space and Pedestrian Access

As outlined in the Design Review submittal, the proposed project would create approximately 40,000 square feet of new, permanent open space adjacent to the estuary to the west of the hotel (Site F3). The Meadow Green (Site C) would be reconfigured by removing the existing parking spaces so that open space is immediately adjacent to the estuary shore. The building on Site C would be designed such that a public viewing and open area would wrap the building from the terminus of Washington Street and overlook the Meadow Green and Estuary.

Water Street, the main pedestrian walkway through Jack London Square, would be extended to the east through Sites F1, F2, and F-3 and would connect to a public access path along the Estuary shore at The Landing development, an existing residential development immediately east of the project area. The plaza area at the terminus of Broadway near Water Street and the Scott's Restaurant entrance would be improved for pedestrian circulation and activity by relocating the valet parking service closer to The Embarcadero.

The proposed project would also maintain the historic city street grid system, such that north/south view corridors along Clay, Washington, Broadway, Franklin, Webster, Harrison, and Alice Streets would be maintained through Jack London Square with glimpses of the Estuary.

ISSUE: Are Canary Island Palms an appropriate tree for use in this development?

Staff comment: Although several individuals have expressed concern with the proposed use of Canary Island Palms, staff feels that it is an appropriate choice for this location given limitations in growing conditions (salt intrusion and historic bay fill materials). The large stature of the trees will provide an attractive landscape statement, while preserving views to the water beneath the tall crowns. Further, the palms will complement the palms located along the San Francisco waterfront, across the bay. The Committee should comment about whether other tree choices need to be considered.

ISSUE: Water features should be incorporated throughout the development to complement the waterfront setting.

Staff comment: The redesigned proposal includes retaining existing water features and adding new ones, particularly in the area adjacent to Water 1. Are these features adequate, or should additional water elements be incorporated into the proposed development plan to further accentuate the unique waterfront setting?

ISSUE: The project affords the opportunity to incorporate public art into the public areas. Are there specific areas that should incorporate significant works of art?

Staff comment: This development affords opportunity to incorporate works of art into public areas in a variety of ways, including sculpture, street furniture, murals, friezes on parts of buildings or parking structures, etc. Staff believes that the applicant should be given specific direction regarding the preferred location and scale of public art that should be incorporated into the proposal. Some preliminary suggestions include the Amtrak parking structure wall (already mentioned); the theater building (Site D); the foot of Broadway; and the area around Heinhold's and Jack London's cabin.)

SUMMARY OF KEY DESIGN COMMENTS AND ISSUES:

The applicant and architect have worked successfully in reducing the mass and bulk of the proposed structures, strengthening the link between buildings and open areas, and improving pedestrian circulation. In this way, the individual components of the project are linked together to form a cohesive development that complements the surrounding built environment and waterfront setting.

Staff requests that the DRC review and comment on the identified key design elements listed 1 through 11 which are summarized below:

1. Site C

- Should the proposed structure have a third level?
- If the structure has an additional level, what design guidelines should guide development of the third level?

2. Site D

- Should the cinema building on Site D be taller?
- Is the building too boxy?
- Is the lobby entrance too narrow?

3. Pavilion 2

- Is the proposed location of Pavilion 2, adjacent to Water Street and the proposed turn-around at the terminus of Broadway acceptable?
- Is the proposed development at Pavilion 2 too symmetrical?

4. Water 1 Expansion

- No Design Review application for Water 1 Expansion has been submitted at this time.

5. 66 Franklin

- If larger building is built, is it acceptable to demolish the existing one?

6. Site F1

- Heinold's First and Last Chance Saloon is an historic resource and should be appropriately preserved through a variety of means. Suggestions include scaling the glass atrium back so it is a totally freestanding building; eliminating the large roof; and building a plaza or other features around Heinhold's and Jack London's cabin with other features honoring Jack London's life and times at the Oakland waterfront., etc.

7. Site F2

- Is upper level pedestrian over crossings acceptable?

8. Site F3

- Should the tower element of the hotel be increased in height?

9. Site G

- The garage structure includes a more substantial design element at the top and an architecturally integrated screen to obscure cars and vehicle headlights?
- Other means to break up the mass and bulk of the wall of the garage structure adjacent to the Amtrak station including punch outs, other geometric forms, lighting, colors and different materials.

10. Open Space and Pedestrian Access

- Are Canary Island Palms an appropriate tree for use in this development?
- Water features should be incorporated throughout the development to complement the waterfront setting.

- Are there specific areas that should incorporate significant works of art?

11. Other Issues the Design Review Committee May Identify

Staff requests that the Design Review Committee give further comments about these as well as any other issues at this meeting in order to aid staff and the applicant in further identifying aspects of the design review for this project that may warrant further attention or study. Following this meeting, the applicant will finalize drawings to be brought forward for final Design Review approval.

RECOMMENDED DRC ACTION:

To review the proposed design plans for the Jack London Square Redevelopment Project and give any comments pertaining to identified key issues or other issues regarding the design aspects of the project.

Respectfully Submitted,

Claudia Cappio
Development Director

Attachments:

1. Plans
2. Attachment B: Comparison Chart of November 2002 Submittal, Alternative #2 in DEIR and Design Review Submittal
3. JLS Redevelopment Massing Comparison, October 8, 2003
4. Applicable General Plan and Zoning Provisions