

Location:	7100 Mountain Boulevard (Leona Quarry – 128 acres)
Proposal:	Design Review of the Leona Quarry Residential Project PUD Design and Specifications Document. The Leona Quarry Residential Project consists of 423 residential units, a 2,300 square foot community center, 2-acre park and related site improvements on a 128-acre quarry site located at 7100 Mountain Boulevard.
Applicant:	DeSilva Group, LLC (Edward DeSilva, Principal).
Owner:	Gallagher Properties, Inc.
Case File Number:	ER 01-33
General Plan:	Mixed Housing Type and Resource Conservation Area.
Zoning:	R-30 One-Family Residential and R-50 Medium Density Residential Zones.
Environmental Determination:	A Subsequent Environmental Impact Report has been completed for the proposed project and approved by the Oakland City Council.
Service Delivery District:	IV – Hills Area.
City Council District:	6
Action to be Taken:	No action will be taken; discussion only of Design Review issues.
For further information:	Contact Major Projects Manager Claudia Cappio (510)238-2229

SUMMARY

This meeting is a follow-up to a design review requirement for the Leona Quarry Project. The project has been modified from the original approval in December 2002 to include a larger detention basin and to eliminate the 54 unit senior housing project at the base of Edwards Avenue. The modified project was approved by the City Council on February 17, 2004. As a condition of the project, the Design Review Committee was charged with reviewing and commenting on certain design considerations and materials as contained in the *PUD Design and Specifications Document*. This document will serve as the master plan for the subsequent phases of the project and has been prepared to comply with Condition of Approval 4, as follows:

The plans approved as part of the PUD shall be amended to be consistent with the Conditions of Approval and shall be submitted to the City Planning Department in the form of a "PUD Design and Specification Document for the Leona Quarry Project" within ninety (90) days of this Approval. This Design and Specification Document shall include but not be limited to all detailed plans and specifications pertaining to Condition of Approval No. 14 and all other information and details deemed necessary by the Planning Director or the Planning Director's designee.

During the DRC and Planning Commission review of this project in 2002, the following issues were identified:

- landscaping, pedestrian pathways and linkages
- building typology and form, (including building mass, layout and overall architectural character)
- building heights and profiles (as they pertain to the new residential development standards)
- streetscape, sidewalks and garage frontages, and
- the location of the Senior Housing, commercial space and community space.
(Note: the Senior Housing component has been removed from the project)

Staff considers each of these issues, was successfully resolved in the approved project, through revisions in the plans or through conditions of approval. As part of the design development and final review of this project prior to building plans being finalized, staff requests that the DRC provide any remaining comments about how the design review conditions have been addressed in the plans and whether the *PUD Design and Specifications Document* can be finalized.

BACKGROUND

The 128-acre Leona Quarry is located adjacent to I-580 and the Edwards Avenue interchange. The site extends east uphill to Campus Drive. After the publication of an initial Environmental Impact Report for this project a legal challenge was presented to the City regarding project approval. To comply with the direction of the Alameda County Superior Court (Dorsey, et al v. City of Oakland RG03-077607) the City prepared a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the project. In January, 2004, the City Council approved a Settlement Agreement with the neighborhood groups who had brought the legal action, and subsequently, the Council approved the modified project.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project approved by the City Council calls for 423 residential units, a 2,300 square foot community center and a two acre park on a 128 acre parcel located above the I-580 interchange at Edwards Avenue. The approved project provides for clustered residential development adjacent to Edwards Avenue on an existing active quarry site in the Oakland Hills, with 19 single-family homes fronting on Campus Drive. The project also includes a Village Green area, three tot lot areas and a slope restoration and revegetation program.

As part of the project, the site will undergo extensive reclamation, the provision of a Reclamation Plan and will include the restoration of open areas within the site. New roads within the development, a pedestrian trail system and a storm water retention and treatment facility are also included in the project. In addition, the City Council has approved the establishment of a Geologic Hazard Abatement District (GHAD) for the site.

DESIGN REVIEW ISSUES

Approved Development Plan and Compliance with Design Review Conditions

The purpose of this meeting is to receive comments on the proposed project from both the public and the Design Review Committee in conformance with Condition of Approval 4 for the project. The approved development plan refines the project in several important ways as a result of a) information contained in the SEIR, b) public comment on the plan, c) Staff level review and discussion, d) a more detailed review of site conditions by the project applicant, and e) a refinement of the design concept for the project through the design development process. We note that the overall disposition of residential units and site features in the approved development plan remains largely the same as that presented in the initial application. Access from Campus Drive to single-family home development on the upper portion of the site remains unchanged, as does the main access to development on the lower portion of the site from the intersection of Edwards Avenue and Freeway I-580. The key difference at the Edwards Avenue entrance is that the 54 unit senior building has been replaced by a green space with a small parking area.

The *PUD Design and Specifications Document* (Volumes 1, 2 and 3; dated January 9, 2004 with revisions dated March 1, 2004) contains development proposals and incorporates a number of design refinements that are described in detail in the following section of this report. Volume 1 contains the detailed plans as revised and refined during the past year. Volume 2 contains detailed specifications about materials, guidelines for implementation and other design details. Volume 3 includes the original schematic plans approved by the Commission and the City Council in 2002, for reference. The Planning Director has determined that the refinements and development of specifications and other details has not resulted in new significant environmental impacts or an increase in the severity of environmental effects compared to those analyzed in the EIR and SEIR completed for the project.

Response to Condition of Approval No. 4

A previously noted, Condition of Approval 4 states in part that *the PUD Design and Specifications Document* shall include but not be limited to all detailed plans and specifications pertaining to Condition of Approval No. 14. The text of Condition of Approval No. 14 is provided in full below, with Staff comments noted in *italics* for each item cited.

Project Design Requirements

14. The following design refinements, standards and requirements shall be incorporated into the final design plans for the project:
 - a. The design of the Gateway Senior Housing Project shall be revised to be more of a signature gateway design, with high quality materials and detailing appropriate to its tall height and prominent location close to the freeway. The design shall incorporate a greater degree of articulation and detailing, including a combination of window recess and trim that creates at least three inches of shadow and

articulation. The other major elements of the design to be revised include the roof forms, entry, and overall proportions. The revised design shall be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Committee of the Planning Commission as part of the design submittal required for compliance with Condition of Approval No. 4. b. Four of the retaining walls proposed shall be revised to be closer in compliance with zoning standards for height and distance separation. The following four areas of retaining walls shall be revised such that the maximum height of the walls is eight feet, with at least four feet of horizontal separation between walls.

- Retaining wall at the uppermost portion of “A” Street, near the roundabout
- Retaining Wall near the south property line abutting Altura Place
- Retaining Wall along the EVA in Parcel Y, near the cul-de-sac end of “I” Street
- Retaining Wall behind the Gateway Senior Housing on Parcel Z

Staff Comments: The Gateway Senior Housing Project proposed for a site east of the main entrance to the project was removed from project as a result of a Settlement Agreement reached between the petitioner.

Details of the other retaining walls noted above are shown in Volume 1 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document, Sheet L-5 and L-24. Section 7 of Volume 2 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document describes a variety of materials and textures of the retaining walls proposed for the project. Exhibit 1 of the Leona Quarry Reclamation Plan, dated March 2, 2004 contains information on the location of the rockfall and barrier fences for the site (see Sheet 3 of 5).

- b. The design of the Community Center shall be revised to be more consistent with the overall design theme and design elements used in other portions of the project. The size of the proposed facility shall not be required to be reduced. The final design shall be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Committee of the Planning Commission as part of the submittal required to comply with Condition of Approval No. 4.

Staff Comments: The revised design for the Community Center, shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheet AC –1, is now more consistent with the overall design theme and design elements used in other portions of the project.

- c. The design of the Terrace Buildings, 6-plex buildings, Product 8A, shall be revised. The roof forms and design of the west-facing, downhill side shall be revised to reduce the repetitiveness of the roof forms, and to introduce some degree of asymmetry. It will be acceptable to have the lower three stories of these buildings in one plane to create a more prominent central element that reduces the

repetition of roof forms and is differentiated from the roof forms of the fourth and fifth floors above. A gable roof rather than a hip in this area of the façade could be incorporated. The revised design shall be approved by the Planning Director; if there are issues that cannot be resolved between the applicant and the Planning Director the matter shall be referred for decision to the Design Review Committee of the Planning Commission. The revised design shall be incorporated into the submittal required as part of Condition of Approval 4.

Staff Comments: The revised design for the Terrace Buildings, 6-plex buildings, Product 8A, is shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheets A8-1 to A8-10. The roof forms and design of the west-facing, downhill side have been revised to reduce the repetitiveness of the roof forms, and a degree of asymmetry has been introduced into the design. The lower three stories of these buildings have been revised and simplified to provide a central element that avoids the repetition of roof forms and differentiates this part of the building from the roof forms of the floors above. A gable roof, rather than a hip roof, has been introduced into a portion of the façade of the building in response to the Condition of Approval (PUD Sheets A8-9 and A8-10)

- d. The massing of the Product 6A buildings shall be revised such that at least one unit within these four unit buildings is pushed forward or back in plan so that the garages are not lined up in a row, as follows:
- For lots 231 and 136, push these corner units forward towards the street at least 6 feet.
 - For the buildings with lots 212-215, 160-163, and 148-151, push at least one unit in each of these three buildings downhill at least 4 feet.
 - This requirement shall not apply to the building on lots 204-207.

Staff Comments: Lots 231 and 136 have been pushed forward towards the street by 6 feet (PUD, Volume 1, Sheets A6-2). At least one unit on Lots 212-215, 160-163, and 148-151 has been pushed back downhill by 4 feet.

- e. Product 7 shall be revised and refined to add more design variety in the following manner, to a level of design variety comparable to that of Product 6:
- Vary the siding material for different units
 - Vary the roof lines for different units and/or different buildings
 - Vary the porch railing designs
 - Vary the design of the entry roof forms
 - Vary the design of the arched design elements at the garage entrances

Staff Comments: Product 7 has been and refined to conform with the Condition of Approval as shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheets A7-7, A7-8 and A7-9, including the design of arched elements at garage entrances.

- f. The siding materials of Products 6 and 7 on “I” and “J” Streets shall be revised and refined to include more of a mix of stucco and siding within each building, rather than alternating buildings of stucco and siding.

Staff Comments: Products 6 and 7 have been and refined to conform with Condition of Approval as shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheets A6-7 and A6-8. The building exterior materials have been revised to include a greater of a mix of stucco and siding on the elevations.

- g. For Products 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7, the end units of the buildings at the ends of the blocks (both downhill and uphill units) shall be revised to include more windows, and a significantly greater degree of articulation through the use of elements such as bay windows, entry porches, etc.

Staff Comments: The elevations of the end units of Products 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7, (both downhill and uphill) have be revised to include additional elements such as bay windows and entry porches to provide a greater degree of articulation, as shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheets A1-4, A2-1, A2-3, A6-2, A7-7, A7-8 and A7-9.

- h. A special inspector shall be hired at the applicant’s expense to verify compliance with all building heights shown in the approved plans for all building types. The inspection shall occur at the completion of the framing stage of construction, prior to installation of building siding. The inspector shall be a surveyor or other licensed professional, and shall verify in writing to the City that the buildings constructed do not exceed the heights shown on the approved plans referenced in Condition of Approval 1. This special inspector shall be identified in the Construction Phasing and Management Plan required by Condition of Approval 41.

Staff Comments: This Condition of Approval provides a way to determine compliance with all building heights shown in the approved plans for all building types. As shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheet A1-3, dormer elements at roof level would not exceed a total of 4 feet above the height limit (total of 30 units with a two foot long dormer gable end exceeding the 4 foot limit); PUD Sheet A3-2 indicates that dormer elements at roof level would not exceed a total of 2 feet above the height limit (total of 2 units); and PUD, Volume 1, D Sheet A6-5 indicates that dormer elements at roof level would not exceed a total of 4 feet above the height limit (total of 22 units, with a two foot long dormer gable end exceeding the 4 foot limit).

In addition, we note that the text of Item 17, "Exceptions", of Exhibit "D" General Findings Related to Approval of Leona Quarry by the Oakland City Council (February 17, 2004) deals with certain exceptions to height requirements. The last paragraph of Item 17 states that the maximum heights noted in this section may be exceeded by up to 8 feet for gable ends and dormers and 15 feet wide or less. This condition occurs at points throughout the project and cannot be finally confirmed until the finished floor elevations are set. A certain amount of leeway was deemed appropriate given the complexity of the steepness, grading, drainage and other site constraints.

- i. The height of the Product 5 buildings shall not exceed 40 feet, as measured per the zoning code standard method from finished grade to top of roof.

Staff Comments: As shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheet A5-3 the height of the Product 5 buildings does not exceed 40 feet, as measured per the zoning code (total of 25 units, with a two foot long dormer gable end exceeding the 40 foot height limit).

- j. The height of Product 1, Phase I Downhill Condos, shall be revised and reduced to conform to the drawings submitted on October 14, 2002, entitled 6/7 – Plex Condos, Product, Section.

Staff Comments: As shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheet A1-3, dormer elements at roof level would not exceed a total of 4 feet above the height limit (total of 30 units, with a two foot long dormer gable end exceeding the 4 foot limit). (See also 14 h. above).

- k. The final site plan shall provide for a minimum of 10 feet from the back of the sidewalk to the face of the buildings of the Product 4 Village Green units, in all conditions where the buildings front on streets.

Staff Comments: PUD, Volume 1, Sheet A4-1 illustrates a minimum of 10 feet from the back of the sidewalk to the face of the buildings of the Product 4 Village Green units.

- l. Product 4B of the Village Green units shall be revised as follows:
 - On the left side of the buildings (as viewed in the elevations), a planter box shall be added in front of the garage wall to add articulation to the façade, such planter box to be a minimum of three feet tall and 2.5 feet deep.
 - On the right side of the buildings (as viewed in the elevations), a planter box shall be added in front of the garage wall to add articulation to the façade, such planter box to be a minimum of three feet tall and 2.5 feet deep; and a bay window shall be added in the first floor living room projecting forward of the main façade at least 2.5 feet.

Staff Comments: PUD, Volume 1, Sheet A4-7 illustrates a planter box on the left and right side of the building. PUD Sheet A4-7 also indicates the provision of a bay window on the first floor living room elevation projecting 2.5 feet beyond the face of the main building façade.

- m. For Products 1 and 2, Phase I uphill and downhill units, the entry stoops and steps of the units shall be revised such that they project forward of the front plane of the garage structure two to four feet, and such that the entry arch or awning also extends forward of the main plane of the façade, covering the stoop.

Staff Comments: PUD, Volume 1, Sheet A1-4 illustrates the provision of the entry stoops and steps projecting from two to four feet beyond of the plane of the garage structure such that the entry arch or awning also extends to cover the entry stoop.

- n. The following detailed requirements and specifications for all of the following features shall be incorporated into the “*PUD Design and Specification Document for the Leona Quarry Project*”. This document shall be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Committee of the Planning Commission, with the benefit of the recommendations of the Planning Director:
- *Retaining Walls:* The design of all the retaining walls shall be constructed of attractive quality materials, and shall have landscaping planted at the base to minimize the visibility and height of the retaining walls when they are located in a location visible from public streets. Basic concrete block will not be an acceptable material. The retaining wall at the top of “A” Street shall be of the highest quality material because there is no landscaping immediately in front of the wall.

Staff Comments: The overall site layout of site walls and fences are shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheet L-5. Details and landscape elements, including site walls and materials, are illustrated on PUD Sheets L-7 through L-25. The location of walls and fencing is indicated on PUD Sheets L-8, L-9, L-11, L-12, L-15, L-17, L-18, L-19, L-22, L-23 and L-24. Retaining wall details are depicted on PUD Sheets L-7, L-8A, and L-24.

As stated on PUD, Volume 1, Sheet L-5 there is no longer a need for a retaining wall at the top of “A” Street due to a revision in site grading. The area at the top of “A” Street will now consist of a revegetated slope and alternating shrubs and ground cover.

- *Garage Doors and Entry Doors:* The design and color of the garage doors and entry doors shall be varied throughout the project, and there shall be a variety of designs and colors within each Product Type.

Staff Comments: The final design and color selection of the garage doors and entry doors has yet to be made. However, Volume 2 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document provides an extensive selection of exterior materials to be used in the project. The City Planning Director, or designee, shall work with the project applicant in selecting the final materials and colors for the project, making sure that the choices will be varied throughout the project employing a variety of designs and colors within each Product Type. The array of materials and colors provides an appropriate palette for variety and interest.

- *Driveway Surfaces:* All driveways shall be colored to be in the darker tone range, to reduce the prominence of the paved surfaces within the streetscape area. The use of stamped concrete is strongly encouraged.

Staff Comments: Materials for driveway surfaces and paved surfaces are shown on PUD, Volume 1, Sheets L-5 PUD Sheets L-9, L-12, L-13, L-14, L-17, L-18, L-19, L-20, L-21, and L-22. See Garage Doors and Entry Doors comments above.

- *Uphill Driveways:* For all driveways serving townhouses on uphill lots (specifically on "I", "J" and "B" streets, where such driveways are on-grade driveways) twenty percent of the 16 foot by 20 foot driveway area shall be pervious surface.

Staff Comments: The submission for this design review did not include details of the surfaces for individual units. However, the project will be subject to this Condition of Approval when drawings are submitted for building permit approval.

- *Exterior Material for all Product Types using Siding:* Hardiplank or equivalent siding, in 4, 6, and 8 inch sizes. Hardiplank or equivalent should have a maximum of 8 inches of exposure.

Staff Comments: Volume 2 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document provides an extensive selection of exterior materials to be used in the project, including the examples of Hardiplank or its equivalent siding. The City Planning Director, or designee, shall work with the project applicant in selecting the final materials and colors for the project, making sure that the selected siding will have a maximum of 8 inches of exposure. Exterior materials are called out on PUD Sheets A1-4, A3-1, A2-3, A4-6, A4-7, A5-2, A5-4, A6-2, A6-7, A6-8, A6-9, A7-7, A7-8, A8-9, A8-9, A8-10 and AC-1.

- *Exterior Siding Finishes for Stucco:* Stucco finishes shall be specified for all product types.

Staff Comments: Exterior materials are called out on PUD, Volume 1, Sheets A1-4, A3-1, A2-3, A4-6, A4-7, A5-2, A5-4, A6-2, A6-7, A6-8, A6-9, A7-7, A7-8, A8-9, A8-9, A8-10 and AC-1.

- *Window Types:* Milgard vinyl windows or equivalent as a minimum standard of quality throughout the project. Wood windows or vinyl-clad wood windows may also be used.

Staff Comments: Volume 2 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document provides an extensive selection of exterior materials to be used in the project, including the examples of Milgard vinyl windows or the equivalent. Window materials are referenced on PUD Sheets A1-4, A3-1, A2-3, A4-6, A4-7, A5-2, A5-4, A6-2, A6-7, A6-8, A6-9, A7-7, A7-8, A8-9, A8-9, A8-10 and AC-1. The City Planning Director, or designee, shall work with the project applicant in selecting the final window materials.

- *Window Recess and Trim Details:* For all windows in Products 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, dimensions of window recess and trim shall be at least of the minimum dimensions specified in the drawing dated 10.14.02 and entitled "Alt. Window Head/Sill Trim Siding (Single Hung Typ.) The general parameter established in this drawing which shall be a requirement is that there shall be a minimum of 3 inches of articulation created by a combination of window recess (face of window to face of siding), and trim projection (face of trim to face of siding). The same parameter shall apply to the stucco buildings of Product 8 (Terrace Units). However the details shall be developed specific to that Product Type, and may include recessed surrounds in lieu of trim.

Staff Comments: Section 10 of Volume 2 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document provides head/sill and recessed window details for three conditions. The detail for siding finish and stucco finish condition indicates approximately three (3) inches from face of trim to the face of the window glass. The recessed window detail indicates a dimension of approximately two and one quarter inches (2 1/4) for this condition.

- *Roof Materials:* Specified as composition shingle, of a quality and depth equivalent to Landmark TL by Certainteed. Concrete tiles may also be acceptable, to be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Committee of the Planning Commission.

Staff Comments: Section 1 of Volume 2 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document provides an array of roofing materials, including Landmark TL by Certainteed roofing, that may be used on the project. The introduction to Volume 2 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document states that Certainteed

Landmark TL roofing has been established as a minimum standard for the project.

- *Railings:* Minimum dimension of 2 inches by 4 inches (nominal dimensions) for the main members and 2 inches by 2 inches (nominal dimensions) for pickets. Specify wood railings for stucco buildings. Metal railings can be used in some of the shingled buildings or shingled parts of buildings.

Staff Comments: Section 4 of Volume 2 of the PUD Design and Specifications Document provides examples of railings, guardrails and decks for the project. The introduction to Volume 2 of the PUD states that main members will have a minimum dimension of 2 inches by 4 inches (nominal dimensions) and that the minimum dimension for pickets will be 2 inches by 2 inches (nominal dimensions). The City Planning Director, or designee, shall work with the project applicant in the final selection of these materials for the project.

- *Exterior Colors:* Windows shall be a sand or beige color, not white. Colors shall be as shown in the colored renderings shown in the Plans described in Condition #1, and as shown in the Primary and Secondary colors submitted in the color board. The tertiary colors shown on the color board are not approved for use.

Staff Comments: The City Planning Director, or designee, shall work with the project applicant in the final selection of colors for individual building units and structures.

- *Master Sign Program:* A master sign program for the site shall be submitted, including all project identification and directional signs, temporary real estate sales signs and/or banners and street signs, and other signs for the site.

Staff Comments: A Master Sign Program is in development for the project and will be finalized as site and landscape plans are confirmed. A project monument sign is anticipated for the entrance to the site at Mountain Boulevard and mailbox cluster prototype is shown on Volume 1 PUD Sheet L-2. The City Planning Director, or designee, shall assist the project applicant in the final selection of sign program materials for the project. The DRC may indicate whether this detail can remain at staff level for final review or whether these details should return to the Committee.

- *Lighting Plan:* The Project Applicant shall implement Mitigation Measure 3a as set forth in the MMRP by submission of a lighting plan for each phase of development to the Department of Building Services for review and approval, prior to issuance of the first building permit for each phase of the project.
(MM#M.3a)

Staff Comments: Volume 1, PUD Design and Specifications Document, Sheet L-6 contains an overall lighting plan for the site. Landscape Vignettes, Sheets L-7 to L-22 provide the location of lighting fixtures and specify decorative street luminaries. Section 6, Volume 2, PUD Design and Specifications Document illustrated various lighting elements, posts and fixtures. The City Planning Director, or designee, shall agree with the project applicant on the final selection of lighting plan materials for the project.

Staff understands that as the project moves forward there will be aspects of the design that will need further review, refinement and greater specificity. These design aspects include but are not limited to, coordination with Condition of Approval 19 (public improvements), coordination of the more cultivated landscaping design with the revegetation plan, master sign program details, selection, design and layout of the open space at the entrance to the site and the design details of the village green, pathways and other open space areas. The Development Director or his or her designee will continue to work with the project applicant on these aspects of implementation. The DRC should review this approach and indicate whether it is acceptable or if there are certain design details that would require further review by the Committee.

RECOMMENDED DRC ACTION:

- 1) To review the *PUD Design and Specifications Document* for the Leona Quarry Project.
- 2) To provide comments and to indicate whether further changes or refinements are required to comply with the design conditions and requirements.
- 3) If deemed acceptable, to approve the document as submitted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Claudia Cappio
Development Director

Attachments:

1. *PUD Design and Specifications Document (Volumes 1, 2 and 3)* -- available at the Planning Department, 250 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Suite 3330, Oakland, CA