

July 12, 2004

TO:	Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB)
FROM:	Planning and Zoning Staff
SUBJECT:	1720 MacArthur Blvd. – Altnheim: Design Review of a two-phase proposal including demolition of the kitchen and infirmary wings and the boiler house, renovation of existing buildings and new construction of three buildings totaling 174 studio and one-bedroom units for use as affordable senior housing and associated uses. The existing Excelsior Building will remain for use by the Altnheim Association as a language school, and for cultural events and administrative functions. Review and comment on the Historic Resources report and the historic and cultural resource issues per the Initial Study and Environmental Assessment in support of a Mitigated Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact (MND/FONSI).

INTRODUCTION

This project is before the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) for design review and comments on historic and cultural resource issues as they relate to 1720 MacArthur Blvd., commonly known as the “Altnheim”, including demolition of the kitchen and infirmary wings and the boiler house, renovation of existing buildings and new construction of three buildings totaling 174 studio and one-bedroom units for use as affordable senior housing and associated uses, 58 on-site parking spaces, and landscaping. Staff is recommending LPAB recommend design review approval, with conditions, to the Planning Commission. LPAB comments on the historic and cultural resource issues will also be forwarded to the Planning Commission.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located at 1720 MacArthur Boulevard in Oakland’s Dimond/Glenview District. The project is generally bounded by Excelsior Avenue to the north, MacArthur Boulevard to the south and east, and single-family residences to the west along MacArthur Boulevard, Miami Court and Excelsior Avenue. The project site sits at the crest of a hill, with the crest tending to the north. The project site is predominantly flat in the vicinity of the main buildings; the remainder of the site slopes moderately downward to the east, west and south.

The project sponsor, Citizens Housing Corporation, proposes to develop an estimated 174 affordable studio and one-bedroom apartments for seniors at the 6.1-acre facility known as the Altnheim. The project would reconfigure and convert existing dormitory

facilities into apartments, and construct three new wings of apartments on the western portion of the site. Construction of the new wings would result in demolition of an existing boiler house, kitchen and infirmary wings, asphalt surface parking lot, a small garden area, and relocation of telecommunications facilities to another location on-site. The project would not result in any change to the Excelsior Building or the approximately three acres of gardens along the eastern side of the site.

Each new building wing would be three to four stories, with a maximum of 49 feet for four stories. The height of the new wings is the same or below that of the existing buildings, and would be designed to complement the architecture of existing buildings. The project would provide an estimated 58 on-site parking spaces. In addition, limited unmarked parking is available along the circular driveway in front of the Administrative Building.

The project would also add two new driveways to the site, one to provide additional access from MacArthur Boulevard along the western perimeter of the site to a surface parking lot, and another to provide additional access from Excelsior Avenue. The project would also realign the existing driveway from Excelsior Avenue to align with Elston Avenue. The project sponsor proposes to add landscaping, including landscaping along the site's edges where new construction is proposed and street trees along MacArthur Blvd. and Excelsior to provide a buffer between the new residential wings and adjacent residences. The project would also improve electrical, plumbing, heating, and mechanical systems for all existing parts of the building complex.

Historic Status

The Altenheim complex meets the definition of an historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Altenheim is rated by the City of Oakland's Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey as an "A," which means 'highest importance.' The project has been designed to conform to the *Standards for Rehabilitation (Rehabilitation Standards)* contained in *The Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.

BACKGROUND

The Altenheim was before the LPAB for a Notice of Intent to Landmark in December 2002. Since then, when the Board was informed of an impending project at the Altenheim, the Board has toured the Altenheim, an Altenheim LPAB sub-committee was formed, and progress on the forthcoming project has been reported to the Board. Excerpts from previous meetings are attached for information and background.

GENERAL PLAN

The site is a historic resource per the Historic Preservation Element, Policy 3.8, as follows:

For purposes of environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act, the following properties will constitute the City of Oakland's Local Register of Historical Resources.

2) Those Potential Designated Historic Properties that have an existing rating of "A" or "B".

Although not officially designated, as a Potential Designated Historic Property with an "A" rating" (highest importance) by the City of Oakland's Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS), the Altheim is part of the City of Oakland's Local Register of Historic Resources.

Historic Preservation Element - Policy 3.5: Historic Preservation and Discretionary Permit Approvals

Policy 3.5 states that for additions or alterations to Potential Designated Historic Properties requiring discretionary City permits, the City will make a finding that:

1. the design matches or is compatible with, but not necessarily identical to, the property's existing or historical design; or
2. the proposed design comprehensively modifies and is at least equal in quality to the existing design and is compatible with the character of the neighborhood; or
3. the existing design is undistinguished and does not warrant retention and the proposed design is compatible with the character of the neighborhood.

Staff believes that finding (1) could be made. The Historic Resources and Design Review Report finds that the proposed project appears to be compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Rehabilitation Standards. The State Office of Historic Preservation has consulted with the project sponsor and has indicated that preliminarily, the project conforms to the Secretary's Standards. (See discussion below under Design Review.)

Environmental Review – Cultural Resources

The City has prepared an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) in support of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Finding of No Significant Impact. The IS/EA is included with this report.

The IS/EA found two Impacts (one potentially significant, but Mitigation Measure provided, and one Less than Significant) based on the City of Oakland CEQA

Significance Thresholds. Based on the City's Thresholds, the project would have a significant impact on the environment if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5. Specifically, substantial adverse changes include physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be "materially impaired"; the significance of an historical resource is "materially impaired" when a project demolishes or materially alters, in an adverse manner, those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion on an historical resource list (including the California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historical Resources, Local Register, and historical resources survey form;)
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource on site or unique geologic feature; or.
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Environmental Analysis

Proposed Demolition

The historic character of the Altemheim complex is defined by its spatial organization of wings and nodal connections, its historic features at the exterior elevations and the interior common spaces of the complex. The garden at the east end of the property is also a defining characteristic of the site. All of the above elements are retained in the proposed project.

The proposed elements to be demolished include the kitchen wing, infirmary wing and boiler house. They are utilitarian in nature, have had extensive alterations and contain relatively few character-defining features. All are located in the least visually sensitive areas of the site. In addition, the kitchen and infirmary functions will not be utilized in the proposed project and the boiler house will no longer function for that purpose.

The Historic Report finds that "when viewed in the overall context of the proposed project, the removal of these less significant components of the complex is the least destructive way to accomplish Standard 1" of the Secretary of Interior's Standards (i.e., use the property as it was used historically with minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment). The Historic Report, therefore, finds that the proposed demolition does not impact the historical significance of the overall complex and should not jeopardize the Altemheim's eligibility for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. This finding is also in compliance with the City's thresholds.

Archaeological Resources

The IS/EA identifies the following Potentially Significant Impact.

Impact CR-1: Ground-disturbing activities could affect subsurface historical archaeological resources and cultural resources. (Potentially Significant).

Mitigation Measure CR-1: If archaeological or cultural materials are accidentally discovered at the site, the project sponsor shall immediately cease construction in the vicinity of the resource until the City and a consulting archaeologist make a determination of whether the materials are unique based on the definition provided in Public Resources Code 21083.2(g). The City and the project sponsor, in consultation with the cultural resources expert, shall make a reasonable effort to avoid damaging effects, as contained in Public Resource Code 21083.2(B).

This Mitigation Measure also ensures that the project complies with the City's Thresholds.

Changes to Potential Designated Historic Properties

Neighboring Area of Secondary Importance –Elston Avenue District
The Altenheim

The IS/EA identifies the following Less than Significant Impact.

Impact CR-2: The proposed project could result in changes to Potentially Designated Historic Properties. (Less than Significant)

Neighboring Area of Secondary Importance –Elston Avenue District:

Because the proposed additions and alterations to the Altenheim site will be placed within the Altenheim property boundaries, the potential impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhood are minimal. Potential impacts include sight lines to and from the surrounding residential properties and shadowing from the potential new structures. The Area of Potential Effect for the surrounding neighborhood is bounded by: the western blocks of MacArthur Blvd. between Sheffield and Woodruff Avenues, Woodruff Avenue, Excelsior Avenue Between Woodruff and Elston Avenues, the southern two properties of Elston Avenue, Excelsior Avenue to MacArthur Blvd., and MacArthur Blvd. surrounding the southern boundary of the Altenheim site and returning to Sheffield Avenue. (See Appendix A-Historic Report.)

The properties within the Area of Potential Effect represent an intact, though substantially altered, residential neighborhood, constructed between approximately 1910

and 1935. The Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey identifies the properties on both sides of Elston Avenue as the Elston Avenue District, an Area of Secondary Importance.

The IS/EA found that because of the distinct and clearly separate architecture of the historic Elston Avenue District (an Area of Secondary Importance per the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey), and the separate and cohesive site and architecture of the Altenheim complex on a clearly separate piece of land, the ASI would not be affected. It should be noted that with respect to shadows, Citizens Housing redesigned the original massing concept to break up the original proposed building along the west edge of the property into two smaller buildings. This redesign was based on extensive community input at meetings with Citizens Housing and their architect.

The Altenheim:

The IS/EA also found that the proposed project would generally conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards (See discussion under Zoning-Design Review.) Compliance with the Secretary's Standards would be ensured by the implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1, below:

Mitigation Measure CR-2: Through the design review process, conditions of approval shall incorporate construction and rehabilitation standards consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Please see Conditions of Approval attached.

Section 106

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a consultation process for any federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted project. The process requires a consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer. The proposed project is subject to the Section 106 consultation process because it would be partially funded with funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In addition, the project is expected to seek historic tax credits, and would therefore be required to use the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, which provides standards for preserving, rehabilitating, restoring and/or reconstructing historic properties.

The State Office of Historic Preservation has consulted with the project sponsor and has indicated that preliminarily, the project conforms to the Secretary's Standards. See discussion below under Zoning –Design Review, Compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

ZONING – Design Review

The property is zoned R-50 (Medium Density Residential Zone). In the R-50 zone, if a project results in three or more dwelling units on a lot, plans for the proposal shall be approved pursuant to the Design Review procedure in Chapter 17.136.

Design Review Criteria (Chapter 17.136.070) for Residential Facilities are:

1. That the proposed design will create a building or set of buildings that are well related to the surrounding area in their setting, scale, bulk, height, materials and textures;
2. That the proposed design will protect, preserve, or enhance desirable neighborhood characteristics;
3. That the proposed design will be sensitive to the topography and landscape;
4. That, if situated on a hill, the design and massing of the proposed building relates to the grade of the hill;
5. That the proposed design conforms in all significant respects with the Oakland Comprehensive Plan and with any applicable district plan or development control map which has been adopted by the City Council.

Staff believes that the above findings can be made. The Historic Resources and Design Review Report finds that the proposed project appears to be compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Rehabilitation Standards. The State Office of Historic Preservation has consulted with the project sponsor and has indicated that preliminarily, the project conforms to the Secretary's Standards. (See discussion below.)

The Director has referred this project to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) for design review, based on its historic status and recent review by the LPAB for a *Notice of Intent to Landmark*. Additionally, the Initial Study and Environmental Assessment in Support of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Finding of No Significant Impact (IS/EA) finds that the "proposed project could result in changes to Potentially Designated Historic Properties". This is a Less than Significant impact ensured by Mitigation Measure CR-2. Mitigation CR-2 states:

Through the design review process, conditions of approval shall incorporate construction and rehabilitation standards consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Proposed Conditions of Approval are attached to this report. Staff suggests that the LPAB review and discuss these and make modifications and/or additions.

The State Office of Historic Preservation has consulted with the project sponsor and has indicated that preliminarily, the project conforms to the Secretary's Standards. Under CEQA, conformance to the Secretary's Standards, the proposed project would not have a significant adverse effect on an historic resource. Conformance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation is addressed in the IS/EA and summarized below:

Compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

Standard 1: A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

The IS/EA finds that the project would be consistent with this standard. The Altenheim was designed for senior housing and would continue to be used for senior housing. Character-defining elements of the exterior of the buildings would remain in place, including exterior materials and features in addition to no changes to interior ceiling heights, and hallway widths and heights. Other character-defining features of the project would also be retained or replaced in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards when it could not be saved, including the historic wood sash throughout the building complex. The three-acre onsite eastern garden area would not be affected by the project. The proposed connecting bridges from new wings to existing wings are positioned to use existing door openings and porches.

Standard 2: Retention and preservation of the historic character of the project site, with minimal removal of historic materials or alteration of character-defining features.

The IS/EA finds that the overall historic character of the complex would remain despite the removal of the two building wings and the boiler house. The site boundaries would remain unchanged, and the removal would leave the spatial organization of the wings and nodal connections unchanged. The new wings are connected to the existing buildings using a design parti that is similar to the historic wings of the building. These wings and the adjacent parking areas will be constructed in the least significant areas of the property, most of which have been previously developed.

Standard 3: Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

The IS/EA finds that the new additions to the existing complex would not create a false sense of history and would complement existing architectural features without creating false architectural references. The new additions would be similar in height, bulk, and exterior coloring. The new additions complement the existing buildings without copying discrete features of those buildings. The materials used on the exteriors of the new wings will be different from those on the original buildings.

Standard 4: Most buildings change over time; those changes that have achieved historic significance shall be retained and preserved.

The IS/EA finds that the proposed project would minimize changes so that the historic significance of character-defining features of the complex are retained. The most substantial alterations that include character-defining features are the expansion of the dining hall (1914-1915-incorporated the same interior finishes and details as the original portion of the dining room and will remain) and the addition of a second floor to the administration building in 1938. The second floor of the administration building includes character-defining features which will remain, including interior finishes and wood detailing, grandfather clock and donor wall, domed skylight with first floor oculus and Moderne elements such as steel casement windows.

Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize an historic property shall be preserved.

The exterior of the complex and the distinctive features and finishes of the common areas would be retained. Work required at the three bridges that would link original building wings with new building wings is small in comparison to the massive amount of exterior surface that would be untouched by the project.

Standard 6: Historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

The buildings appear to be in generally good condition. The current proposal for rehabilitation calls out few specific areas of repair or replacement. For example, the window casings may be in such poor condition that they cannot be repaired. If so, the project sponsor would replace the casings with casings that match in design, color texture, and other visual qualities, as well as materials. The Conditions of Approval require the project sponsor to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Although the current plan does not specifically mention cleaning of the exterior of the existing complex, the Condition of Approval require that this standard must be followed if exterior cleaning is required at a later time.

Standard 8: Significant archaeological resources affected by the project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Mitigation Measure CR-1 (Page 4) addresses this standard. In addition, an April 12, 2004 report from the Northwest Information Center indicates that the proposed project area contains no recorded Native American or historic period archaeological

resources listed with the Historic Resources Information System. The report also states that there is a moderate possibility of identifying Native American and a moderate to high possibility of identifying historic-period resources in the project area. Mitigation CR-1 outlines requirements if archaeological or cultural materials are discovered at the site.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment

See discussion under #3 above.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would not be impaired.

The IS/EA finds that all three new wings would be easily distinguishable by their architecture that would complement the existing historic complex, but would have minimal contact with the façade of the complex. The three new building wings would be connected to the existing complex by bridges that make use of existing openings and porches, in order to minimize the effect of the three bridges on the historic complex. Therefore, all three wings could be removed in the future without substantially affecting the complex.

ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

1. Results from the LPAB Sub-Committee Review – May 20, 2004

The LPAB Altenheim Sub-Committee (Gilmartin, Armstrong) met with the applicant and staff on May 20, 2004. Following are comments:

- Request for more detail in the form of a narrative with respect to the design approach to character-defining features.

Staff Response: Please see Attachment B – “The Altenheim Senior Housing Design Approach” which has been submitted by the architect in response to this request.

- Discussion of the timeline for City Landmark Designation.

Staff recommends a Condition of Approval (See Conditions #7) requiring that the LPAB proceed with the Notice of Intent to Landmark the Altenheim following completion of project review by the Planning Commission scheduled for the August 4,

2004 Planning Commission meeting. The Notice of Intent to Landmark would be placed on the next LPAB agenda.

- Discussion of the proposed parapet material – cement board panels; questioning why they were different from the remainder of the building finish – stucco.

Staff suggests that the Board discuss this issue and recommend that the parapet be finished in stucco.

- Discussion of design details

While the proposed design complements the historic architecture with respect to massing, bulk, and scale, staff recommends that the Board review some details that would enhance the quality of the proposed design to more closely reflect the quality and attention to detail of the existing historic architecture.

- Window recess depth

The proposed vinyl windows are not recessed from the building plane. A small recess is provided by the application of the window trim onto the face of the stucco. Staff suggests that the Board recommend a condition of approval requiring a greater recess.

- Proposed rail material

The proposed rails are used to provide interest to facades and porches. Currently, the applicant is proposing tubular metal. Staff suggests that since these are limited, and therefore would not create a significant project expense, that the Board consider a condition of approval requiring solid stock wrought iron.

2. Neighborhood Concerns Regarding New Proposed Building #8 along Excelsior – Setback and Height

Staff has received a letter from Neighborhood Associations (See Attachment E) expressing concern about Building #8's proposed setback along Excelsior and proposed height.

Based on the City's definitions of Lot Types and Lot Lines and Yards, the Altenheim lot could be interpreted in two ways. Staff is using the most restrictive of these interpretations (requires the greatest setback) to allow the most public benefit. This interpretation would result in the shorter length of the Altenheim lot along MacArthur Blvd. (along the east garden edge) as the front of the lot, the edges along both Excelsior Avenue and the long edge of MacArthur Blvd. as Side Yards – Street Sides and the west edge of the Altenheim lot as the rear of the lot. The minimum yards under 17.24.140 for the R-50 zone are:

Front Yard – 15 feet

Side Yard-Street Side – 7.5 feet, as prescribed in section 17.108.060(A.) In all residential zones, on every corner lot which abuts to the rear a key lot (i.e., the first interior lot to the rear of a reversed corner lot, with its front lot line being substantially a continuation of a side lot line of the reversed corner lot), there shall be provided on the street side of such corner lot a side yard with a minimum width equal to one-half of the minimum front yard depth required on the key lot and no less than the minimum side yard width required along an interior side lot line on the corner lot. Therefore, the minimum yard along the Excelsior Avenue street side lot would be one-half of the Front Yard or 7.5 feet.

Rear Yard – 15 feet.

The letter outlines the following concerns:

1. The building height and setback will overwhelm the small street.

Staff Response:

The building setback, 15 feet, (with front porch setback 11 feet) is well within the 7.5 feet required setback for this site. The setback of this building was reduced early in the design process in response to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) direction to clearly distinguish this new building from the historic buildings to either side. SHPO stated that Building #8's original setback of 30 feet (building face) and 25 feet (building porch) was too similar to the historic Buildings #1 and #3 setback of 30 feet (building face) and 24 feet (building porch). The current proposed setback of 15 feet for the building façade (11 feet for the porch) is further setback than the existing adjacent Excelsior Building to the west, which has an 11 foot setback.

The building height, 36 feet, is 6 feet over the maximum 30 feet requirement for the R-50 zone. This will require a variance. Staff believes the variance for the additional 6 feet can be supported. The proposed building height is not out of scale with existing buildings located to the east and west of Building #8 (Buildings #1, #3, #7). The proposed height, massing and bulk of Building #8 compliments the existing historic architecture's massing bulk and height.

In addition, the proposed street trees along Excelsior, Red Sunset (fast growth to 40 ft.), Raywood (fast growth to 25 – 30 ft.), Liriodendron tulipifera (fast growth to 60 – 80 ft.), or the Tristania Conferta (fast growth to 30 – 60 ft.) will provide a strong buffer along this street. Additionally there is a five-foot planting strip on the site with one tree proposed in front of Building #8. Staff would not recommend any building setback at the third floor as a building setback would not be consistent with the existing historic buildings' massing.

2. Most of the buildings have larger setbacks, with the exception of the Excelsior building and it does not meet existing zoning setback requirements.

Staff Response:

The existing buildings along Excelsior have setbacks between 11 and 26 feet. The proposed 15 foot setback for Building #8 is twice that required. All of the existing buildings, including the Excelsior are within current requirements.

3. The original plans depicted a setback of approximately 25 feet with adequate room for landscaping. Neighborhood letters of support were based on those plans. The new small setback will provide inadequate room for a landscape screen. The landscape screening will take years to mature and power lines will impede tall growth of trees meaning that landscaping cannot fully address his issue.

Staff Response:

The original proposed new building #8 was set back 25 feet with a landscape strip of about 15 feet. There were three trees proposed in the landscape strip. No street trees were proposed. The entire community was not in support of the project due to the four-story, 188 foot long proposed Building #9 along the west edge of the property. The change in setback was done in response to direction from SHPO to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Staff Recommendation

Staff supports the current proposal based on the above responses. Staff suggests that the LPAB consider requiring one to two additional trees within the on-site landscape strip as was originally proposed. Additionally, the Board could recommend that the size of the trees (on-site and street trees) at the time of planting be increased to a 24" box size in order to create a greater buffer immediately. As noted above, all of the proposed street trees are fast growing.

SUMMARY

The proposed development rehabilitates and preserves the historical residential buildings and the grounds. The project follows the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The proposed new wings with bridge connections complement the historic architecture without creating false architectural references. The scale, massing and site locations of the proposed new wings complement the existing scale, massing and site design of the historic Altenheim complex. Additional site landscaping and street trees will enhance the neighborhood. The applicant and consultants have worked extensively with the community to keep them informed and to resolve traffic, historic and design issues in a way that enhances the historic Altenheim complex. In response to

community concerns, the project has been redesigned, and refined, to address community concerns, including complete redesign of Building #9 into two smaller, relocated buildings, and the addition of street trees to work as buffers along streets where new construction is proposed. While there are minor design issues outlined for discussion in the report that may require refinement as design development progresses, staff believes the proposal would meet the required Design Review and Historic Preservation Policy 3.5 findings subject to the attached conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Receive any testimony from the applicant and interested citizens;
2. Review and comment on the Historic Resource report and the historic and cultural resource issues in the Initial Study and Environmental Assessment in Support of a Mitigated Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact;
3. Discuss outlined issues of concern and give direction to staff on these and any other issues raised by the Board;
4. Determine that the design matches or is compatible with, but not necessarily identical to, the property's existing or historical design (Finding for HPE Policy 3.5);
5. Determine that the proposal, with specific direction on any design issues raised by the Board/report, meets the design criteria;
5. Recommend Design Review approval to the Planning Commission, subject to Conditions of Approval addressing the issues for discussion, any issues raised by the Board, and any recommendations submitted by the Board.

Respectfully submitted:

Claudia Cappio
Director of Development

Prepared by:

Joann Pavlinec, Planner III
Major Projects and Historic Preservation

- Attachments:
- A: Plans, Elevations, Sections, dated May 10, 2004
 - B. Altenheim Senior Housing Design Approach dated July 7, 2004
 - C. Joint Initial Study and Environmental Assessment in Support of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Finding of No Significant Impact
 - D. Historic Resources and Design Review Report for the Altenheim Housing Project
 - E. Letter from the Elston Avenue block group, Miami Court block group, Dimond Improvement Association, and Glenview Neighborhood Association dated July 6, 2004 to Citizens Housing

Ref: DesignReview-Landmarks:Altenheim7-12-04

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION

1. All exterior features as outlined below shall remain and be refurbished, as necessary, following the Secretary of Interior Standards:
 - a. Exterior wood and brick materials and features throughout;
 - b. Doric pilasters (in wood at 1908 buildings and in brick at 1914 wing) and wood frieze with modillions;
 - c. Wood porticos at the ends of the dormitories;
 - d. Brick raised basement with window openings;
 - e. Fenestration and its pattern of typical 2/2 double hung wood sash with simple wood surrounds (set in masonry openings in 1914 wing).
 - f. Moderne elements such as steel casement windows at the second floor of Administration Building (Building #2);
 - g. Solarium (Building #6)
 - Bi-fold windows
 - Doric Pilasters and columns
 - Copper dome above cupola
 - h. Dining Hall (Building #4)
 - Arched window openings at first floor;
 - Half-timbering and knee braces at second floor
 - Stained glass and casement windows at second floor
 - i. Interior Features
 - Spatial organization of complex, including
 - Common spaces as nodal connections between dormitory wings;
 - Long double-loaded hallways running longitudinally through dormitories (narrowed from 8' to 7' wide);
 - Glazed cupolas and oculi marking circulation paths.
 - j. Administration (Building 2)
 - Domed skylight with first floor oculus;
 - Interior finishes and wood detailing including columns, cornice and casework;
 - Grandfather clock and donor wall;
 - k. Solarium (Building #6)
 - Domed rotunda with clerestory windows;
 - Interior finishes including wood detailing and glazed hallway wall.
 - l. Dining Hall (Building #4)
 - Interior finishes and details including exposed wood trusses, beams and ceiling;
 - Decorative painting on trusses and ceiling;
 - Built-in casework.
2. Unattractive modern site lighting on existing buildings shall be replaced with simple, contemporary fixtures. Staff level review of proposed fixtures required.

3. Provide simple, contemporary pole-mounted fixtures to light pathways and parking areas. The poles shall be a maximum of 12 feet tall and placed to avoid light spilling onto neighboring properties. Staff level review of proposed fixtures required.
4. Lighting levels shall be as low as safety standards permit, a photometric study to be prepared and reviewed by the appropriate City Agency.
5. The project sponsor shall follow the Secretary of Interior Standards:
 - a. The property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
 - b. The project shall retain and preserve the historic character of the project site, with minimal removal of historic materials or alteration of character-defining features.
 - c. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
 - d. Those changes that have achieved historic significance shall be retained and preserved.
 - e. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the historic property shall be preserved.
 - f. Historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
 - g. If exterior cleaning is required at a later time, chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
 - h. Significant archaeological resources affected by the project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
 - i. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - j. New additions and adjacent construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would not be impaired.
6. Existing openings and porches on historic buildings, where new bridges that connect the existing historic buildings to new wings are located, shall be documented should the bridges be removed in the future and reconstruction of the historic openings/porches required.
7. The Notice of Intent to Landmark the Altenheim shall be placed on the LPAB Agenda following completion of the Altenheim application review by the Planning Commission, scheduled for August 4, 2004.

Excerpts from LPAB Minutes

Notice of Intent to Landmark – December 9, 2002 LPAB Meeting: The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) reviewed a Notice of Intent to Submit an Oakland Landmark and S-7 Preservation Combining Zone Application Form submitted by the Oakland Heritage Alliance at their December 9, 2002 meeting. At that meeting, the (previous) potential Altenheim developer, in the midst of a 60-day due diligence period, requested that the Notice of Intent be tabled in order to complete this process. After some discussion of the merits of postponing a Notice of Intent from moving forward, the Board voted (5-yes; 1-no) to:

- Receive any testimony from the applicant and interested citizens;
- Discuss the proposed Notice of Intent and Evaluation Sheet for Landmark Eligibility, make modifications and request additional information/research, as needed;
- Direct staff to set up a tour of the Altenheim for staff and the LPAB;
- Continue action on the Notice of Intent to January or February.

LPAB Altenheim Site Visit – January 13, 2003: Prior to the regularly scheduled meeting, the LPAB toured the Altenheim site and building. At the meeting, the Board discussed the site visit with respect to the LPAB review of the *Notice of Intent to submit an Oakland Landmark and S-7 Preservation Combining Zone Application Form* submitted by the Oakland Heritage Alliance, continued from December LPAB meeting to the February 10, 2003 LPAB meeting. Staff did not recommend any action at this time. The developer was putting together a proposal package for reuse of the property.

The LPAB decided to step back from landmarking at this time so that the project negotiations could move forward. Chair Gilmartin stated that after the site visit, it is apparent that the Altenheim is eligible for Landmarking. Barbara Armstrong and Una Gilmartin volunteered to serve on the Altenheim LPAB sub-committee. Chair Gilmartin recommended that the Preliminary Eligibility Rating review for the Altenheim be placed on the March LPAB agenda.

February 10, 2003 LPAB Meeting Director's Report: The Director clarified that the Altenheim is an historic resource for CEQA purposes. If any proposal would alter or adversely impact the historic resource there would need to be a determination of how these alterations would affect the resource and whether these would be deemed significant under CEQA. The applicant would need to retain an historic architect to be supervised by City Staff to make those determinations. We have offered to meet with the Altenheim and developer to go over the process. Michael Rombs, Board Member of the Altenheim, informed the Board that negotiations with the initial developer had broken. They are now negotiating with another company, Citizens Housing (the current applicant) who is also proposing a senior housing project. They have retained Architectural Resources Group to look at the historical issues.

March 10, 2003 LPAB Meeting Secretary's Report: Staff Pavlinec reported that there was a meeting with City staff, new developer - Citizens Housing, their consultants, including Architectural Resources Group (ARG), members of the Altenheim Board and their consultant. At this time, there are no plans on paper. The new concept would propose some demolition to the rear and west of the site where smaller buildings such as the infirmary and boiler room are located. The three main buildings would be retained. ARG has guided the applicant regarding proposed demolition and appropriate location(s) for new construction. The concept includes some additional surface parking and access to the on-site parking along the rear of the property. The use would be senior housing. Their next step is preliminary massing and building footprint location studies. When they have completed these new studies they will contact the City to set up an appointment with city staff and the LPAB subcommittee.

May 10, 2004 LPAB Meeting: Chair Gilmartin inquired as to when the Altenheim would apply for City Landmark designation, and requested that staff discuss this with the applicant.

June 14, 2004 LPAB Meeting Board Reports: Altenheim sub-committee (Armstrong, Gilmartin): Dreyfuss recused and left the room. Armstrong and Gilmartin reported on meeting with the developers and on the evolution of the project. New buildings were being added in a way that seemed satisfactory to both SHPO and the neighbors. Cappio said the project would be coming to Landmarks Board in July, and then to Planning Commission [Design Review Committee July 14, Commission August 4].