



*Chris Pattillo, Chair  
Jim Moore, Vice Chair  
Jahaziel Bonilla  
Michael Coleman  
Jahmese Myres  
Adhi Nagraj  
Emily Weinstein*

**October 1, 2014  
Regular Meeting**

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Pattillo, Moore, Bonilla, Coleman, Nagraj, Weinstein.

**Excused:** Myres.

**Staff:** Rachel Flynn, Robert Merkamp, Edward Manasse, Devan Reiff, Heather Klein, Cheryl Dunaway.

**WELCOME BY THE CHAIR**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Items 1 and 2 were moved on consent of the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Moore made a motion to approve, seconded by Commissioner Coleman.

Action on the matter: Approved 6 ayes, 0 noes.

---

***For further information on any case listed on this agenda, please contact the case planner indicated for that item. For further information on Historic Status, please contact the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey at 510-238-6879. For other questions or general information on the Oakland City Planning Commission, please contact the Community and Economic Development Agency, Planning and Zoning Division, at 510-238-3941.***

♿ This meeting is wheelchair accessible. To request materials in alternative formats, or to request an ASL interpreter, or assistive listening device, please call the **Planning Department at 510-238-3941** or TDD 510-238-3254 at least three working days before the meeting. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting so attendees who may experience chemical sensitivities may attend. Thank you.



1.	<b>Location:</b>	<b>7223 International Boulevard (APN: 041-4129-025-00)</b>
	<b>Proposal:</b>	Co-location to install three (3) concealed telecommunication antennas at a site with 3 existing antennas for a total of 6 onsite antennas and associated equipment.
	<b>Applicant:</b>	Sprint, Phil Gamick of Forza Telecom
	<b>Contact Person/Phone Number:</b>	Phil Gamick (530)386-5253
	<b>Owner:</b>	Uriel & Maria Pena TRS
	<b>Case File Number:</b>	<b>PLN14-070</b>
	<b>Planning Permits Required:</b>	Regular Design Review for co-location to install three (3) concealed telecommunication antennas and associated equipment. Major Conditional Use Permit for the expansion of a Mini telecommunication facility within 100 feet of a residential zone.
	<b>General Plan:</b>	Community Commercial
	<b>Zoning:</b>	CC-2 Community Commercial Zone
	<b>Environmental Determination:</b>	Exempt, Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines; minor additions and alterations of existing facilities. Exempt, Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; new construction of small structures. Section 15183 of the State CEQA Guidelines; projects consistent with a community plan, general plan or zoning.
	<b>Historic Status:</b>	Not A Potential Designated Historic Property (PDHP); Survey Rating: D3
	<b>Service Delivery District:</b>	5
	<b>City Council District:</b>	7
	<b>Status:</b>	Pending
	<b>Action to be Taken:</b>	Decision of Application
	<b>Finality of Decision:</b>	Appealable to City Council within 10 days
	<b>For Further Information:</b>	Contact case planner Michael Bradley at (510) 238-6935 or by email: <a href="mailto:mbradley@oaklandnet.com">mbradley@oaklandnet.com</a>

Vice Chair Moore made a motion to approve, seconded by Commissioner Coleman.

Action on the matter: Approved 6 ayes, 0 noes.



2.                   **Location:** 6450 Camden Street (APN: 039-3282-001-08)  
**Proposal:** A revision of a previously granted Conditional Use Permit and Design Review that would co-locate the addition of three (3) new antennas at a site with 15 existing antennas for a total of 18 antennas and associated equipment.  
**Applicant:** Sprint, Phil Gamick of Forza Telecom  
**Contact Person/Phone Number:** Phil Gamick (530)386-5253  
**Owner:** Evergreen Cemetery Association  
**Case File Number:** REV120011-R01 (Revision of case file CD08-018 & REV12-0011)  
**Planning Permits Required:** Design Review for the co-location to install three (3) new antennas at an existing Macro Telecommunication facility in the RM-1 zone. (Major Conditional Use Permit for the installation of a Macro telecommunication facility within 100 feet of a residential zone).  
**General Plan:** Urban Open Space  
**Zoning:** RM-1 Mixed Housing Type Residential  
**Environmental Determination:** Exempt, Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines; minor additions and alterations to existing structures.  
Exempt, Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; new construction of small structures.  
Section 15183 of the State CEQA Guidelines; projects consistent with a community plan, general plan or zoning.  
**Historic Status:** No Historic Record  
**Service Delivery District:** 5  
**City Council District:** 6  
**Status:** Pending  
**Action to be Taken:** Decision of Application  
**Finality of Decision:** Appealable to City Council within 10 days  
**For Further Information:** Contact case planner Michael Bradley at (510) 238-6935 or by email: [mbradley@oaklandnet.com](mailto:mbradley@oaklandnet.com)

Vice Chair Moore made a motion to approve, seconded by Commissioner Coleman.

Action on the matter: Approved 6 ayes, 0 noes.



PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.	<p><b>Location:</b> The Coliseum Area Specific Plan area (“Plan Area”) is located in East Oakland and covers an area of approximately 800 acres bounded by 66th Avenue to the north, San Leandro Street on the east, Hegenberger Road on the south, and San Leandro Bay and the Oakland International Airport to the west. The Plan Area includes the Oakland Alameda County Coliseum and Arena and the Oakland Airport Edgewater Business Park.</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Conduct a public hearing to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), the Draft Coliseum Area Specific Plan, and associated General Plan and Planning Code amendments (text and map changes) along with Design Guidelines (collectively called “Related Actions”).</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> City of Oakland</p> <p><b>Case File Numbers:</b> ZS13103 / ER130004 / SP14001 / GP14002 / ZA14001</p> <p><b>Planning Permits Required:</b> Not applicable. Discussion of Draft Specific Plan, proposed General Plan Amendments and proposed Planning Code amendments.</p> <p><b>General Plan:</b> Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) Areas: Regional Commercial, Community Commercial, Business Mix, Estuary Policy Plan Areas: General Commercial 2, Light Industry 3, Parks</p> <p><b>Zoning:</b> CR-1, IO, M-40, S-15, CIX-2</p> <p><b>Environmental Determination:</b> An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is being prepared for the Coliseum Area Specific Plan. The Draft EIR (DEIR) was published on August 22, 2014 for a 45-day public comment period, which extends to October 6, 2014.</p> <p><b>Historic Status:</b> CEQA historic resources currently identified in the Plan Area (resources that are on or may be eligible for National, California, or Local Registers of Historical Resources), include the Coliseum and Arena (individually rated A and B by the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey and together constituting an Area of Primary Importance) and the Warehouse Union Local 6 building at 99 Hegenberger Road (PDHP, preliminary rating *c3, of potential future significance; now over 50 years old). Portions of the Project Area contain other older buildings and structures not currently evaluated as significant but of possible future interest.</p> <p><b>Service Delivery District:</b> 5,6</p> <p><b>City Council Districts:</b> 7 (with CCD 6 representing 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue frontage of the Plan Area)</p> <p><b>Actions to be Taken:</b> No decision. The purpose of this meeting is to receive public and Planning Commission comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.</p> <p><b>For Further Information:</b> Contact project planner Devan Reiff at 510-238-3550 or dreiff@oaklandnet.com Project website: www.oaklandnet.com/coliseumcity</p>
----	---

Director Flynn gave brief opening remarks.

Staff Member Edward Manasse gave an introductory PowerPoint presentation.

Ed McFarlan, City Consultant with JRDV Urban International, Inc., of Oakland continued the PowerPoint presentation.

QUESTIONS ASKED BY COMMISSIONER BONILLA:

- There are different sets of numbers for residents and job creation on pages 26 and 44. One page has 7,000 the other has 5,000 and 20,000 and 21,000 for job creation. Which set of numbers is correct?



**Mr. Manasse** responded stating that the actual job creation amount is between 20,000 and 21,000. The correct amount of housing units is 5,750 and the estimated population studied in the EIR is over 10,000. This is based on those amounts and unit type projected to be included in the various residential areas, which can be elaborated on. Staff heard questions about the overall estimated population and reviewed very specific rationale of why those particular amounts were included.

- How many community groups actually attended these hearings?

**Mr. Reiff** responded stating that staff held a number of public workshops, each were attended by 30 to 60 people. There were other presentations with smaller representation of 20 to 30 people overall, roughly 200 people involved. The mailing list consist of 450 and staff received 200 emails within the last couple of days from both Raiders and A's fans so, the community is definitely receiving the message.

- Has Allen Temple Church been involved in this process?

**Mr. Manasse** responded stating that Allen Temple Church hasn't been involved as much as they'd hoped for and that staff will do their best over the next few months to make up for any lack of outreach to them.

- Are Alameda County, JPA and the Port of Oakland in agreement with this plan moving forward?

**Mr. Manasse** responded stating, staff made an informational presentation to JPA about a week or so ago where they weren't asked for their feedback nor did they volunteer any. They are very well informed of this plan through the negotiations occurring over the ENA. The preference was to give them a public forum to allow them the opportunity to ask questions or raise concerns as property owners.

- Is there in fact some agreement between those entities?

**Mr. Manasse** stated there are some concerns, but there's a uniform opinion that this plan is valuable going forward. There may not be 100% agreement on all elements of it, but they have strong consensus that this plan is flexible enough to be a valuable document to both Alameda County and the City of Oakland.

- On page 60 of the plan it states "the plan area may develop more than 5,700 housing units". This wasn't the number of housing units studied in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). If there are more housing units developed, will this negate the amount in the existing Environmental Impact Report (EIR)?

**Scott Gregory** responded stating, they will correct any mistakes in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), if any. The correct answer should be 5,750 residential units and approximately 10,270 future residential units. The flexible design that's included as a part of the environmental analysis is, one of the premises is a trip budget so residential, commercial and industrial units all have a trip allocation. The plan allows for a flexible mix between commercial, industrial and residential uses so we can review in the future and be able to have our environmental document adapt and flex to changes that may occur.



As long as overall trip units are held in balance there could be a different mix of commercial, industrial and residential uses.

- In the affordable housing strategies on pages 60 and 61. Why isn't it stated that the City of Oakland will consider impact fees as a way to finance affordable housing?

**Mr. Manasse** responded stating that staff proactively identified that affordable housing and an anti-displacement strategy wasn't adequately addressed in the plan itself. Staff brought forth amendments in the plan for the Planning Commission's consideration. The various funding mechanisms were better addressed including impact fees and how it can apply to this project as well as an entire menu of funding mechanisms that were identified in other plans. It will soon be included in the plan as stated in the attachment.

- What is the purpose for creating the bay inlet in Area B, is it to create more expensive waterfront properties? If so, how many square feet or acres of wetlands will be destroyed in this process if that's the plan?

**Mr. McFarlan** responded stating that this was an early concept to increase the amount of shoreline, not to destroy wetlands, but to potentially increase them and the Bay area. Environmental and development groups reviewed the plan and found both pros and cons. One of the complexities is it requires clean dirt, if there is no cut, the bay is exposed to that dirt. This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) didn't cover the bay inlet, which may require its own environmental review to cover it.

#### **QUESTIONS ASKED BY COMMISSIONER WEINSTEIN:**

- Throughout the plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR), there are differing maps that shows subarea A west of Interstate 880 and others don't. Please explain why that exists.

**Mr. Manasse** explained that staff divided the overall plan area into subareas A through E. Within that, there is a district called the Coliseum district that expands all of subarea A and a portion of B. This particular planning district expands over Interstate 880 and includes a portion of subarea B which incorporates the boundaries of this detailed level of planning and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) reviews and incorporates the foot prints of all 3 potentially new sports venues. Staff will improve on the explanation of how the boundary differentiates from the separate subareas which includes A and B together.

- The understanding about vehicle trip budget is, all uses have greater impacts, other than the sports venues because they are outside of the peak trips. In the various scenarios, would the biggest impact be the build out if none of the sports venues were there?

**Mr. Gregory** responded stating that they had a very good traffic engineer working on the project. In the A.M. and P.M. peak hour trips are the primary threshold questions for the City's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) check list as it currently exist. Because most of the sports venue activities occur during off peak hours, they are not major contributors to those peak times measured. The residential, commercial, industrial and other uses are the drivers of most of the traffic impacts. They geared each of the alternatives so they would have the same trip budget in the P.M. peak hour trips generated by different amounts of develop. Under the scenario that there are no sports venues on



site, the development is less dense, but relatively the same amount and generates the same amount of traffic.

- In the scenario that there isn't one or more sports venue mean there will be an increase in residential density?

**Mr. Gregory** responded stating that there would be a decrease in density, but not an increase in units. It would most likely be spread out over more land since the land wouldn't be used for more sports venues.

#### QUESTIONS ASKED BY COMMISSIONER Coleman:

- On page 7 of the summary states if the bay inlet is created, it would be an intertidal mud flat as an attraction and amenity to development. How would that work as an amenity and attraction?

**Mr. McFarlan** responded stating, from an environmental point of view, they wanted it to be a part of the Bay, not just a hard scape edge but, the concept is too complicated to implement. Part of the problem is, if you cut and expose the Bay underneath the Edgewater Business Park there will be a lot of environmental risks.

- Is there's a limit to the 159 feet height reference on page 11?

**Mr. McFarlan and Mr. Gregory** explained that the height limit would be negotiated with the FAA. Anything over the wedge shaped flight pattern height limit should be reviewed by the FAA for conformance with their rules, requirements and flight operations.

- On page 14, relocation of the City of Oakland's Corporation Yard on Edgewater Drive. Do you have an idea where it may be relocated to?

**Mr. Manasse** responded stating that they reviewed a number of sites, but no specific site was identified. Without a specific site identified, it's speculative that it will in fact be relocated. It's a low value use for waterfront property if it's well served by freeway access, it could be located in a multitude of areas throughout the City of Oakland. Waterfront property is a limited resource, whether or not it's this particular vision of residential, some higher value use would be something that the plan would envision for that particular property. It's currently leased from the Port of Oakland in which the City of Oakland has an ongoing lease agreement at a very reasonable monthly rate and would like to find a location of equal value and affordability.

- What's the Port of Oakland Board of Commission's position on this project?

**Mr. Manasse** stated that staff attended their first meeting with the Port of Oakland Board of Commission last week concerning this project. This will be an ongoing process with the Port of Oakland's Board of Commission. They were hesitant about developing residential as a compatible use within the Airport Business Park which is ongoing discussions that will occur long after the final adoption of this plan. It's not identified as a Phase 1 or 2 element of the plan, but it's included as something that would create high value to be placed in the necessary sports and infrastructure to support the overall vision. There's a high level of skepticism among both the Port of Oakland Board of Commission and Airport Business Park representatives, but the discussions will continue to come to



some type of an agreement. Staff also met with the head of various divisions of the Port of Oakland who authorized a working group to work with the City of Oakland. The meetings occur once or twice a month and we've presented these various issues including, how they may be able to amend their land use code to support this vision and an in-depth discussion over land use jurisdiction. We hope the working group will continue beyond the final adoption of this Specific Plan and have further discussions on the future of the Airport Business Park.

- In the Specific Plan on pages 98 TR Policy 5-11- No bulb outs and 110 TR Policy 5-44 – Install bulb outs on the streets. Please explain how that discrepancy was addressed?

**Mr. Manasse** stated that those are errors which will be corrected.

- How will the “at grade train crossings” be addressed? He didn't find the discussion on “at grade train crossings” in chapter 5.

**Mr. Manasse** responded stating that there are no new “at grade train crossings”. That's one of the purposes and intent of the elevated concourse to replace the current in adequate elevator walkway.

**Mr. Gregory** further explained that environmental analysis reviews the existing grade crossings together with the additional traffic generated by the project. The additional pedestrian activity that would occur to consider whether or not there are existing “at grade crossings” would create a further hazard. This issue is studied in the EIR and there's additional traffic congestion at each of those “at grade crossings” that would contribute to the difficulty of those crossings.

**Vice Chair Moore** asked if the OPD Communications Center will be relocated within the plan area or outside of the plan area. He asked that the time of the meeting scheduled on October 9, 2014 at the City of Oakland's Public Library on 81<sup>st</sup> Avenue be announced at tonight's meeting.

**Mr. Manasse** responded yes, the OPD Communications Center will be located within the plan area.

**Mr. Reiff** responded stating that the time of the Community Workshop scheduled on October 9, 2014 at the 81<sup>st</sup> Avenue Public Library is 6:30 P.M. - 8:30 P.M.

**Commissioner Bonilla** asked for clarity on the housing to residents ratio.

**Mr. Gregory and Manasse** explained that there is a description of the housing to residents ratio in the Staff Report. It was calculated by the residents per unit, first by per units multiplied by the vacancy factor to come up with households. Staff reviewed relatively new similar type housing developments that have occurred within the City of Oakland, which are very tall and dense developments to come up with a resident density per unit type for that type of like development, multiply that times the households you should come up with the total population per household or per unit.

**Speakers:** Esther Goolsby, Jose Lopez Jean Cohen, Barbara Estella, Naomi Schiff, Heather Lewis, Sunny Gustafson Theola Polk, Mary Butler, Anwar Zeidi, Godfather Griz, Dr. Death, Rayna Smith, John Jones, Eddy Toomey, Kate O'Hara, Nehanda Imara, Maggie Gibson, Tanya Fuller, Jane Martin, Raider Commando, David Zisser, Angela Heavin, Christopher Fry-Lopez, Johnny Stake, Brian Holt, Michael Sims, Karim Muhammad, Christine Garret, Susan Schacher, Ollie Cox.





Mr. Manasse explained that the new section 3.11 which is provisionally called “revitalization” and should appropriately be called “local access to jobs and job training”, because there are significant new policies proposed that address many of the community member’s concerns, including policy 3-42 concerning the encouragement of mix of land use and development and provide permanent good paying jobs and career opportunities for local residents.

The Planning Commission thanked everyone for attending tonight’s meeting and submitting comments both written and public and then had the following comments:

- The plan should ensure housing for the science and technology jobs, but also on an affordability level that allows retail, hospitality and sports venue employees to afford to live there. This should be incorporated, studied and implemented on how this can be done. When we talk about low income housing, there’s also very low income housing. Those employees should be able to live there and make enough money to attend the events at the venues.
- Land use policy 3.9 on page 60 of the plan should also include very low income as stated, not just low income.
- The plan should ensure that any transit or bus service also serves hospitality and retail employees who work various shifts and ensure they will travel to and from work and home safely.
- The plan talks about grocery stores which is truly needed, Oakland has been called a “food waste land”, but affordable grocery stores to the low income residents should be provided, and Whole Foods Market won’t do because it’s too expensive for those residents. We have to think about the affordability of groceries for the low income residents for that area and how to attract those stores.
- We need to attract developers and people interested in building; we do our best not knowing how this will play out.
- The concern is, Oakland may lose their sports teams during this process and if that happens, the fear is this project will not come together. The plan goes into great detail and is much better having read the details which indicate they will proceed if there are no sports teams remaining in Oakland. Make sure this Specific Plan goes beyond looking at it as a sports and entertainment venue, but really thinks about it as a complete neighborhood, as a complete part of the accosting city and a complete neighborhood integrated with East Oakland and becomes a benefit to all of Oakland. Even with the teams, we need to think about what this area would feel like on a non-game or entertainment event day and what it would feel like as a resident in the area walking down the street to retail or your home.
- To build a Center for Science and Technology is an amazing goal, how we’re going to attract someone of interest will take a company to come and start that process, which is a little fearful.
- There’s great detail on what to do for a sea level rise projection for the 100 year flood plan and a diagram of where the 500 year flood plan is, but it doesn’t state what’s going to be done about it. There is a long list of possible mitigations, but again, we need to specifically address that.



- Other likeable aspects of this plan is the rehabilitation of open space, waterfront access that will attract new businesses, transit oriented development and the concept of the aerial-tropolis. This promotes sustainable design and the construction is clearly responsive to the issues of pedestrian safety and bicycle access.
- The connectivity from this site area to the neighboring areas is important. Would like to see emphasis on the Damon Slough, Elmhurst Creek and the public access to the shoreline, which is not very well represented in the plan. It creates a 100 feet buffer from the top of the banks, but doesn't create opportunities to drive and park in the smaller areas along the shoreline.
- Concerned about the amount of change in the zoning for light industrial, which currently creates job accessibility to residents in the area, but to see that reduced by 846,000 square feet should be considered before any action is taken.
- There are some concerns about the process of building Oakland Global and discussing developing a similar logistic center to where won't compete with each other. This issue should be addressed and would like confirmation that both logistic centers will support each other and not compete against each other.
- Area E was in the Estuary Plan now it seems like it's being moved into the Coliseum City and it's not clear in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on why that is.
- Concerned about relocating the creek which would be a good opportunity to remove it out of a channelized and degraded slough and reconstitute the creek to a great open space and habitat, but a little more discussion in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) about how that will be done and some criteria is needed.
- Wants to see a more robust public process and would like staff to address the many requests for extending the comment period either at tonight's meeting or in the near future.
- Excited about the new 34 acres of park, open space, wetland and habitat in which a number of comments submitted supports converting a parking lot into a habitat. Improvements to Damon Slough, creating tree shaded streets and using trees to reinforce the hierarchy of streets.

**No decision will be made at tonight's meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to receive public and Planning Commission comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

9:05 P.M.

  
**ROBERT MERKAMP**  
Development Planning Manager  
Planning and Zoning Division

**NEXT MEETING:** October 8, 2014