



**City of Oakland  
Landmark of the Month  
2007**

\* Also Listed on National Register of Historic Places

	Description	NRH P	Ordinance Date	Zoning Case No.
1	Western Pacific Depot 3 <sup>rd</sup> & Washington Streets <i>Parish-December</i>		Ord. 9032 July 9, 1974	LM 74-176
2	Camron-Stanford House 1426 Lakeside Drive <i>F. Rhoades-May</i>	*	Ord. 9120 January 7, 1975	LM 74-335
3	Heinolds First & Last Chance Saloon 90 Jack London Square <i>Muller-April</i>		Ord. 9120 January 7, 1975	LM 74-335
4	Tower to General John C. Fremont Joaquin Miller Park <i>Tavernier-June</i>		Ord. 9120 January 7, 1975	LM 74-335
5	Joaquin Miller Abbey Joaquin Miller Park <i>Tavernier-June</i>	*	Ord. 9120 January 7, 1975	LM 74-335
6	J. Mora Moss Cottage Mosswood Park <i>Peterosn-July</i>		Ord. 9120 January 7, 1975	LM 74-335
7	Governor George C. Pardee House 672 11 <sup>th</sup> Street <i>D. Nicolai-March</i>	*	Ord. 9120 January 7, 1975	LM 74-335
8	Alfred H. Cohen House 1440 29 <sup>th</sup> Avenue <i>Kahn ? - September</i>	*	Ord. 9120 January 7, 1975	LM 74-335
9	Paramount Theater 2025 Broadway Paramount Theater Interior 2025 Broadway <i>Prevost - October</i>	*	Ord. 9120 January 7, 1975 Ord. 11559 March 9, 1993	LM 74-335
10	Antonio Maria Peralta House 2465 34 <sup>th</sup> Avenue <i>Peterson - November</i>	*	Ord. 9195 August 5, 1975	LM 75-221
11	Adobe Headquarters Site, Rancho San Antonio. 2465-2501-2511 34 <sup>th</sup> Avenue <i>Peterson - November</i>		Ord. 9195 August 5, 1975	LM 75-221

A formal request was received from the Office of Historic Preservation in Sacramento for the Landmarks Board, as a Certified Local Government commission, to review and comment on the National Register nomination of the Lamp Works, in connection with a preservation tax credit project.

Chair Garry noted that the application had many inaccuracies (the out of state consultant described the site as seven miles west of downtown Oakland), inadequately developed topics, and typos: "it's a wonderful building and should be on the National Register, but the nomination could be stronger." What sets this property apart from other industrial buildings of the period? Which of its features are specific to "the Austin Method"? How was its integrity affected by the 1989 earthquake and repairs? There were missed opportunities to discuss social history of women's employment and labor conditions, the later prominence in Oakland of the Austin Company of California, and the 50-year tenure of General Electric in this building as an indication of Oakland's solid 20th century industrial base.

Staff and Board discussed the National Register process. Staff at the State Office of Historic Preservation reviews nominations and presents them to the State Historic Resources Commission. As a tax credit project, this property has already been determined eligible for the Register and has been extensively documented in the "Part 2" form describing the work being done. National Register listing in itself does not provide any regulatory protection, though there would be penalties for violating the terms of the tax credit program. Garry suggested that the Lamp Works should also be a city landmark. Board agreed that the project and National Register listing deserved strong support. Public speaker Naomi Schiff conveyed Oakland Heritage Alliance's strong support for the designation, and seconded concerns about the quality of the documentation: "proofreaders only cost \$35 an hour."

Andrews moved to send a letter conveying the Board's comments and its support for the National Register listing. Buckley seconded; motion carried unanimously.

## 2. **January Goal Setting Meeting** and discussion of 2013-14 Certified Local Government Annual Report.

Public speaker Naomi Schiff of Oakland Heritage Alliance recommended focusing on CEQA mitigations for historic resources. "The Coliseum project could have used a more forceful statement from the Landmarks Board," and monitoring of past mitigations has been weak.

Board packet items for discussion included goals from past years, a list of suggested activities from the State Office, and the detailed table of contents from the Preservation Element. Last year's goals had been specific and tangible and had been pretty well met except for continuing education. Board's role in the Auditorium graffiti abatement and RFP was significant.

Casson suggested trying to get ahead of development pressure with "an inventory of things that might be developed" and suggestions on how development could take place. The Grand Boulevard Initiative on the Peninsula might be a model (<http://www.grandboulevard.net>): it is a plan "given to developers when they come to town." Others noted that the new Area Specific Plans might provide a similar framework, and the Non-landmarks of the Month often highlighted buildings that might be development opportunities.

Buckley, Andrews, and Garry especially mentioned training: more thorough orientation for new members, in-depth training on CEQA and the Board's role in the CEQA process, study session(s) on the Historic Preservation Element. Birkholz suggested monitoring mitigations on a spreadsheet of projects and he proposed landmark designation of Feather River Camp. Andrews forwarded two concerns from the community: updating the Survey and looking into modifying code requirements that adversely affect historic buildings. As one example, when houses are raised – a cost-effective way of simultaneously retrofitting the foundation and enlarging the living space – the fire marshal requires eliminating windows that are near property lines. Garry noted that the new Mayor is interested in improving the City website: how will preservation be presented “so it's not just tedious bureaucratic details”?

Andrews noted that it was interesting to go through the whole list of Preservation Element policies and actions and see what their status is. Many of the concerns discussed in this meeting are actually addressed in the Element. He moved (“a radical suggestion”) making review of the Historic Preservation Element the entire adopted goal for 2015. Birkholz seconded; carried unanimously.

*As elaborated by Garry and Marvin for the CLG report, “Board voted to conduct an in depth review of the Historic Preservation Element of the Oakland General Plan (originally adopted in 1994), in order to better understand its goals and objectives and the status of its 66 action items. The Board believes it is important to understand which policies and actions have been carried out, which still need to be addressed, which may no longer be relevant, and which may have different meanings in 2015. This review is not expected to lead to revision of the Element, but is intended to give the Board a better understanding of the document that is their charter, and a thorough knowledge of the Element's adopted City policies that support the Board's role.”*

**F. OLD BUSINESS - None**

**H. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS – 459 8th Street/Broadway, new 5-story building in Old Oakland S-7 District; subcommittee (Birkholz, Garry) report on meeting with architects and case planner.**

The applicant responded to Board comments by adding cornices that relate to the heights of the Gem and Madrone buildings in the district, deleting a bay that was overshadowing the Madrone, and grounding the storefronts with traditional bulkheads. The height variance seemed justified in order to achieve the desired tall ground floor, and the design appeared to relate well to both 8th Street in the district and Broadway across the street. Andrews said the changes were subtle but effective, an example of what the subcommittee process can accomplish.

**I. ANNOUNCEMENTS - Training opportunities:**

Garry mentioned upcoming California Preservation Foundation (CPF) workshops and webinars: <http://www.californiapreservation.org/workshops.html>

Birkholz mentioned the annual meeting of the Western Chapter of the Association for Preservation Technology in Sacramento in May: <http://wcapt.org/>. There will be tours of the Gladding McBean terra cotta plant and the Sacramento railroad depot.

**Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board  
Goals for 2014**

Drafted by Betty Marvin and Valerie Garry, based on discussion at January 13, 2014, meeting; reviewed and adopted at February 10, 2014 meeting

**Protection:**

1. Insure protection and reuse of historic Oakland Auditorium and other City properties

**Advocacy:**

- 1 Support State Preservation Tax Credit initiative
- 2 Support State Sustainable Preservation plan

**Education:**

1. Educate the public about economic benefits of preservation, from Mills Act to business value of historic interiors
2. Promote appreciation of the whole range of local resources and neighborhoods, not only landmarks
3. Pursue Board training opportunities in preservation, conservation, advocacy, and local government responsibilities (CEQA, role of planning commissions, economic revitalization)

**Procedure:**

1. Schedule formal subcommittee reports in Board hearings on action items
2. Send representatives to Planning Commission and City Council meetings to present Board's recommendations on agenda items and report back
3. Add a Landmarks motto to agenda documents: "Advocate, Educate, Protect Historic Resources"

**DRAFT - 2011 LPAB Goals**  
IDEAS from 2011 Goal Setting Meeting

Mills Act – more frequent reports, more exposure, plaques

Moss Cottage – grants for program potential re-use (e.g. reception, events, day care)

Long-term 10 year goal: Designate Landmarks without Council approval or w/o Planning Commission approval, establish a LPAB ‘Determined Eligible’ category, especially for districts

Speaking at meetings: the Board shall establish by Board vote; the talking points to be relayed to Commission/Council

Place OHA and Annalee’s walking tours at airport

Establish a list of regular monthly tours – Paramount  
Fox  
Mountain View

Have Annalee work with Vision Oakland to make sure they have a list of these tours and dates, and all tours that could be requested.

Food trail  
Bike trail

Work with film office to determine landmarks in films: list on website under each landmark and then as group [filminamerica.com](http://filminamerica.com)

Plaque program in CBD

CPF

LPAB reception/tour  
City Hall  
Bus tour of Mills Act properties  
Terra cotta/tile tour  
Piedmont mansions

Archeology joint meeting with appropriate sub-committee of Planning Commission

Use space for archeology of the month

Walk Oakland – check for landmarks

HPE Review at Board Meetings

## 2010 LPAB GOALS: 1-31-2011 Status in parenthesis

### Board Discussion – 2010 Goals:

#### New:

- Board representation at City Council, Planning Commission, etc. when the Board has forwarded a recommendation (*Ongoing*)
- Establish contact and cooperation with Film Commission, Convention and Visitors Bureau, Façade Grant Program, etc.; presentations at LPAB meetings (*Presentations to Board completed*)
- Raise awareness of landmarks using City website, plaques, publications, information at Planning/Building counter (*Landmark list with some photos and Landmark of Month presentations on the website*)
- Investigate and initiate Neighborhood Conservation Districts (*Listed on Strategic Planning Department Work Program 2011-13*)
- Explore Preserve America designation (*See attached*)
- Recognition of broader cultural heritage issues – Certificates of Recognition (*East Bay Dragons July 2009 – Board Suggestions for 2011?*)
- Long-term 10 year goal: Modify Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board to Landmarks Preservation Commission

#### Continuing:

- Mills Act – expansion in Central Business District; new outreach strategies (*Expansion approved by City Council*)
- Adoption and implementation of more restrictive demolition findings (*Completed – demolition findings adopted*)
- Convene Board sub-committee on relocation of buildings (*Board convened – Garry, Naruta, Peterson*)
- Website development, including links to Landmark of the Month videos (*Partially done – continuing*)
- Greater design review responsibility based on CBD design regulations (*CBD design review adopted*)
- Documentation, restoration, and reuse of City-owned Moss Cottage (*not yet addressed*)

#### New Sub-committees:

Plaques Program - Garry, Naruta and Prevost as alternate  
Cultural Criteria (Bruce Lee) Cultural Preservation (Chinatown) - Biggs,  
Schulman, Naruta  
CEQA Historic Mitigation Measures - Garry, Naruta, Peterson

*upcoming*

# LANDMARKS PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD

## GOAL SETTING MEETING

November 30, 2009

### OPEN FORUM

### ONGOING

- Mills Act Contracts – Potential Permanent Mills Act Program - *continue; annual propos*  
City Council, December 8, 2009 - *CEQA state form 2132 - Don will edit*
- Demolition Regulations – Zoning Update Committee Review – December 2, 2009
- Landmark of the Month - *Dep, he HS status do it*
- Relocation Sub-committee - *val/Mark, Anna - rd p for other dpts, mpts,*
- Website – Oakland Landmarks
- Greater design review responsibility based on CBD revision

### BOARD MEMBER/STAFF SUGGESTIONS

- LPAB representation at City Council, Planning Commission, etc. when the Board has forwarded a recommendation.
- LPAB positions – modify to include one member from the Planning Commission to facilitate better coordination, communication and education.
- Outreach/City Awareness of Historic Resources:
  - Bus tour of Mills Act properties; *Tom, per Ab in Green Bay Car*
  - Hold LPAB meeting(s) in alternating historic neighborhoods;
  - Historic visuals/photographs at 250 Frank Ogawa Plaza;
  - Utilize television at Planning/Building Counter to show Landmarks/Landmark of the Month videos;
  - Create Historic Resource kiosk at Zoning/Building counters.
- Establish and initiate Neighborhood Conservation Districts - *NA, Marky was mostly Co. Dist, it was point to pass the Dist*
- Streamline the Landmarking process - more Oakland Landmarks.
- Develop a program with Oakland High School history classes for class preparation of Landmark designations. - *Dep, L1 of the Month*
- LPAB recognition of broader issues of cultural heritage (e.g. Recognition of the East Bay Dragons, nomination of the Mai Tai as Oakland's official cocktail). *Dep, will make it through right*
- Increase use of Landmark buildings (e.g., encourage filming of shows and commercials). *Dep, will make it through right*
- Re-use of Moss House. *Preserve Aug, 1924*
- Converting the local registry to an online database. *ASAM*
- Explore grant funding – Oakland Cultural Heritage (OCHS) Fruitvale survey.
- Oakland basement survey – [based on discovery of Chinese language newspapers from the early 1900s to 1930s readable on the walls].
- Investigate and recommend Zoning Regulations to permit greater number of units in existing buildings to increase density and viability of buildings. *Dep, LA DT com. p. 11. 1A 1B 1C 1D*

### ADJOURNMENT

ref: GoalSetting2009

*Reg, ask > with the org/business - may increase business help  
Reg, ask ab units of 11 stories - ask as to can be + get  
val, each shows prop v. ls but Dep what's in it for owner? Many jobs preservation  
Moss House. 1924.*



**Chapter 4: PRESERVATION INCENTIVES AND REGULATIONS (continued)**

*Policy 2.4:* Landmark and Preservation District regulations . . . . . 4-8

*Action 2.4.1:* Landmark and Preservation District design guidelines . . . . . 4-18

*Policy 2.5:* Heritage Properties . . . . . 4-18

*Policy 2.6:* Preservation Incentives for Designated Historic Properties . . . . . 4-24

*Action 2.6.1:* Mills Act contracts . . . . . 4-25

*Action 2.6.2:* Conservation easements . . . . . 4-25

*Action 2.6.3:* Transferable development rights . . . . . 4-26

*Action 2.6.4:* Limit to Landmarks and Preservation Districts  
                     existing zoning provisions conditionally permitting  
                     additional uses in historic buildings . . . . . 4-27

*Action 2.6.5:* Broader range of conditionally permitted uses for  
                     Landmarks and Preservation Districts in certain zones . . . . . 4-27

*Action 2.6.6:* City development assistance priority to historic preservation  
                     projects involving Designated Historic Properties . . . . . 4-28

*Action 2.6.7:* Historic preservation revolving fund . . . . . 4-28

*Action 2.6.8:* Marks bonds . . . . . 4-28

*Action 2.6.9:* Waivers and reductions of permit fees . . . . . 4-29

*Action 2.6.10:* Apply State Historical Building Code to Designated  
                     Historic Properties and other qualified historical buildings . . . . . 4-29

*Action 2.6.11:* State Historical Building Code information sheet . . . . . 4-30

*Action 2.6.12:* State Historical Building Code interpretations . . . . . 4-30

**Chapter 5: HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND ONGOING CITY ACTIVITIES . . . . . 5-1**

**Objective 3: Historic Preservation and Ongoing City Activities . . . . . 5-1**

*Policy 3.1:* Discretionary City actions . . . . . 5-2

*Policy 3.2:* City-owned properties . . . . . 5-2

*Action 3.2.1:* Designated Historic Property status  
                     for City-owned properties . . . . . 5-2

*Action 3.2.2:* Historic preservation management procedure  
                     for City-owned properties . . . . . 5-2

*Policy 3.3:* Designated Historic Property status for certain City-assisted properties . . 5-3

*Action 3.3.1:* City assistance contract provisions  
                     requiring Designated Historic Property status . . . . . 5-3

*Action 3.3.2:* Definition of small-scale projects  
                     exempt from Policies 3.3 and 3.6 and Action 3.3.1 . . . . . 5-3

(continued)

Chapter 5: **HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND ONGOING CITY ACTIVITIES (continued)**

<i>Policy 3.4:</i>	City acquisition for historic preservation	5-4
<i>Action 3.4.1:</i>	Ordinance for acquisition by eminent domain	5-4
<i>Action 3.4.2:</i>	Procedures and criteria for historic preservation property acquisitions	5-4
<i>Policy 3.5:</i>	Discretionary permit approvals	5-5
<i>Action 3.5.1:</i>	Design guidelines for discretionary permit approvals	5-5
<i>Action 3.5.2:</i>	Standard conditions for discretionary permit approvals	5-6
<i>Policy 3.6:</i>	City-sponsored or assisted projects	5-6
<i>Action 3.6.1:</i>	Evaluation and selection procedures for City-sponsored or assisted projects	5-7
<i>Action 3.6.2:</i>	Development and design assistance for City-assisted projects involving existing or Potential Designated Historic Properties	5-7
<i>Policy 3.7:</i>	Property relocation rather than demolition	5-8
<i>Action 3.7.1:</i>	Property relocation procedures and design guidelines for all projects	5-9
<i>Action 3.7.2:</i>	Property relocation procedures for City-sponsored or assisted projects	5-9
<i>Action 3.7.3:</i>	Building relocation assistance program	5-9
<i>Action 3.7.4:</i>	Building relocation permit regulations	5-10
<i>Policy 3.8:</i>	Definition of "Local Register of Historical Resources" and "significant effects" for environmental review purposes	5-10
<i>Action 3.8.1:</i>	Include historic preservation impacts in City's Environmental Review Regulations	5-11
<i>Policy 3.9:</i>	Consistency of zoning with existing or eligible Preservation Districts	5-12
<i>Action 3.9.1:</i>	Zoning study and possible zoning text changes to promote consistency with existing or eligible Preservation Districts	5-12
<i>Policy 3.10:</i>	Earthquakes, fires or other emergencies	5-13
<i>Action 3.10.1:</i>	Review and possible amendment of emergency response documents	5-13
<i>Policy 3.11:</i>	Seismic retrofit and other building safety programs	5-15
<i>Action 3.11.1:</i>	Review building codes and other documents related to building safety	5-15
<i>Action 3.11.2:</i>	Design guidelines for building safety programs	5-16
<i>Policy 3.12:</i>	Substandard or public nuisance properties	5-16
<i>Action 3.12.1:</i>	Housing Code procedures and notices	5-17
<i>Action 3.12.2:</i>	Incentives for returning vacant properties to service	5-17
<i>Action 3.12.3:</i>	Earlier property acquisitions	5-18
<i>Action 3.12.4:</i>	Additional property acquisition and third-party transfer methods	5-18
<i>Action 3.12.5:</i>	Repair by City with liens	5-19
<i>Action 3.12.6:</i>	Substandard and public nuisance abatement procedures and criteria	5-19

(continued)

