



Location:	1261 Harrison Street (See map on reverse)
Assessors Parcel Number:	002-0063-002-00
Proposal:	Proposal to demolish the existing historic commercial building and construct a new mixed use tower of 440 feet in height that would include approximately 12,000 square feet of retail, 130,000 square feet of office, and 185 dwelling units. The proposal would include the inclusion of affordable units to take advantage of the affordable housing density bonus and concessions.
Applicant:	Ronnie Turner – (510)395-2766
Owner:	Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
Planning Permits Required:	Regular Design Review for new construction and Category II Demolition Findings, Major Conditional Use Permits for a large project in the D-LM Zone in excess of 200,000 square feet and Height Exception to allow the D-LM 275 Height Zone regulations, Minor Conditional use Permit to allow a base height of up to 85 feet, Minor Variance for loading berths (3 Required; 0 Proposed).
General Plan:	Central Business District
Zoning:	D-LM-4 Height Area – 85'
Environmental Determination:	Section 15270 of the State CEQA Guidelines; Projects that are disapproved.
Historic Status:	Designated Historic Property (DHP); Rating C1+, contributor to the King Building Group Area of Primary Importance (API)
City Council District:	3
Status:	Pending
Action to be Taken:	Decision on the development application
Staff Recommendation:	Denial of the application based upon direction provided by the Planning Commission by unanimous vote at the March 21, 2018 hearing.
Finality of Decision:	Decision is appealable to City Council
For Further Information:	Contact case planner Peterson Z. Vollmann at 510-238-6167 or by e-mail at pvollmann@oaklandnet.com .

SUMMARY

The applicant is proposing a downtown mixed-use high-rise development. The proposed development would be approximately 440 feet tall at 36 stories and include a mix of ground floor retail, above ground level office and residential units within the upper levels of the tower. The project is located within the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan (LMSAP) within a block that is designated as an area with an 85-foot height limit. The block is limited in height because it consists of the King Building Group historic district which is an Area of Primary Importance (API). However, the resulting LMSAP zoning regulations allow for waivers of height areas to allow a limited number of towers that would be allowed to exceed the base zone height to a higher level up to 275 feet upon the granting of a Major Conditional Use Permit. Three such towers could be permitted within the 85-foot height area and three within the 175-foot height areas. At present, one has been granted in the 85-foot height area and one has been granted in the 175-foot height area, leaving two within the 85-foot height area applicable to the subject property. If approved,

CITY OF OAKLAND PLANNING COMMISSION



Case File: PLN17438
Applicant: Ronnie Turner
Address: 1261 Harrison Street
Zone: D-LM-4
Height Area: 85 ft

only one more exception within the 85-foot height area would be allowed. The development proposal would be required to meet the Conditional Use Permit Criteria for the height district waiver to go up to 275 feet, the Category II Demolition Findings as well as the Design Review Findings for properties located within APIs.

During the pre-application submittal, staff informed the applicant that the project as proposed might not conform to applicable Design Review Criteria and that it might staff wouldn't support the grant of one of the few available Major Conditional Use Permits to allow a height exception for this subject site since it would result in the loss of a historic building (CEQA historic resource) as well as potentially compromise the King Building Group API.

Staff brought this item before the Planning Commission on March 21, 2018 for an initial review before advising the applicant to proceed with the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which would be required due to the loss of the subject building which is a historic resource under CEQA. At the March hearing the Planning Commission voted unanimously to direct staff to return with findings for denial of the project. This item also appeared before the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) on March 12, 2018 who also voted unanimously to recommend that the project would not be able to meet the required findings for approval, based upon the concerns raised in the staff report.

This item is returning to the full Planning Commission as directed with findings for denial, which are attached to the report.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The subject property consists of an approximately 15,100 square foot site located at the southwest corner of Harrison and 13th Streets and is completely occupied by a one-story commercial building. The property is one of five buildings on the city block that make up the King Building Group API or the "King Block". The subject building itself is listed as a City of Oakland Designated Historic Property and has been assigned an Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS) rating of C1+, meaning that it is a contributor to the API.

King Building Group, aka King Block

The five buildings and alley that comprise the King Building Group were developed between 1904 and 1922 by the Charles H. King family and constitute the principal surviving Oakland structures associated with the wheat and lumber baron Charles H. King and his locally prominent descendants. In addition, the group provides a good and somewhat unusual example of an early 20th century downtown development project that was carried out in phases. The buildings together fully occupy the block bounded by Webster, 12th, Harrison and 13th Streets. The buildings are visually related by zero setbacks, similar widths, pressed brick surfaces, black glazed tile store bases, skeletal articulation, Renaissance/ Baroque ornamentation and the lack of any vacant lots or intrusions. In its very mixed setting; the block is a strong unified presence. Horizontality dominates, as each building occupies long street frontages and rises only one to two stories, except for one four-story focal building. The prominent use of arcades on three of the corner buildings is another unifying element. The alley entrances are masked within the facades of two of the buildings.

1261 Harrison, subject building

The OCHS records describe the subject building as an attached one-story brick masonry store building on a corner lot in an enframed semicircular arcade window-wall composition with ten bays along the 13th

Street side and five bays along Harrison Street. The restrained ornamentation is Renaissance/ Baroque. Surfaces are glazed white pressed brick with glazed lightly polychromed white terra cotta details. The second bay from the end on Harrison Street projects slightly outward and the opening is rectangular instead of arched and forms the Harrison Street entry to the alley which passes through the middle of the block to Webster Street. The buildings arches are compound with brick headers, deep reveals and console keystones. They are supported by brick piers with elaborated terra cotta Tuscan caps. Small rectangular decorated terra cotta panels are in the spandrels. Projecting brick courses along the top form a shallow denticulated cornice above a frieze and architrave. A parapet extends above the cornice. The original storefront doors have been replaced with aluminum, but most of the storefronts retain their glazed white-banded black tile back splash panels and multiple-light clerestories set within the arches. Some of the clerestories have been painted over. The building otherwise appears unaltered.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would demolish the existing commercial building to construct a new mixed use development with 36 stories reaching up to approximately 440 feet in height. The ground level of the building would contain retail activities, one of which is currently called out as a market that would have frontage onto 13th Street as well as into the midblock alley. The ground level would also include residential and office lobbies as well as an entry to an automated parking system along 13th Street. There would be one driveway each for incoming and outgoing traffic where cars would drive into a car lobby for people to get into and out of vehicles before and after the car is taken to one of the below grade levels where the vehicles are stored. Above the ground floor up to level 12 would consist of office uses totaling approximately 121,000 square feet, and above that up to the 36th floor would consist of residential uses totaling 185 dwelling units.

The proposed development would include 11% of the dwelling units as very-low income which would allow for a density bonus of up to 35%. The applicant is also requesting an affordable housing density bonus concession that would waive the requirements for tower setbacks as well as allowing the height to exceed the Conditionally Permitted maximum of 275 feet up to the proposed height of 440 feet.

GENERAL PLAN ANALYSIS

The General Plan's Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) classifies the project site as being located in the Central Business District (CBD) General Plan area. This land use classification is intended encourage, support, and enhance the downtown area as a high density mixed use urban center of regional importance and a primary hub for business, communications, office, government, high technology, retail, entertainment, community facilities, and visitor uses. The CBD classification includes a mix of large-scale offices, commercial, urban high rise residential, institutional, open-space, cultural, educational, arts, entertainment, service, community facilities, and visitor uses.

Among the General Plan Land Use and Transportation policies and objectives applicable to the proposed Project are the following:

- Policy D10.1 – Encouraging Housing – Housing in the downtown should be encouraged as a vital component of a 24-hour community.
- Policy D10.2 – Locating Housing – Housing in the downtown should be encouraged in identifiable districts, within walking distance of the 12th Street, 19th Street, City Center, and Lake

Merritt BART stations to encourage transit use, and in other locations where compatible with surrounding uses.

- Policy N3.1 – Facilitating Housing Construction – Facilitating the construction of housing units should be considered a high priority for the City of Oakland.
- Policy N3.2 – Encourage In-fill Development – In order to facilitate the construction of needed housing units, in-fill development that is consistent with the General Plan should take place throughout the City of Oakland.

Lake Merritt Station Area Plan

The Lake Merritt Station Area Plan (LMSAP) provides planning framework for future growth and development in the area surrounding the Lake Merritt BART Station. The Planning Area encompasses 315 acres in the heart of Oakland, a major urban center within the San Francisco Bay Area. Adjacent neighborhoods and destinations include Downtown Oakland, Lake Merritt, the Jack London District, Old Oakland, and Uptown.

Among the Specific Plan goals and policies applicable to the proposed Project are as follows:

- **LMSAP Policy LU-2 - High intensity development potential.** Support transit-oriented development and accommodate regional growth projections by promoting high intensity and high density development in the Planning Area.
- **LMSAP Policy LU-4 - Active ground floor uses.** Encourage active uses in new buildings on key streets in neighborhood hubs in order to transform key streets into activated pedestrian connections over time and expand the vibrancy and activity that already exists in some areas, as shown in Figure 4.2. These active ground floor uses should be located at the street edge, or at the edge of parks, plazas, or other public spaces. Activated neighborhood hubs include the 14th Street Corridor.
- **LMSAP Policy LU-19 – King Block Alley.** Encourage redevelopment of the King Block alley as an active use space that creates a unique destination.
- **LMSAP Policy OS-25 – King Block Alley.** Work with owners and adjoining properties of the King Block alley to develop a unique, active use for the space that highlights the historic nature of the space. The City can provide technical assistance and waive certain standards and permits in order to promote revitalization of this alley. Potential ideas include a café row, bocce ball courts or other games, and a sculpture garden.

The project site is located within the Upper Chinatown Area sub district of the LMSAP. This sub district contains six identified opportunity sites for future development, which the project site is not one of. The site sits within the historic King Block, which is referenced specifically several times throughout the LMSAP. The vision for the King Block is for revitalization of the historic buildings and activation of the King Block Alley as a destination that is able to take advantage of the unique historic nature of the site (policies LU-19 & OS-25). The LMSAP also references limits on heights in historic districts in Chapter 4.2 stating that considerations for future building heights should take into account the surrounding historic building heights and character of historic districts, and specifically cites the King Block in Chapter 7.1 stating that the height limit in the King Block was limited to a maximum of 85 feet so to keep future development within the range of existing heights in the district.

While the proposed development would be consistent with a number of broadly stated development related goals to housing and economic development within the LUTE and LMSAP, it appears to fall short of very specific goals identified within the LMSAP related to controls on the location of large scale development, limitation on building heights, and historic preservation.

ZONING ANALYSIS

The subject property is located within the D-LM-4 Zone. The site is also located within the D-LM Height Area 85. The intent of the D-LM-4 Zone is to designate areas of the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan District appropriate for a wide range of Residential, Commercial, and compatible Light Industrial Activities. The Height Area 85 allows for a maximum residential density of one dwelling unit per 225 square feet of lot area and a maximum commercial FAR of 5.0.

Conditional Use Permit for Density/ Intensity

The D-LM Zones requires that any development that exceeds 200,000 square feet be required to obtain approval of a Major Conditional Use Permit.

The D-LM Zones also dictate allowed height and density based upon the height area in which the property is located. The subject property is located within a D-LM height area 85, in which for the 15,101-square foot site the maximum development allowed would be 67 dwelling units and 75,505 square feet of commercial floor area. The D-LM Zone allows for two exceptions west of the Lake Merritt Channel to jump to the D-LM height area 275 by the granting of a Major Conditional Use Permit, which for this site would allow the height to increase from a maximum of 85 feet to 275 feet. The D-LM Zone also requires a Conditional Use permit to allow for an increase in the base height from 45 feet to 85 feet, which the applicant is also requesting as part of the application.

The proposed development site would allow the following density based upon the Height Areas that it is located within as compared to the allowances under the granting of the Major Conditional Use Permit to move the site into a 275 height area described in the table below:

Height Zone	Lot Area	Residential Density	Commercial FAR	Max Units/ Floor Area
85' Height Zone	15,101 sq.ft.	1 dwelling:225 sq.ft. of lot area	5.0	67 dwellings / 75,505 sq.ft.
275' Height Zone w/ CUP	15,101 sq.ft.	1 dwelling:110 sq.ft. of lot area	12.0	137 dwellings/ 181,212 sq.ft.

As discussed at the March 21, 2018 Planning Commission hearing, the project does not appear to satisfy the required findings to take advantage of the Major Conditional Use Permit. See the Key Issues section of this report for additional analysis on this issue.

Density Bonus for Affordable Housing

The applicant has proposed as part of their development proposal to include affordable units within the project in order to take advantage of a density bonus and concessions pursuant to Planning Code Section 17.107. The applicant proposes to include 11% of the 137 conditionally permitted dwelling units at Very Low Income (less than 50% of Median Income) resulting in 15 affordable units. This allows for a

Density Bonus of 35% above the baseline number of 137 units resulting in a maximum density of 185 dwelling units on the site.

In addition to the bonus in density allowed on-site the applicant is also able to take advantage of two density bonus concessions/incentives, pursuant to Section 17.107.080, that would relax other Zoning Regulations. The applicant has requested that to waive the required tower bulk regulations above the base height and the conditionally permitted height limit of 275 feet.

Design Review

The proposed development is required to undergo Design Review pursuant to Planning Code chapter 17.136 and is subject to several Design Review Criteria. The Design Review Criteria that the project is subject to for an approval are set forth in Section 17.136.050. A for new construction projects that include residential facilities, Section 17.136.055.B.2 for projects that involve historic properties within the CBD or D-LM Zones, and Section 17.136.075.C Category II Demolition Findings for the proposed demolition of a contributing building in an API.

To date, staff has not provided comments to the applicant on the exterior architectural design of the tower due to concerns regarding the overall concept of the development that includes the demolition of a historic building and a high-rise development within the King Building Group API, and any such efforts at this point in time would be moot given that the project is being recommended for denial. Please see the Key Issues section of this report for detailed information on the Design Review issues. In the event that the Planning Commission reverses the prior direction (for staff to return with findings for denial) and directs staff to proceed with review of the application, staff will undertake a thorough review of the exterior design of the building along with the necessary environmental review of the development proposal.

Parking and Loading

The proposed development project is located within the D-LM Zoning and as such no off-street parking is required. However, the development will include 185 off-street parking stalls at a 1:1 ratio for the dwelling units located within a fully automated subterranean garage. The proposal also requires bike parking in the amount of 55 long-term stalls within the development and an additional 20 short-term stalls that can be provided in bike racks around the exterior in the public right of way.

The proposal requires three off-street loading berths, one for the residential and two for the office use. The applicant has requested a variance to not provide any off-street loading.

Staff and the Planning Commission have often supported the granting of loading berth variances when they cannot be feasibly accommodated without impacting pedestrian flow on streets downtown, and due to the scale of the project a loading berth variance may be warranted for this site. However, due to the larger issues on this project staff has not conducted a thorough analysis of the variance request since the project is being recommended for denial as directed by the Planning Commission. Without the entitlements of the Major Conditional Use Permit and Design Review for the project, the minor Variance for loading is a moot point.

KEY ISSUES**Consistency with D-LM Conditional Use Permit Criteria**

Many of the criteria identified for analyzing applications for a D-LM Zone height exception are based upon specifically implementing the vision of the LMSAP. As discussed above under the General Plan Analysis section of this report, the proposed development would be consistent with a number of broadly stated development-related goals to housing and economic development with the office proposal, but it appears to fall short of specific goals identified within the LMSAP related to controls on location of development, limitation on building heights, and historic preservation. Specifically, the site is located within the King Building Group API and the LMSAP references limits on heights in historic districts in Chapter 4.2 stating that considerations for future building heights should take into account the surrounding historic building heights and character of historic districts, and specifically cites the King Block in Chapter 7.1 stating that the height limit in the King Block was limited to a maximum of 85 feet so to keep future development within the range of existing heights in the district.

The LMSAP identified opportunity sites where development would be most likely to occur. Overall the plan identified 28 total opportunity sites. The subject property was not identified as one of the 28 opportunity sites. Of the 28 opportunity sites, 19 are in height zones below 275 feet where they would be able to take advantage of the height bonus exception. When the D-LM Zoning was adopted to implement the LMSAP, a total of three exceptions were allowed where a property could take advantage of an exception to the height limit and increase to the 275-foot height zone. Of the three height exceptions to 275 feet, one is designated to the east of the Lake Merritt Channel and two to the west. To date the one allowance to the east has been granted, and one of the two allowed to the west have been granted. This leaves only one height exception of up to 275 feet that is available. To date there are 10 remaining opportunity sites west of the Lake Merritt Channel, that are not currently in development, that would be able to potentially take advantage of the one remaining exception of up to 275 feet.

It is not necessary under the D-LM zoning for a site to be located within one of the identified opportunity sites within the LMSAP to take advantage of the height exception to 275 feet. However, it would run contrary to the intent of the plan to grant the 275-foot height exception in an area that was identified within the LMSAP as keeping a lower height for historic preservation purposes. This is also especially true considering that there is only one such height exception remaining, with ten opportunity sites still available that are in areas that allow less than a 275-foot height that could take advantage of the exception.

Design Consistency with the API Criteria

As required by the API Design Review criteria in the D-LM Zone, projects are required to relate to the massing of other buildings within the API. Given scale and mass of the proposed tower, at 440 feet in height, it is difficult to make the consistency finding given no other building in the King Building Group API exceeds 70 feet in height. While the King Building Group API is not one of the downtown APIs that is considered to have a height context limitation, that provision was set forth to further limit heights in those areas below the maximum height within the zone. For example, the Cathedral District API is in a zone that allows buildings up to 55 feet in height, but the context is set at 45 feet, further reducing allowances for height without special design considerations. For the purposes of the King Block, the API wasn't designated one of these areas because most of the buildings are only one to two stories with the exception of the King Building which is four stories and approximately 65 feet in height.

Consistency with the Demolition Findings

The applicant prepared a demolition findings submittal for review by staff, and staff has concerns that the proposed development does not satisfy the required findings. The first issue is with the soundness report (Appendix F of the Demo Findings Submittal) in which a number of items are included in the primary and secondary costs that appear unnecessary such as all new windows and doors throughout, all new bathrooms and HVAC systems throughout, all new utilities to the main point of service. While a number of these upgrades may be preferable it seems that their inclusion in some instances is unnecessary in order to have a functioning commercial space as many of these items were permitted at the time the building was constructed and some of the costs seem high given the scope of the proposed work as well as the fact that most of the building is currently leased and occupied by tenants.

The second issue is that, even considering the full scope of improvements and associated costs proposed in the soundness report, it appears that the applicant's economic analysis (Appendix A of the Demo Findings Submittal) in fact demonstrates that the building could generate a reasonable economic return contrary to the conclusion in the report. In the submitted economic analysis, the costs for improvements are shown as being \$8,817,998 whereas the number for upgrades from the soundness report is \$3,077,669 for both primary and secondary upgrades. The cost differential is from the economic analysis including costs for seismic upgrades to current code which are prohibited from being included in the soundness report upgrade costs under the Demolition Findings Ordinance. The economic analysis argues that the rate of return (which appears to be 7%) falls short by \$4,725,837 of the total investment of the building value of \$3,600,000 plus the \$8,817,998 improvements costs (page 39). However, when the improvement costs from the soundness report of \$3,077,669 are substituted, it appears that their economic return target is met. The applicant has argued that the seismic upgrades are allowed as part of the overall economic analysis in the building costs; however, staff disagrees with this since the submittal requirements identify providing information on the property value under the as-is scenario, the value after demolition, the estimated value after the completion of the project and also include a category requiring the applicant to estimate the value after including the upgrades identified in the soundness report. As previously stated, the soundness report requirements do not permit the inclusion of seismic upgrades.

LMSAP Design Guidelines

Another issue with concern for the project is consistency with the LMSAP Design Guidelines that were developed as part of the specific plan process. The issue is that the project appears to have consistency issues with the Historic Resources section of the Design Guidelines. The two guidelines at issue are:

- **DG-67 – Adaptive Reuse.** Retain and integrate historic and architecturally significant structures into larger projects with adaptive reuse.
- **DG-68 – Preservation.** Avoid Removal of and rehabilitate historic resources.

Based upon the two above mentioned guidelines it would seem that the proposed development should at the least attempt to incorporate the exterior components of the building as part of a redevelopment project at the site and restore exterior components. As presently submitted, the proposal appears inconsistent with these two Design Guidelines since the development proposal would completely remove the historic building.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15270, CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves. Section 15270 was intended to allow initial screening of projects on the merits for quick disapprovals prior to the initiation of the CEQA process where the agency can determine that a project cannot be approved. However, in the event that the project is not denied or a denial is overturned on appeal, the development proposal would require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report given that the proposal includes the demolition of a CEQA historic resource.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Affirm staff's environmental determination,
2. Deny the Major Conditional Use Permit and Design Review based upon the attached findings.

Prepared by:




PETERSON VOLLMANN
Planner IV

Reviewed by:



CATHERINE PAYNE
Acting Development Projects Manager
Bureau of Planning

Approved for Forwarding to the
City Planning Commission:



ED MANASSE
Acting Deputy Director
Bureau of Planning

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Findings for Denial
- B. Project Plans

NOTE: The Demo Findings Submittal was provided under separate cover for review and consideration by the Planning Commission, and is available to the public at the Bureau of Planning office at 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 2114, Oakland, CA 94612 and on the City's website at:

<http://www2.oaklandnet.com/oakca1/groups/ceda/documents/agenda/oak069439.pdf>

ATTACHMENT A: FINDINGS

This proposal fails to meet all the following required findings under **Sections 17.134.050, 17.101.G.050.B.2, 17.136.050A., 17.136.055.B.2, and 17.136.075.C** of the Oakland Planning Code (OMC Title 17) as set forth below and which are required to approve the application. Required findings are shown in **bold type**; reasons the proposal fails to satisfy them are shown in normal type. Given that the project is being recommended for denial, only the findings for denial are being made and responses to other findings will appear blank.

SECTION 17.134.050 –CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS:

- 1. That the location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed development will be compatible with, and will not adversely affect, the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood, with consideration to be given to harmony in scale, bulk, coverage, and density; to the availability of civic facilities and utilities; to harmful effect, if any upon desirable neighborhood character; to the generation of traffic and the capacity of surrounding streets; and to any other relevant impact of the development.**

The subject property is a historic resource and contributes to a historic district that is an Area of Primary Importance (API), the proposed demolition of the subject building and proposed high rise of 440 feet would have a negative impact on the character of the historic district. This was an area that was identified within the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan (LMSAP) as an area that should have lower height limits (eventually set at 85 feet) due to the historic district and the desire the have any new development be compatible with the district in height and scale. The use permit request to exceed the baseline height would be inappropriate as a result.

- 2. That the location, design, and site planning of the proposed development will provide a convenient and functional living, working, shopping, or civic environment, and will be as attractive as the nature of the use and its location and setting warrant.**
- 3. That the proposed development will enhance the successful operation of the surrounding area in its basic community functions, or will provide an essential service to the community or region.**
- 4. That the proposal conforms to all applicable design review criteria set forth in the DESIGN REVIEW PROCEDURE of Chapter 17.136 of the Oakland Planning Code.**
- 5. That the proposal conforms in all significant respects with the Oakland General Plan and with any other applicable plan or development control map which has been adopted by the City Council.**

The subject property is located within the LMSAP and the proposed development would be consistent with a number of broadly stated development-related goals to housing and economic development with the office proposal. However, the development proposal falls short of specific goals identified within the LMSAP related to controls on location of development, limitation on building heights, and historic preservation. Specifically, the site is located within the King Building Group API and the LMSAP references limits on heights in historic districts in Chapter 4.2 stating that considerations for future building heights should take into account the surrounding historic building heights and character of historic districts, and specifically cites the King Block in Chapter 7.1 stating that the height limit in the King Block was limited to a maximum of 85 feet so to keep future development within the range of existing heights in the district. For these reasons, it would be inconsistent with the LMSAP to grant a Major Conditional use permit for one of the few allowable height exceptions in the district at this location.

17.101.G.050.B.2 – D-LM HEIGHT CRITERIA:

- a. **The proposal is consistent with the intent and desired land use character identified in the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan and its associated policies;**

The development proposal is inconsistent with specific goals identified within the LMSAP related to controls on location of development, limitation on building heights, and historic preservation. Specifically, the site is located within the King Building Group API and the LMSAP references limits on heights in historic districts in Chapter 4.2 stating that considerations for future building heights should take into account the surrounding historic building heights and character of historic districts, and specifically cites the King Block in Chapter 7.1 stating that the height limit in the King Block was limited to a maximum of 85 feet so to keep future development within the range of existing heights in the district. For these reasons, it would be inconsistent with the LMSAP to grant a Major Conditional use permit for one of the few allowable height exceptions in the district at this location.

- b. **The proposal will promote implementation of the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan;**

The D-LM Zoning for the area was adopted to implement the LMSAP. Within the D-LM zoning regulations height limits were set for different areas around the district from 45 feet up to 275 feet. The zoning allows for three exceptions to areas with lower height limits to achieve a bonus to go up to the higher 275 height area which increases height and density on a site. The zoning allows for only three such cases throughout the entire district as part of the specific plan. Of the three height exceptions to 275 feet, one is designated to the east of the Lake Merritt Channel and two to the west. To date the one allowance to the east has been granted, and one of the two allowed to the west have been granted. This leaves only one height exception of up to 275 feet that is available. To date there are 10 remaining opportunity sites west of the Lake Merritt Channel that are not currently in development that would be able to take advantage of the one remaining exception of up to 275 feet. The granting of the one remaining height exception at the subject property would run contrary to the intent of the plan given that the site is in an area that was specifically identified within the LMSAP as keeping a lower height for historic preservation purposes.

- c. **The proposal is consistent with the desired visual character described in the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan and Lake Merritt Station Area Design Guidelines, with consideration given to the existing character of the site and surrounding area.**

The subject property is located within the King Building Group API. The LMSAP specifically states that the height limit on this block is to be set at 85 feet as to keep future development consistent with the height of the historic block. The proposed 440-foot tower and the requested height exception would run contrary to this desired visual character of the specific plan. Furthermore, the LMSAP Design Guidelines include guidelines DG-67 and DG-68 that state that development proposals should avoid removal of historic buildings and instead try to adaptively reuse them or incorporate them into the development. Based upon these guidelines it would be more appropriate for any future development at this site to at a minimum incorporate the existing building's exterior walls into the proposal.

SECTION 17.136.050. A – REGULAR DESIGN REVIEW CRITERIA (Residential Facilities)

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 General Plan and with any applicable design review guidelines or criteria, district plan, or development control map which have been adopted by the Planning Commission or City Council.

The subject property is located within the LMSAP and the proposed development would be consistent with a number of broadly stated development related goals to housing and economic development with the office proposal. However, the development proposal falls short of specific goals identified within the LMSAP related to controls on location of development, limitation on building heights, and historic preservation. Specifically, the site is located within the King Building Group API and the LMSAP references limits on heights in historic districts in Chapter 4.2 stating that considerations for future building heights should take into account the surrounding historic building heights and character of historic districts, and specifically cites the King Block in Chapter 7.1 stating that the height limit in the King Block was limited to a maximum of 85 feet so to keep future development within the range of existing heights in the district.

The LMSAP Design Guidelines include guidelines DG-67 and DG-68 that state that development proposals should avoid removal of historic buildings and instead try to adaptively reuse them or incorporate them into the development. Based upon these guidelines it would be more appropriate for any future development at this site to at a minimum incorporate the existing building's exterior walls into the proposal.

SECTION 17.136.055.B.2 - HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN THE D-LM & CBD

- a) Any proposed new construction is compatible with the existing API in terms of massing, siting, rhythm, composition, patterns of openings, quality of material, and intensity of detailing;

The subject property is located within the King Building Group API. Most of the buildings are one to two stories in height except for the King Building which is four stories and approximately 65 feet in height. The proposed development would include a 440 foot tall tower within this block, which would not be compatible with the massing of the buildings in the API. Furthermore, the LMSAP specifically set a height limit in this area at 85 feet to prevent any new buildings that would be so out of scale from the historic context.

- b) New street frontage has forms that reflect the widths and rhythm of the facades on the street and entrances that reflect the patterns on the street;
- c) The proposal provides high visual interest that either reflects the level and quality of visual interest of the API contributors or otherwise enhances the visual interest of the API.

- d) The proposal is consistent with the visual cohesiveness of the API. For the purpose of this finding, visual cohesiveness is the architectural character, the sum of all visual aspects, features, and materials that defines the API. A new structure contributes to the visual cohesiveness of a district if it relates to the design characteristics of a historic district while also conveying its own time. New construction may do so by drawing upon some basic building features, such as the way in which a building is located on its site, the manner in which it relates to the street, its basic mass, form, direction or orientation (horizontal vs. vertical), recesses and projections, quality of materials, patterns of openings and level of detailing. When some combination of these design variables are arranged in a new building to relate to those seen traditionally in the area, but integral to the design and character of the proposed new construction, visual cohesiveness results;
- e) Where height is a character-defining element of the API there are height transitions to any neighboring contributing historic buildings. "Character-defining elements" are those features of design, materials, workmanship, setting, location, and association that identify a property as representative of its period and contribute to its visual distinction or historical significance. APIs with a character-defining height and their character-defining height level are designated on the zoning maps; and
- f) For additions, the proposal meets either: 1) Secretary of Interior's standards for the treatment of historic resources; 2) the proposal will not adversely affect the character of the property or API; or, 3) upon the granting of a conditional use permit, (see Chapter 17.134 for the CUP procedure) and a hearing in front of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board for its recommendations, a project meets the additional findings in Subsection g., below.
- g) For construction of new principal buildings:
 - i. The project will not cause the API to lose its status as an API;
 - ii. The proposal will result in a building or addition with exterior visual quality, craftsmanship, detailing, and high quality and durable materials that is at least equal to that of the API contributors; and
 - iii. The proposal contains elements that relate to the character-defining height of the API, if any, through the use of a combination of upper story setbacks, window patterns, change of materials, prominent cornice lines, or other techniques. APIs with a character-defining height and their character-defining height level are designated on the zoning maps.

SECTION 17.136.075.C – CATEGORY II DEMOLITION FINDINGS:

- 1. For the demolition of structures in the CIX-1A Zone; or contributors to an S-7 Zone, S-20 Zone, or API:
 - a. The applicant demonstrates that: i) the existing property has no reasonable use or cannot generate a reasonable economic return and that the development replacing it will provide such use or generates such return, or ii) the applicant demonstrates that the structure constitutes a hazard and is economically infeasible to rehabilitate on its present site. For this criterion, a hazard constitutes a threat to health and safety that is not immediate; and

The applicant's economic analysis (Appendix A of the Demo Findings Submittal) may demonstrate that the building could generate a reasonable economic return contrary to the conclusion in the report. In the submitted economic analysis the costs for improvements are shown as being \$8,817,998 whereas the number for upgrades from the soundness report is \$3,077,669 for both primary and secondary upgrades. The cost differential is from the economic analysis including costs for seismic upgrades to current code

which are prohibited in being included in the soundness report upgrade costs under the Demolition Findings Ordinance. The economic analysis argues that the rate of return (which appears to be 7%) falls short by \$4,725,837 of the total investment of the building value of \$3,600,000 plus the \$8,817,998 improvements costs (page 39). However, when the improvement costs from the soundness report of \$3,077,669 are substituted, it appears that their economic return target is met.

- b. It is economically, functionally, architecturally, or structurally infeasible to incorporate the historic structure, or existing structure in the CIX-1A Zone, into the proposed development.**
- 2. For the demolition of noncontributors to an S-7 Zone, S-20 Zone, or API: The existing structure is either: i) seriously deteriorated or a hazard; or ii) the existing design is undistinguished and does not warrant retention. For this finding, a hazard constitutes a threat to health and safety that is not immediate;**

N/A

- 3. For the demolition of any structure in an S-7 Zone, S-20 Zone, or API:**
 - a. The design quality of the replacement structure is equal/superior to that of the existing structure; and**
 - b. The design of the replacement project is compatible with the character of the district, and there is no erosion of design quality at the replacement project site and in the surrounding area. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following additional findings:**

- i. The replacement project is compatible with the district in terms of massing, siting, rhythm, composition, patterns of openings, quality of material, and intensity of detailing;**

The subject property is located within the King Building Group API. Most of the buildings are one to two stories in height except for the King Building which is four stories and approximately 65 feet in height. The proposed development would include a 440 foot tall tower within this block, which would not be compatible with the massing of the buildings in the API. Furthermore, the LMSAP specifically set a height limit in this area at 85 feet to prevent any new buildings that would be so out of scale from the historic context.

- ii. New street frontage includes forms that reflect the widths and rhythm of the facades on the street and entrances that reflect the patterns on the street;**
 - iii. The replacement project provides high visual interest that either reflects the level and quality of visual interest of the district contributors or otherwise enhances the visual interest of the district;**
 - iv. If the design contrasts the new to the historic character, the replacement project enriches the historic character of the district;**
 - v. The replacement project is consistent with the visual cohesiveness of the district. For the purpose of this item, visual cohesiveness is the architectural character, the sum of all visual aspects, features, and materials that defines the district. A new structure contributes to the visual cohesiveness of a district if it relates to the design characteristics of a historic district. New construction may do so by drawing upon some basic building features, such as the way in which a building is located on its site, the manner in which it relates to the street, its basic mass, form, direction or orientation (horizontal vs. vertical), recesses and projections, quality of materials, patterns of openings and level of detailing.**

When a combination of some of these design variables are arranged in a new building to relate to those seen traditionally in the area, but integral to the design and character of the proposed new construction, visual cohesiveness results; and

- vi. The replacement project will not cause the district to lose its current historic status.**

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

COVER SHEET

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER:

G0.0

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



1261 HARRISON STREET

OAKLAND, CA

1261 HARRISON

OAKLAND, CA 94612



1261 HARRISON STREET



1261 HARRISON STREET
OAKLAND CA 94612

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284

ABBREVIATIONS

AFF	ABOVE FINISHED FLOOR	(N)	NEW
ACOUS	ACOUSTICAL	NEG	NEGATIVE
ADJ	ADJUSTABLE	NOM	NOMINAL
AL	ALIGN	NIC	NOT IN CONTRACT
ALT	ALTERNATE	NTS	NOT TO SCALE
AB	ANCHOR BOLT	NO	NUMBER
APROV	APPROVED	OC	ON CENTER
ARCH	ARCHITECTURAL	OD	OUTSIDE DIAMETER
AUTO	AUTOMATIC	OP	OPENING
BLDG	BUILDING	OPP	OPPOSITE
BLKG	BLOCKING	ORIG	ORIGINAL
BM	BEAM	PART	PARTITION
BD	BOARD	PP	PARTIAL PENETRATION
BO	BOTTOM OF	PAF	POWDER ACTUATED FASTENER
BS	BOTH SIDES	PLAM	PLASTIC LAMINATE
CAB	CABINET	PL	PLATE
CBC	CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE	PN	PLATE NAILING
CI	CAST IRON	PLYWD	PLYWOOD
CIP	CAST IN PLACE	PT	POINT
COL	COLUMN	LB	POUND
CTR	CENTER	PRES	PRESSURE
CL	CENTER LINE	QUAL	QUALITY
CTC	CENTER TO CENTER	QUAN	QUANTITY
CER	CERAMIC		
CJ	CONSTRUCTION JOINT	PT	PRESSURE/ PRESERVATIVE TREATED
CL	CLEAR	PS	PRESTRESSED
CMU	CONCRETE MASONRY UNIT	PART	PARTITION
CON	CONNECTION		
CONT	CONTINUOUS		
CP	COMPLETE PENETRATION		
CS	COUNTERSUNK	RAD	RADIUS
CW	COLD WATER	RWL	RAIN WATER LEADER
		RECPT	RECEPTACLE
DET	DETAIL	REF	REFERENCE
DEPT	DEPARTMENT	REF	REFERENCE
DIA	DIAMETER	REIN	REINFORCEMENT, REINFORCED
DIV	DIVISION	REQ	REQUIRED
DR	DOOR	RDWD	REDWOOD
DBL	DOUBLE	RH	RIGHT HAND
DF	DOUGLAS FIR	RHR	RIGHT HAND REVERSE
DN	DOWN	RM	ROOM
DS	DIAGONAL SHEATHING	RND	ROUND
DWG	DRAWING	RO	ROUGH OPENING
DRWR	DRAWER	REV	REVISION
		SS	SANITARY SEWER
(E)	EXISTING	SAD	SEE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS
EA	EACH	SCD	SEE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
EF	EACH FACE	SED	SEE ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS
EW	EACH WAY	SKD	SEE KITCHEN CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
EN	EDGE NAILING	SSD	SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS
EL	ELEVATION	SLD	SEE LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS
ELEV	ELEVATOR	SMD	SEE MECHANICAL DRAWINGS
ELEC	ELECTRICAL	SFMD	SEE FINISH CARPENTRY DRAWINGS
ENG	ENGINEER	SPD	SEE PLUMBING DRAWINGS
EQ	EQUAL	SJ	SEISMIC JOINT
EQUIP	EQUIPMENT	SCHED	SCHEDULE, SCHEDULE
EX	EXHAUST	SECT	SECTION
EXP	EXPEDITE	SHT	SHEET
EXT	EXTERIOR	SM	SHEET METAL
		SIM	SIMILAR
FAB	FABRICATE	SP	SPACE
FOC	FACE OF CONCRETE	SPEC	SPECIFICATION
FOF	FACE OF FINISH	SQ	SQUARE
FOS	FACE OF STUD	SQFT	SQUARE FOOT
FOW	FACE OF WALL	ST	STRAP
FIN	FINISH	STAG	STAGGERED
FF	FINISHED FLOOR	SSTL	STAINLESS STEEL
FE	FIRE EXTINGUISHER	STND	STANDARD
FA	FIRE ALARM	STL	STEEL
FLR	FLOOR	STOR	STORAGE
FLUOR	FLUORESCENT	STRUCT	STRUCTURAL
FL	FLUSH	SUS	SUSPENDED
FOUND	FOUNDATION	SYM	SYMMETRICAL
FTNG	FOOTING	SYS	SYSTEM
FR	FRAMING		
FUR	FURRING	TEMP	TEMPERED
		TH	THICKNESS
GA	GAUGE	THR	THREADED
GALV	GALVANIZED, GALVANIZING	TD	TIE DOWN
GL	GLASS, GLAZING	T&B	TOP AND BOTTOM
GLULAM	GLUE LAMINATED BEAM	T&G	TONGUE AND GROOVE
GYP BD	GYPSUM BOARD	TOC	TOP OF CONCRETE
		TOF	TOP OF FINISH
HVAC	HEATING VENTILATION & AIR CONDITIONING	TOP	TOP OF PLATE
HSR	HIGH STRENGTH RODS	TOS	TOP OF STEEL
HSB	HIGH STRENGTH BOLT	TOW	TOP OF WALL
HT	HEIGHT	TN	TRUE NORTH
HD	HOLD DOWN	TYP	TYPICAL
HORIZ	HORIZONTAL		
HW	HOT WATER	UL	UNDER WRITERS LABORATORY
		UN	UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED
INC	INCLUDING, INCLUDED	UTIL	UTILITY, UTILITIES
INFO	INFORMATION		
INT	INTERIOR	VERT	VERTICAL
		VIF	VERIFY IN FIELD
		VER	VERIFY
		VEST	VESTIBULE
JH	JOIST HANGER		
JT	JOINT	WC	WATER CLOSET
		WH	WATER HEATER
LAM	LAMINATE	W	WITH
LH	LEFT HAND	WO	WITH OUT
LHR	LEFT HAND REVERSE	WD	WOOD
LT	LIGHT		
LTW	LIGHT WEIGHT	###	###
L	LONG, LENGTH	#	#
		X'-X"	X'-X"
MB	MACHINE BOLTS		
MAINT	MAINTENANCE		
MAX	MAXIMUM		
MECH	MECHANICAL		
MANF	MANUFACTURER		
MTL	METAL		
MEZZ	MEZZANINE		
MIN	MINIMUM		
MISC	MISCELLANEOUS		
MTD	MOUNTED		
MUL	MULLION		

PARCEL MAP



PROJECT DIRECTORY

OWNER: Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT: Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER: BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284


DRAWING LIST

SHEET NUMBER	SHEET NAME
G0.1	INDEX
G0.2	PROJECT DATA
G0.3	GREEN POINT RATING CHECKLIST 1
G0.4	GREEN POINT RATING CHECKLIST 2
A0.1	3D VIEWS
A0.2	3D VIEWS
A0.3	EXISTING SITE PHOTOS
A0.4	SIGNAGE PLAN & DETAILS
A0.5	LIGHTING PLAN
A1.1	EXISTING SITE PLAN
A1.2	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
A2.0P1	PARKING - TYPICAL
A2.0B1	BASEMENT 1
A2.0BM	BASEMENT MEZZANINE
A2.1	GROUND LEVEL
A2.1M	GROUND LEVEL MEZZANINE
A2.2	LEVEL 2
A2.12	LEVEL 12
A2.13	LEVEL 13 - AMENITY
A2.14	LEVEL 14
A2.18	LEVEL 18
A2.20	LEVEL 20
A2.23	LEVEL 23
A2.28	LEVEL 28
A2.30	LEVEL 30
A2.33	LEVEL 33 - AMENITY
A2.34	LEVEL 34
A2.35	LEVEL 35
A2.36	LEVEL 36
A2.37	ROOF PLAN
A3.0	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A3.1	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A3.2	SECTIONS
A8.0	ENLARGED UNIT PLANS
A8.1	ENLARGED UNIT PLANS
C1.0	TITLE SHEET
C2.0	EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN
C2.1	PROPOSED PARCELIZATION PLAN
C3.0	SITE PLAN
C4.0	PROPOSED GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN
C5.0	PROPOSED UTILITY PLAN
C6.0	DETAILS
L1.2	LANDSCAPE GROUND LEVEL MATERIALS
L2.1	LANDSCAPE 13TH AMENITY LEVEL
L2.2	LANDSCAPE 32 EMENTY LEVEL

GRAPHIC SYMBOLS

DETAIL REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER	---	#	
	SHEET NUMBER	---	#	
DETAIL SECTION REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER	---	#	
	SHEET NUMBER	---	#	
BUILDING SECTION REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER	---	#	
	SHEET NUMBER	---	#	
WALL SECTION REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER	---	#	
	SHEET NUMBER	---	#	
EXTERIOR ELEVATION REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER	---	1	#
	SHEET NUMBER	---	1	#
INTERIOR ELEVATION REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER	---	1	#
	SHEET NUMBER	---	4	#
REVISION REFERENCE		---	#	
DOOR REFERENCE		---	##	
WINDOW REFERENCE		---	#	
ELEVATION DATUM		---	⊙	
ROOM NUMBER		---	###	
PARTITION TYPE		---	#	
FINISH CEILING HEIGHT		---	X'-X"	

PROJECT LOCATION



DEFERRED SUBMITTALS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Construction of a new mixed-use building including 185 residential units above 11 floors of office, ground floor rental and 6 underground parking levels.

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

INDEX

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER

G0.1

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

OPEN SPACE CALCULATIONS

	# OF UNITS		COMPLIANT	NOTES
OPEN SPACE REQUIRED TOTAL	75 SF/UNIT	185	13,875 SF	Y
PRIVATE AREAS:				
LEVEL 13 FITNESS ROOMS		3,158 SF		
1,330 SF				
532 SF				
83 SF				
83 SF				
LEVEL 13 GALLERY LOUNGE		2,028 SF		
1,057 SF				
LEVEL 33 COMMUNITY ROOMS		1,057 SF		
1,764 SF				
409 SF				
LEVEL 13 DECK AREAS		2,173 SF		
2,398 SF				
2,679 SF				
LEVEL 33 DECK AREAS		5,077 SF		
4,579 SF				
505 SF				
217 SF				
OPEN SPACE PROVIDED TOTAL		18,794 SF		

BUILDING AREA & UNIT CALCULATIONS

	ST	1BR	1BR+	2BR	2BR+	3BR	3BR+	TH	PH+	LEASABLE	ENCLOSED SPACE	UNITS/FLOOR	
RESIDENTIAL	Level 36 Residential							0	1	3,856 sf	4,582 gsf	1 units	
	Level 35 Residential							0	0	3,710 sf	4,736 gsf	0 units	
	Level 34 Residential							3	0	2,729 sf	4,610 gsf	3 units	
	Level 33 Amenity									AMENITY	5,298 gsf	0 units	
	Level 32 Residential	0	4	0	2	0	2	0		7,935 sf	10,431 gsf	8 units	
	Level 31 Residential	0	4	0	1	0	3	0		7,935 sf	10,431 gsf	8 units	
	Level 30 Residential	0	3	1	1	0	2	1		7,983 sf	10,479 gsf	8 units	
	Level 29 Residential	0	3	1	1	1	1	1		7,953 sf	10,449 gsf	8 units	
	Level 28 Residential	1	3	1	2	2	0	0		8,017 sf	10,513 gsf	9 units	
	Level 27 Residential	2	4	1	1	2	0	0		7,855 sf	10,361 gsf	10 units	
	Level 26 Residential	2	4	1	1	2	0	0		7,754 sf	10,260 gsf	10 units	
	Level 25 Residential	2	5	0	1	2	0	0		7,706 sf	10,207 gsf	10 units	
	Level 24 Residential	2	4	1	2	1	0	0		7,685 sf	10,191 gsf	10 units	
Level 23 Residential	2	5	0	3	0	0	0		7,632 sf	10,133 gsf	10 units		
Level 22 Residential	3	3	1	3	0	0	0		7,796 sf	10,302 gsf	10 units		
Level 21 Residential	3	2	2	3	0	0	0		7,660 sf	10,166 gsf	10 units		
Level 20 Residential	3	2	2	3	0	0	0		7,660 sf	10,166 gsf	10 units		
Level 19 Residential	3	2	1	4	0	0	0		7,721 sf	10,227 gsf	10 units		
Level 18 Residential	3	2	1	4	0	0	0		7,617 sf	10,123 gsf	10 units		
Level 17 Residential	3	2	1	4	0	0	0		7,596 sf	10,102 gsf	10 units		
Level 16 Residential	3	2	2	3	0	0	0		7,695 sf	10,201 gsf	10 units		
Level 15 Residential	3	2	1	4	0	0	0		7,659 sf	10,165 gsf	10 units		
Level 14 Residential	3	2	1	4	0	0	0		7,648 sf	10,191 gsf	10 units		
Level 13 Amenity	38	58	18	47	10	8	2	3	1	AMENITY	2,281 gsf	0 units	
RESIDENTIAL LEASABLE											157,801 SF	216,604 gsf	185 units
OFFICE	Level 12 Office										9,213 sf		
	Level 11 Office										9,379 sf		
	Level 10 Office										9,641 sf		
	Level 9 Office										9,993 sf		
	Level 8 Office										10,452 sf		
	Level 7 Office										10,955 sf		
	Level 6 Office										11,466 sf		
	Level 5 Office										11,911 sf		
	Level 4 Office										12,282 sf		
	Level 3 Office										12,567 sf		
Level 2 Office										12,654 sf			
Level 1M Mezzanine	1,720 sf										136,835 sf		
Level 1 Retail	7,201 sf			1,142 sf									
Basement B1M Mezzanine				622									
Basement B1 Mech/Office				1,699 sf									
Basement P1 Parking	8,921 sf			2,841 sf									
Basement P2 Parking													
Basement P3 Parking													
Basement P4 Parking													
Basement P5 Parking													
Basement P6 Parking													
Basement P7 Parking													
OFFICE BOMA SF											120,508 sf		
TOTAL RETAIL											11,762 sf		
BUILDING gsf											399,692 gsf		

PARKING

OFFICE

RESIDENTIAL

PROJECT DATA

BUILDING INFORMATION

BUILDING ADDRESS:	1261 HARRISON
NUMBER OF STORIES:	36 STORIES
ALLOWABLE HEIGHT:	LM-85, w/ CUP: LM-275
PROPOSED HEIGHT:	456'-4" (TOP OF PARAPETS)
CONSTRUCTION TYPE:	TYPE I-A (36 STORIES)
SPRINKLERED:	YES
OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION:	A2 (COMMUNITY SPACE) A3 (FITNESS) B (OFFICE) R2 M (MERCANTILE) S2 (PARKING)

DENSITY

	ALLOWED DENSITY	LOT AREA	ALLOWED UNITS	PROPOSED UNITS
D-LM-2 /-4	110 SF/UNIT	15,101 SF	137	185

LOT AREA

TOTAL 15,101 SF (.34 ACRES)

SETBACKS

0' FOR BUILDINGS NOT EXCEEDING 85' IN HEIGHT
10' ALONG AT LEAST 50% OD THE PERIMETER LENGTH OF BASE FOR BUILDINGS EXCEEDING 85' IN HEIGHT

ZONING INFORMATION

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL #:	002 006300200
ZONING DISTRICT:	D-LM-4
HEIGHT AREA:	85'

PARKING INFORMATION

	REQUIRED	PROVIDED	NOTES
RESIDENTIAL	NO SPACES REQUIRED IN D-LM ZONES FOR MULTI-FAMILY	185 STALLS	UNDERGROUND AUTOMATED PARKING SYSTEM
COMMERCIAL	NO SPACES REQUIRED IN D-LM ZONES FOR RETAIL/ASSEMBLY	0 STALLS	

BICYCLE PARKING INFORMATION

	SHORT TERM REQUIRED	SHORT TERM PROVIDED	LONG TERM REQUIRED	LONG TERM PROVIDED	COMPLIANT
RESIDENTIAL	10 SPACES (1 SPACE FOR EACH 20 DWELLINGS)	10 SPACES	44 SPACES (1 SPACE FOR EACH 4 DWELLINGS)	60 SPACES	Y
COMMERCIAL	MIN. 2 SPACES	2 SPACES	MIN. 2 SPACES	2 SPACES	Y

RECYCLING & GARBAGE SPACE ALLOCATION

	REQUIRED	PROVIDED	NOTES
RESIDENTIAL			
RECYCLING	2,768 GALLONS (2 CF X 185 UNITS = 370 CF = 13.7 CY)	14 CY (1@6 YD + 2@4YD BIN)	
GARBAGE	28 CY (4.3 CF X 185 UNITS = 795.5 CF = 29.5 CY)	30 CY (5@6 YD BIN)	

	REQUIRED	PROVIDED	NOTES
COMMERCIAL			
RECYCLING	81.61 GALLONS (2 CF/1,000 SF X 5,455 SF = 10.91 CF = 81.61 GAL)	96 GALLONS (1 x 96 GALLON TOTER CARTS)	
GARBAGE	DEPENDS ON RETAIL TENANT TBD / ASSUMED GENERAL RETAIL USE	192 GALLONS (2 x 96 GALLON TOTER CARTS)	STORAGE OR FREQUENCY OF PICK-UP CAN BE ADJUSTED AS NEEDED

	REQUIRED	PROVIDED	NOTES
OFFICE			
RECYCLING	DEPENDS ON OFFICE TENANT TBD	12 CY (2@6YD BIN)	STORAGE OR FREQUENCY OF PICK-UP CAN BE ADJUSTED AS NEEDED
GARBAGE	DEPENDS ON OFFICE TENANT TBD	12 CY (2@6YD BIN)	STORAGE OR FREQUENCY OF PICK-UP CAN BE ADJUSTED AS NEEDED



1261 HARRISON STREET



1261 HARRISON STREET
OAKLAND CA 94612

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

PROJECT DATA

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER

G0.2

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



NEW HOME RATING SYSTEM, VERSION 7.0

MULTIFAMILY CHECKLIST

The GreenPoint Rated checklist tracks green features incorporated into the home. GreenPoint Rated is administered by Build It Green, a non-profit whose mission is to promote healthy, energy and resource efficient buildings in California.

The minimum requirements of GreenPoint Rated are: verification of 50 or more points. Earn the following minimum points per category: Community (2) Energy (25), Indoor Air Quality/Health (6), Resources (6), and Water (6). And meet the prerequisites CALGreen Mandatory, E5.2, H6.1, J6.1, O1, O7.

Directions for Use: Column A is a dropdown menu with the options of "Yes", "No", or "TBD" or a range of percentages to allocate points. Select the appropriate dropdown and the appropriate points will appear in the blue "points achieved" column.

The criteria for the green building practices listed below are described in the GreenPoint Rated New Home Rating Manual. For more information please visit www.builditgreen.org/greenpointrated

Build It Green is not a code enforcement agency.

A home is only GreenPoint Rated if all features are verified by a Certified GreenPoint Rater through Build It Green.

New Home Multifamily Version 7


Project Name: 1261 Harrison Street
Project Street: 1261 Harrison Street
Project City: Oakland
Project Zip: 94612

Total Points Targeted: 145

Certification Level:

POINTS REQUIRED

Minimum Points Targeted Points



Measures	Points Achieved	Community	Energy	IAQ/Health	Resources	Water	Notes
CALGreen							
Yes CALGreen Res (REQUIRED)	4	1	1	1	1	1	
A. SITE							
TBD A1. Construction Footprint				1			
A2. Job Site Construction Waste Diversion							
No A2.1 75% C&D Waste Diversion (Including Alternative Daily Cover)	0			2			
Yes A2.2 65% C&D Waste Diversion (Excluding Alternative Daily Cover)	2			2			
Yes A2.3 Recycling Rates from Third-Party Verified Mixed-Use Waste Facility	1			1			
TBD A3. Recycled Content Base Material				1			
Yes A4. Heat Island Effect Reduction (Non-Roof)	1	1					
Yes A5. Construction Environmental Quality Management Plan Including Flush-Out	1			1			
A6. Stormwater Control: Prescriptive Path							
No A6.1 Permeable Paving Material	0				1		
Yes A6.2 Filtration and/or Bio-Retention Features	1				1		
Yes A6.3 Non-Leaching Roofing Materials	1				1		
Yes A6.4 Smart Stormwater Street Design	1	1					
No A7. Stormwater Control: Performance Path	0				3		
B. FOUNDATION							
Yes B1. Fly Ash and/or Slag in Concrete	1			1			
Yes B2. Radon-Resistant Construction	2		2				
Yes B3. Foundation Drainage System	2			2			
N/A B4. Moisture Controlled Crawlspace	0		1				
B5. Structural Pest Controls							
No B5.1 Termite Shields and Separated Exterior Wood-to-Concrete Connections	0			1			
No B5.2 Plant Trunks, Bases, or Stems at Least 36 Inches from the Foundation	0			1			
C. LANDSCAPE							
5.00% Enter the landscape area percentage							
No C1. Plants Grouped by Water Needs (Hydrozoning)	0				1		
Yes C2. Three Inches of Mulch in Planting Beds	1				1		
C3. Resource Efficient Landscapes							
Yes C3.1 No Invasive Species Listed by Cal-IPC	1			1			
Yes C3.2 Plants Chosen and Located to Grow to Natural Size	1			1			
Yes C3.3 Urought, I oierant, California Native, Mediterranean Species, or Other Appropriate Species	0				3		
C4. Minimal Turf in Landscape							
No C4.1 No Turf on Slopes Exceeding 10% and No Overhead Sprinklers Installed in Areas Less Than Eight Feet Wide	0				2		
Yes C4.2 Turf on a Small Percentage of Landscaped Area	0				2		
No C5. Trees to Moderate Building Temperature	0	1	1	1			
Yes C6. High-Efficiency Irrigation System	0			2			
No C7. One Inch of Compost in the Top Six to Twelve Inches of Soil	0			2			
Yes C8. Rainwater Harvesting System	3			3			
No C9. Recycled Wastewater Irrigation System	0			1			
Yes C10. Submeter or Dedicated Meter for Landscape Irrigation	0			2			
0.5 E To C11. Landscape Meets Water Budget	0			1			
C12. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Site							
No C12.1 Environmentally Preferable Materials for 70% of Non-Plant Landscape Elements and Fencing	0			1			
Yes C12.2 Play Structures and Surfaces Have an Average Recycled Content >20%	1			1			
No C13. Reduced Light Pollution	0	1					
Yes C14. Large Stature Tree(s)	1	1					
TBD C15. Third Party Landscape Program Certification					1		
TBD C16. Maintenance Contract with Certified Professional					1		
No C17. Community Garden	0	2					
D. STRUCTURAL FRAME AND BUILDING ENVELOPE							
D1. Optimal Value Engineering							
No D1.1 Joists, Rafters, and Studs at 24 Inches on Center	0	1		2			
No D1.2 Non-Load Bearing Door and Window Headers Sized for Load	0			1			
No D1.3 Advanced Framing Measures	0			2			
TBD D2. Construction Material Efficiencies				1			
D3. Engineered Lumber							
No D3.1 Engineered Beams and Headers	0			1			
No D3.2 Wood I-Joists or Web Trusses for Floors	0			1			
No D3.3 Engineered Lumber for Roof Rafters	0			1			
No D3.4 Engineered or Finger-Jointed Studs for Vertical Applications	0			1			
No D3.5 OSB for Subfloor	0			0.5			
No D3.6 OSB for Wall and Roof Sheathing	0			0.5			
No D4. Insulated Headers	0	1					
D5. FSC-Certified Wood							

Points Achieved	Community	Energy	IAQ/Health	Resources	Water	
No D5.1 Dimensional Lumber, Studs, and Timber	0			6		
D5.2 Panel Products	1			3		
D6. Solid Wall Systems						
No D6.1 At Least 90% of Floors	0			1		
No D6.2 At Least 90% of Exterior Walls	0	1		1		
No D6.3 At Least 90% of Roofs	0	1		1		
No D7. Energy Heels on Roof Trusses	0	1				
No D8. Overhangs and Gutters	0	1		1		
D9. Reduced Pollution Entering the Home from the Garage						
No D9.1 Detached Garage	0			2		
Yes D9.2 Mitigation Strategies for Attached Garage	1			1		
D10. Structural Pest and Rot Controls						
Yes D10.1 All Wood Located At Least 12 Inches Above the Soil	1			1		
No D10.2 Wood Framing Treating With Borates or Factory-Impregnated, or Wall Materials Other Than Wood	0			1		
Yes D11. Moisture-Resistant Materials in Wet Areas (such as Kitchen, Bathrooms, Utility Rooms, and Basements)	2		1	1		
E. EXTERIOR						
Yes E1. Environmentally Preferable Decking	1			1		
No E2. Flashing Installation Third-Party Verified	0			2		
No E3. Rain Screen Wall System	0			2		
Yes E4. Durable and Non-Combustible Cladding Materials	1			1		
E5. Durable Roofing Materials						
Yes E5.1 Durable and Fire Resistant Roofing Materials or Assembly	1			1		
No E5.2 Roofing Warranty for Shingle Roofing	N	R	R	R	R	R
No E6. Vegetated Roof	0	2	2			
F. INSULATION						
F1. Insulation with 30% Post-Consumer or 60% Post-Industrial Recycled Content						
TBD F1.1 Walls and Floors				1		
TBD F1.2 Ceilings				1		
F2. Insulation that Meets the CDPH Standard Method—Residential for Low Emissions						
Yes F2.1 Walls and Floors	1			1		
Yes F2.2 Ceilings	1			1		
F3. Insulation That Does Not Contain Fire Retardants						
TBD F3.1 Cavity Walls and Floors				1		
TBD F3.2 Ceilings				1		
TBD F3.3 Interior and Exterior Insulation				1		
G. PLUMBING						
G1. Efficient Distribution of Domestic Hot Water						
Yes G1.1 Insulated Hot Water Pipes	1	1				
Yes G1.2 WaterSense Volume Limit for Hot Water Distribution	1				1	
No G1.3 Increased Efficiency in Hot Water Distribution	0				2	
G2. Install Water-Efficient Fixtures						
Yes G2.1 WaterSense Showerheads 1.8 gpm with Matching Compensation Valve	2				2	
Yes G2.2 WaterSense Bathroom Faucets with 1.0gpm or less	1				1	
G2.3 WaterSense Toilets with a Maximum Performance (MaP) Threshold of No. Less Than 500 Grams 1.28gpf OR 1.1 gpf	1				2	
No G2.4 Urinals with Flush Rate of ≤ 0.1 Gallons/Flush	0				1	
G3. Pre-Plumbing for Graywater System	0				1	
No G4. Operational Graywater System	0				3	
No G5. Thermostatic Shower Valve or Auto-Diversion Tub Spout	0				1	
Yes G6. Submeter Water for Tenants	2				2	
H. HEATING, VENTILATION, AND AIR CONDITIONING						
H1. Sealed Combustion Units						
Yes H1.1 Sealed Combustion Furnace	1			1		
Yes H1.2 Sealed Combustion Water Heater	2			2		
No H2. High Performing Zoned Hydronic Radiant Heating System	0	1	1			
H3. Effective Ductwork						
Yes H3.1 Duct Mastic on Duct Joints and Seams	1		1			
Yes H3.2 Pressure Balance the Ductwork System	1		1			
Yes H4. ENERGY STAR® Bathroom Fans Per HVI Standards with Air Flow Verified	1			1		
H5. Advanced Practices for Cooling						
No H5.1 ENERGY STAR Ceiling Fans in Living Areas and Bedrooms	0	1				
No H5.2 Operable Windows and Skylights Located to Induce Cross Ventilation in At Least One Room in 80% of Units	0	1				
H6. Whole House Mechanical Ventilation Practices to Improve Indoor Air Quality						
Yes H6.1 Meet ASHRAE Standard 62.2-2010 Ventilation Residential Standards	Y	R	R	R	R	R
Yes H6.2 Advanced Ventilation Standards	2			2		
No H6.3 Outdoor Air is Filtered and Tempered	0			1		
H7. Effective Range Design and Installation						
Yes H7.1 Effective Range Hood Ducting and Design	1			1		
No H7.2 Automatic Range Hood Control	0			1		
Yes H8. High Efficiency HVAC Filter (MERV 13+)	1			1		
No H9. Advanced Refrigerants	0			1		
I. RENEWABLE ENERGY						
No I1. Pre-Plumbing for Solar Water Heating	0	1				
No I2. Preparation for Future Photovoltaic Installation	0	1				
20.00% I3. Onsite Renewable Generation (Solar PV, Solar Thermal, and Wind)	5	25				
I4. Net Zero Energy Home						
No I4.1 Near Zero Energy Home	0	2				
No I4.2 Net Zero Electric	0	4				
No I5. Energy Storage System	0	1				
No I6. Solar Hot Water Systems to Preheat Domestic Hot Water	0	4				



1261 HARRISON STREET



1261 HARRISON STREET
OAKLAND CA 94696

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

GREEN POINT
RATING
CHECKLIST 1

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER

G0.3

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

Project Name: 1261 Harrison Street Project Street: 1261 Harrison Street Project City: Oakland Project Zip: 94612		Points Achieved	Community	Energy	IAQ/Health	Resources	Water
No	I7. Photovoltaic System for Multifamily Projects	0		8			
J. BUILDING PERFORMANCE AND TESTING							
TBD	J1. Third-Party Verification of Quality of Insulation Installation				1		
TBD	J2. Supply and Return Air Flow Testing			1	1		
TBD	J3. Mechanical Ventilation Testing				1		
TBD	J4. Combustion Appliance Safety Testing				1		
J5. Building Energy Performance							
10.00%	J5.1 Home Meets or Exceeds Energy Compliance Pathway	25		30			
1.00%	J5.2 Non-Residential Spaces Outperform Title 24	1		15			
No	J6. Title 24 Prepared and Signed by a CABEC Certified Energy Analyst	0		1			
TBD	J7. Participation in Utility Program with Third-Party Plan Review			1			
TBD	J8. ENERGY STAR for Homes			1			
No	J9. EPA Indoor airPlus Certification				1		
TBD	J10. Blower Door Testing				3		
Yes	J11. Compartmentalization of Units	2		1	1		
K. FINISHES							
K1. Entryways Designed to Reduce Tracked-In Contaminants							
Yes	K1.1 Entryways to Individual Units	1			1		
Yes	K1.2 Entryways to Buildings	1			1		
Yes	K2. Zero-VOC Interior Wall and Ceiling Paints	2			2		
Yes	K3. Low-VOC Caulks and Adhesives	1			1		
K4. Environmentally Preferable Materials for Interior Finish							
≥50%	K4.1 Cabinets	1				2	
≥50%	K4.2 Interior Trim	1				2	
≥50%	K4.3 Shelving	1				2	
≥50%	K4.4 Doors	1				2	
Yes	K4.5 Countertops	1				1	
K5. Formaldehyde Emissions in Interior Finish Exceed CARB							
Yes	K5.1 Doors	1			1		
Yes	K5.2 Cabinets and Countertops	2			2		
Yes	K5.3 Interior Trim and Shelving	2			2		
Yes	K6. Products That Comply With the Health Product Declaration Open Standard	2			2		
Yes	K7. Indoor Air Formaldehyde Level Less Than 27 Parts Per Billion	2			2		
No	K8. Comprehensive Inclusion of Low Emitting Finishes				1		
Yes	K9. Durable Cabinets	2				2	
No	K10. At Least 25% of Interior Furniture Has Environmentally Preferable Attributes	0				1	
L. FLOORING							
≥25%	L1. Environmentally Preferable Flooring	1				3	
≥25%	L2. Low-Emitting Flooring Meets CDPH 2010 Standard Method—Residential	1			3		
Yes	L3. Durable Flooring	1				1	
No	L4. Thermal Mass Flooring	0		1			
M. APPLIANCES AND LIGHTING							
Yes	M1. ENERGY STAR® Dishwasher	1				1	
M2. Efficient Clothes Washing and Drying							
TBD	M2.1 CEE-Rated Clothes Washer			1		2	
TBD	M2.2 Energy Star Dryer			1			
No	M2.3 Solar Dryer/ Laundry Lines	0		0.5			
<25 cubic feet	M3. Size-Efficient ENERGY STAR Refrigerator	1		2			
M4. Permanent Centers for Waste Reduction Strategies							
Yes	M4.1 Built-In Recycling Center	1				1	
No	M4.2 Built-In Composting Center	0				1	
M5. Lighting Efficiency							
Yes	M5.1 High-Efficacy Lighting	2		2			
Yes	M5.2 Lighting System Designed to IESNA Footcandle Standards or Designed by Lighting Consultant	2		2			
TBD	M6. Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Infrastructure			2			
No	M7. Central Laundry	0				1	
No	M8. Gearless Elevator	0		1			
N. COMMUNITY							
N1. Smart Development							
Yes	N1.1 Infill Site	2	1			1	
No	N1.2 Designated Brownfield Site	0	1			1	
>20	N1.3 Conserve Resources by Increasing Density	1		2		2	
No	N1.4 Cluster Homes for Land Preservation	0	1			1	
	N1.5 Home Size Efficiency					9	
	Enter the area of the home, in square feet						
	Enter the number of bedrooms						
N2. Home(s)/Development Located Near Major Transit Stop							
Yes	N2.1 Within 1 Mile of a Major Transit Stop	1	1				
Yes	N2.2 Within 1/2 mile of a Major Transit Stop	0	2				
N3. Pedestrian and Bicycle Access							
	N3.1 Pedestrian Access to Services Within 1/2 Mile of Community Services	2	2				
20	Enter the number of Tier 1 services						
20	Enter the number of Tier 2 services						
Yes	N3.2 Connection to Pedestrian Pathways	1	1				
Yes	N3.3 Traffic Calming Strategies	2	2				
Yes	N3.4 Sidewalks Buffered from Roadways and 5-8 Feet Wide	1	1				
Yes	N3.5 Bicycle Storage for Residents	1	1				
Yes	N3.6 Bicycle Storage for Non-Residents	1	1				
1 space per unit	N3.7 Reduced Parking Capacity	2	2				
N4. Outdoor Gathering Places							
Yes	N4.1 Public or Semi-Public Outdoor Gathering Places for Residents	1	1				

Project Name: 1261 Harrison Street Project Street: 1261 Harrison Street Project City: Oakland Project Zip: 94612		Points Achieved	Community	Energy	IAQ/Health	Resources	Water
No	N4.2 Public Outdoor Gathering Places with Direct Access to Tier 1 Community Services	0	1				
N5. Social Interaction							
No	N5.1 Residence Entries with Views to Callers	0	1				
No	N5.2 Entrances Visible from Street and/or Other Front Doors	0	1				
No	N5.3 Porches Oriented to Street and Public Space	0	1				
N6. Passive Solar Design							
No	N6.1 Heating Load	0		2			
No	N6.2 Cooling Load	0		2			
N7. Adaptable Building							
Yes	N7.1 Universal Design Principles in Units	2	1		1		
No	N7.2 Full-Function Independent Rental Unit	0	1				
N8. Affordability							
≤25%	N8.1 Dedicated Units for Households Making 80% of AMI or Less	1	2				
Yes	N8.2 Units with Multiple Bedrooms for Households Making 80% of AMI or Less	1	1				
No	N8.3 At Least 20% of Units at 120% AMI or Less are For Sale	0	1				
N9. Mixed-Use Developments							
No	N9.1 Live/Work Units Include a Dedicated Commercial Entrance	0	1				
Yes	N9.2 At Least 2% of Development Floor Space Supports Mixed Use	1	1				
No	N9.3 Half of the Non-Residential Floor Space is Dedicated to Community Service	0	1				
N8. Resiliency							
TBD	N8.1 Climate Impact Assessment		1		1	1	
TBD	N8.2 Strategies to Address Assessment Findings		1		1	1	
N9. Social Equity							
TBD	N9.1 Diverse Workforce		1			1	
Yes	N9.2 Community Location	2	1		1		
O. OTHER							
Yes	O1. GreenPoint Rated Checklist in Blueprints	Y	R	R	R	R	R
TBD	O2. Pre-Construction Kickoff Meeting with Rater and Subcontractors			0.5		1	0.5
TBD	O3. Orientation and Training to Occupants—Conduct Educational Walkthroughs			0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
TBD	O4. Builder's or Developer's Management Staff are Certified Green Building Professionals			0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
O5. Home System Monitors							
TBD	O5.1 Energy Home System Monitors			1			
TBD	O5.2 Water Home System Monitors					1	
O6. Green Building Education							
TBD	O6.1 Marketing Green Building		2				
TBD	O6.2 Green Building Signage			0.5			0.5
TBD	O7. Green Appraisal Addendum			R	R	R	R
TBD	O8. Detailed Durability Plan and Third-Party Verification of Plan Implementation					1	
TBD	O9. Residents Are Offered Free or Discounted Transit Passes		2				
TBD	O10. Vandalism Deterrence Practices and Vandalism Management Plan					1	
TBD	O11. Smokefree Buildings				2		
TBD	O12. Integrated Pest Management Plan					1	
P. DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS							
P1. Acoustics: Noise and Vibration Control							
2	Enter the number of Tier 1 practices						
2	Enter the number of Tier 2 practices						
P2. Mixed-Use Design Strategies							
Yes	P2.1 Tenant Improvement Requirements for Build-Outs	2			1		1
No	P2.2 Commercial Loading Area Separated for Residential Area	0			1		
Yes	P2.3 Separate Mechanical and Plumbing Systems	1			1		
P3. Commissioning							
No	P3.1 Design Phase	0		1	1		
No	P3.2 Construction Phase	0		2	1		
Yes	P3.3 Post-Construction Phase	3		2	1		
TBD	P4. Building Enclosure Testing			1	1	1	

Summary							
Total Available Points in Specific Categories		404	46	141	69	94	54
Minimum Points Required in Specific Categories		50	2	25	6	6	6
Total Points Achieved		145.0	20.0	44.5	37.0	27.5	16.0



1261 HARRISON STREET



1261 HARRISON STREET
OAKLAND CA 94612

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

GREEN POINT
RATING
CHECKLIST 2

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER

G0.4


ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



VIEW FROM HIGHWAY 880



CORNER VIEW AT HARRISON AND 13TH STREET



PROPOSED ALLEY VIEW

lowney arch

1261 HARRISON STREET

PINNACLE
RED Group Inc

1261 HARRISON STREET
OAKLAND CA 94612

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

3D VIEWS

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER

A0.1

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



VIEW OF 13TH STREET PLANNED MARKET ENTRANCE



VIEW FROM EAST 18TH STREET AT LAKE MERRITT



VIEW LOOKING WEST ALONG 13TH STREET

lowney
arch

1261 HARRISON STREET

PINNACLE
RED Group Inc

1261 HARRISON STREET
OAKLAND CA 94612

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

3D VIEWS

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER

A0.2

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



WEBSTER STREET



HARRISON STREET



13TH STREET

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

EXISTING SITE
PHOTOS

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER
A0.3


ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

SIGNAGE PLAN & DETAILS

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER

A0.4

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



1 FLEX RETAIL SIGNAGE




2 MAIN LOBBY SIGNAGE




3 MARKET HALL 13TH STREET SIGNAGE



4 ALLEY RETAIL SIGNAGE



2 LEVEL 1 Copy 1 Copy 1
3/32" = 1'-0"



A - WALL MOUNTED SCONCE LIGHT

WALL MOUNTED FIXTURE AT RESIDENTIAL BALCONIES



22 215 Wall Luminaire
By BEGA lighting

SYMBOL:

BEGA 22215
Wall Luminaire

Product data sheet

Application: LED wall luminaire for secondary lighting tasks. The used LED technology offers a variety of lighting options with the same appearance as the same line.

Product description: Luminaire made of aluminum alloy, anodized and powder coated. Max. cable length: 20m. Max. cable weight: 20kg. Max. cable diameter: 12mm. Max. cable weight: 20kg. Max. cable diameter: 12mm. Max. cable weight: 20kg. Max. cable diameter: 12mm.

Technical data: Max. cable length: 20m. Max. cable weight: 20kg. Max. cable diameter: 12mm.

Light distribution:

B - IN-GROUND LED

FLOOR RECESSED FIXTURE AT STREET LEVEL



77 050 In-ground Luminaire
By BEGA lighting

SYMBOL:

BEGA 77 050
In-ground luminaire

Product data sheet

Application: Recessed LED luminaire for recessed mounting in compact surfaces, paths and open areas. Area user: luminaire for ambience with protection glass.

Product description: Luminaire made of aluminum alloy, anodized and powder coated. Max. cable length: 20m. Max. cable weight: 20kg. Max. cable diameter: 12mm.

Technical data: Max. cable length: 20m. Max. cable weight: 20kg. Max. cable diameter: 12mm.

Light distribution:

C - RECESSED STRIP LIGHTING


CONTINUOUS ACCENT STRIP LIGHTING; RECESSED MOUNTED AT AMENITY LEVEL GUARDRAILS




N-Series (Narrow) Flexible LED Strip Light - Ultra Bright
By Aspect LED

SYMBOL:

WATERPROOF	
Part #	AL5LMS10
Dimensions	310" (7894mm) x 12" (304.8mm)
Distance Between LEDs	1/4" (6.35mm)
Cut Length	12" (304.8mm) or 24" (609.6mm)
IP Rating	IP68 Submersible
Adhesive Backing	No
Mounting Method	Mounting Straps or Adhesive Caulk
Light Output	12000 lm @ 120°C
Beam Angle	120 Degrees
Dimmable	Yes
Power Consumption	2.10 Watts per foot (6.9 Watts per meter)
Max Luminaire Flux	232 Lumens per foot
LED Type	540° SMD 3535 LED Chips
LED Color	Warm White, 3000K Cool White, 4000K Blue, 4500K Daylight, 5000K Yellow, 5600K
LED Quantity	30 LEDs per foot (96 LEDs per meter)
Max Run	10.4 feet @ 120°C (3.2m @ 120°C)
Weight	1.8 lbs per foot (0.5kg per meter)
Average Lifespan	50,000 hours
Warranty	1 Year
Substrate Uses	Die, Epoxy or Wet Laminate SMD or Leadless Wire Bonding Solder or Solderless
Standards / Certifications	UL Listed ULC Listed RoHS, CE



1 LIGHTING - LEVEL 1
1/16" = 1'-0"



3 LIGHTING - LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL
1/16" = 1'-0"



4 LIGHTING - LEVEL 33 - AMENITY
1/16" = 1'-0"


lowney arch
1261 HARRISON STREET
Pinnacle
RED Group Inc
1261 HARRISON STREET
OAKLAND CA 94612

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN
LIGHTING PLAN

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: A0.5



ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM


ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

EXISTING SITE PLAN

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER: A1.1

A1.1

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT




① SITE EXISTING
1/16" = 1'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN


PROPOSED SITE
PLAN

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 | SHEET NUMBER: A1.2

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



1 SITE PROPOSED
1/16" = 1'-0"




OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

PARKING - TYPICAL


PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER: A2.0P1

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



ROOM LEGEND

- CORE
- PARKING
- UTILITY



10/23/2017 1:14:34 PM


1 BASEMENT 7 Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

BASEMENT 1

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER: A2.0B1

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



10/23/2017 1:14:33 PM


1 BASEMENT 1 - PARKING LEVEL Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



1
A3.2


1
A3.2

2
A3.2

2
A3.2

ROOM LEGEND

 CIRCULATION	 STAIR
 PARKING	 UTILITY
 RETAIL	



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM


ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

**BASEMENT
MEZZANINE**

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 | SHEET NUMBER:

A2.0BM

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

- CIRCULATION
- CORE
- LOBBY
- OFFICE
- PARKING
- RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
- RETAIL
- STAIR
- UTILITY

N	N
PROJECT NORTH	TRUE NORTH

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM


ENTITLEMENT DESIGN
GROUND LEVEL

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: **A2.1**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

10/23/2017 1:14:44 PM

1 LEVEL 1 Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"







OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

GROUND LEVEL MEZZANINE

ROOM LEGEND


 CIRCULATION	 CORE	 LOBBY	 RETAIL	 UTILITY
--	---	--	---	--

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: **A2.1M**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

10/23/2017 1:14:44 PM

1 LEVEL 1M Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"




OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN


LEVEL 2

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER


A2.2

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



ROOM LEGEND

 CIRCULATION	 RESTROOMS
 CORE	 STAIR
 LOBBY	 UTILITY
 OFFICE	



1 LEVEL 2 - OFFICE Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"


10/23/2017 1:14:45 PM

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN



LEVEL 12

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER


A2.12

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



ROOM LEGEND

 CIRCULATION	 RESTROOMS
 CORE	 STAIR
 LOBBY	 UTILITY
 OFFICE	



1 LEVEL 12 - OFFICE Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"



10/23/2017 1:16:53 PM

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN


LEVEL 13 - AMENITY

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: **A2.13**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

10/23/2017 1:19:21 PM

1 LEVEL 13 - AMENITY Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"



OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

 1BR	 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
 2BR	 STAIR
 BALCONY	 STUDIO
 CIRCULATION	 UTILITY




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LEVEL 14

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: **A2.14**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



10/23/2017 1:21:36 PM


1 LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

 1BR	 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
 2BR	 STAIR
 BALCONY	 STUDIO
 CIRCULATION	 UTILITY




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LEVEL 18

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: **A2.18**



ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

10/23/2017 1:24:01 PM


1 LEVEL 18 - RESIDENTIAL Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

 1BR	 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
 2BR	 STAIR
 BALCONY	 STUDIO
 CIRCULATION	 UTILITY




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LEVEL 20

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: **A2.20**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



10/23/2017 1:48:13 PM



1 LEVEL 20 - RESIDENTIAL Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

 1BR	 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
 2BR	 STAIR
 BALCONY	 STUDIO
 CIRCULATION	 UTILITY



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LEVEL 23

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: **A2.23**



ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

 1BR	 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
 2BR	 STUDIO
 BALCONY	 UTILITY
 CIRCULATION	




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LEVEL 28

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: A2.28




ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

 1BR	 CIRCULATION
 2BR	 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
 3BR	 UTILITY
 BALCONY	




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN
LEVEL 30

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051
SHEET NUMBER: **A2.30**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT




OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN


LEVEL 33 - AMENITY

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER


A2.33

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



ROOM LEGEND

 AMENITY	 LOBBY
 BALCONY	 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
 CIRCULATION	 STAIR
 CORE	 UTILITY



1 LEVEL 33 - AMENITY Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"


10/23/2017 1:59:33 PM

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

 2BR	 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY
 3BR	 STAIR
 BALCONY	 UTILITY
 CIRCULATION	




#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LEVEL 34

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER: A2.34

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



10/23/2017 2:02:44 PM


1 LEVEL 34 - TOWNHOUSES Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN



LEVEL 35

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER









A2.35

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



ROOM LEGEND

 2BR	 CIRCULATION
 3BR	 UTILITY
 BALCONY	



1 LEVEL 35 - TOWNHOUSES Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"

10/23/2017 2:06:00 PM

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454


CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

 BALCONY	 STAIR
 PENTHOUSE	 UTILITY
 RESIDENTIAL LOBBY	



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM


ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LEVEL 36

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051

SHEET NUMBER: **A2.36**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



10/23/2017 2:09:23 PM


1 LEVEL 36 - GRAND PENTHOUSE Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



ROOM LEGEND

- STAIR
- UTILITY

N	N		
PROJECT NORTH	TRUE NORTH		
#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN


ROOF PLAN

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER: **A2.37**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

10/23/2017 2:12:32 PM

1 ROOF Copy 1
1/8" = 1'-0"



OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM


ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

EXTERIOR
ELEVATIONS


PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER

A3.0

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



1 NORTH ELEVATION Copy 1
1" = 30'-0"



2 WEST ELEVATION Copy 1
1" = 30'-0"




OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN

EXTERIOR
ELEVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER


A3.1

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



① EAST ELEVATION Copy 1
1" = 30'-0"

② SOUTH ELEVATION Copy 1
1" = 30'-0"



OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284


#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN


SECTIONS

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER: A3.2

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT




A B C D E



② NORTH-SOUTH SHORT SECTION Copy 1
1" = 30'-0"

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8




① WEST-EAST LONG SECTION Copy 1
1" = 30'-0"

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425


ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300


LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284




5 LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 05
1/4" = 1'-0"




1 LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 04
1/4" = 1'-0"



2 LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 03
1/4" = 1'-0"



3 LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 01
1/4" = 1'-0"



4 LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 02
1/4" = 1'-0"

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN


ENLARGED UNIT
PLANS

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER

A8.0

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT




OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425


ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
255 Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Redwood City, CA 94065
Phone: 650.482.6300


LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.465.1284




⑤ LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 10
1/4" = 1'-0"




④ LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 09
1/4" = 1'-0"



③ LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 08
1/4" = 1'-0"



② LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 07
1/4" = 1'-0"



① LEVEL 14 - RESIDENTIAL - UNIT 06
1/4" = 1'-0"

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	06/15/2017	DEV. REVIEW	XX
2	10/19/2017	ENTITLEMENT	EM

ENTITLEMENT
DESIGN


ENLARGED UNIT
PLANS

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER

A8.1

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED
WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE
DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN
CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



BENCHMARK STATEMENT:

THE ELEVATIONS SHOWN ON THIS SURVEY ARE BASED ON THE CITY OF OAKLAND BENCHMARK 26AC, A STANDARD DISC IN A MONUMENT CASTING WITH AN ELEVATION OF 32.697' AND IS OF FIRST ORDER ACCURACY. BENCH MARK INFORMATION AND FIELD NOTES ARE ON FILE AT THE CITY ENGINEERS OFFICE IN OAKLAND CALIFORNIA.

BASIS OF BEARINGS:

THE BASIS OF BEARINGS IS S63°45'00"E BETWEEN FOUND MONUMENTS ON 12TH STREET AT THE INTERSECTIONS OF HARRISON STREET AND WEBSTER STREET, SHOWN HEREON, AND SHOWN ON THAT CERTAIN MAP ENTITLED, "PARCEL MAP 7540", FILED IN BOOK 256 OF MAPS, AT PAGES 28 AND 29, ALAMEDA COUNTY RECORDS.

UTILITY NOTE:

THE UTILITY LINES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE DERIVED FROM SURFACE OBSERVATIONS AND ARE APPROXIMATE ONLY. NO WARRANTY IS IMPLIED AS TO THE ACTUAL LOCATION, SIZE OR PRESENCE OF ANY LINES SHOWN HEREON OR ANY ADDITIONAL UTILITY LINES NOT SHOWN ON THIS PLAN.




SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT:

THIS SURVEY WAS PERFORMED BY ME, OR UNDER MY DIRECTION, AND COMPLIES WITH NATIONAL MAP ACCURACY STANDARDS.

KEVIN STEIN
P.L.S. 9028

09-06-2016
DATE

SEE SHEET C1.0 FOR
ADDITIONAL NOTES
AND LEGENDS



LANDS OF
JEFFERY E. AND EDITH H. SCHWARTZ FAMILY
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
(PARCEL 1, DOC. 1998-187071)
EXISTING
2 STORY BRICK BUILDING

LANDS OF
WAI HO AND CHUN MUI HO 2001 REVOCABLE TRUST
(DOC. 2013-351174)
EXISTING
1 STORY BRICK BUILDING

LANDS OF
JEFFERY E. AND EDITH H. SCHWARTZ FAMILY
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
(PARCEL 2, DOC. 1998-187071)
EASEMENT FOR DRIVEWAY, PEDESTRIAN, LIGHT AND AIR

FOR THE BENEFIT OF:
LANDS OF HO REVOCABLE TRUST
(DOC. 2013-351174)
(HATCH)

LANDS OF
PARCEL B
256 MAPS 29
EXISTING
4 STORY BRICK BUILDING

LANDS OF
JEFFERY E. AND EDITH H. SCHWARTZ
FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
(PARCEL 3, DOC. 1998-187071)
EXISTING
2 1/2? STORY BRICK BUILDING

SDDI
TG 36.59
INV 34.84
(BOTTOM OF BOX)

SDDI
TG 36.50
INV 34.75
(BOTTOM OF BOX)

LANDS OF
PARCEL A
256 MAPS 29
EXISTING
2 STORY BRICK BUILDING

1261 HARRISON STREET
VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 10763
EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN
ALAMEDA COUNTY
CITY OF OAKLAND



255 SHORELINE DR.,
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065
(650) 482-6300
www.bkf.com



No.	Revisions

Date 10/26/17
Scale 1"=10'
MFC
Design
Drawn
Approved SRN
Job No 20160218




Sheet Number:
C2.0
2 OF 7

DRAWING NAME: \\BKF-c\c\2016\160218_301_13th_Street_Oak\land\ENG\01_TPM\C2.0_Existing Conditions Plan.dwg
PLOT DATE: 10-27-17
PLOTTED BY: suid

PROPOSED PARCELIZATION NOTES

- 1. THE PROJECT IS PROPOSING TO CONVERT LOT 002-0063-200 INTO 185 RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM UNITS AND 1 COMMERCIAL CONDOMINIUM UNIT.
- 2. THE PROJECT IS PROPOSING TO USE LOT 002-0063-300 AS A PUBLIC ACCESS EASEMENT.
- 3. ALL STATION LINES ARE ESTABLISHED AS THE CENTERLINE OF THE STREET.

SEE SHEET C1.0 FOR ADDITIONAL NOTES AND LEGENDS



DRAWING NAME: \\BKF-c\c\dat\2016\160218_301_13th_Street_Oak\and\ENG\01_TPM\C2.1_Parcelization_Plan.dwg
PLOT DATE: 10-27-17 PLOTTED BY: suld



Revisions	
No.	Date
	10/26/17
Scale	1"=10'
Design	MFC
Drawn	DFS
Approved SRN	
Job No	20160218

Date: 10/26/17
 Scale: 1"=10'
 Design: MFC
 Drawn: DFS
 Approved SRN:
 Job No: 20160218







Know what's below.
Call before you dig.

HORIZONTAL CONTROL NOTES




1. ALL STATION LINES ARE ESTABLISHED AS THE CENTERLINE OF THE STREET.
2. ALL DIMENSIONS ON THE PLANS ARE IN FEET OR DECIMALS THEREOF UNLESS SPECIFICALLY CALLED OUT AS FEET AND INCHES.
3. SEE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT FOR ALL FLATWORK AND VEHICULAR PAVEMENT SECTIONS AND BASE REQUIREMENTS.
4. THE FINAL OR SURFACE LAYER OF ASPHALT CONCRETE SHALL NOT BE PLACED UNTIL ALL ON-SITE IMPROVEMENTS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED, INCLUDING ALL GRADING, AND ALL UNACCEPTABLE CONCRETE WORK HAS BEEN REMOVED AND REPLACED BY PROJECT CIVIL ENGINEER.

5. ALL PAVING SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH SECTION 26 "AGGREGATE BASE" AND SECTION 39 "ASPHALT CONCRETE" PER LATEST EDITION OF CALTRANS STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS.
6. COLOR AND FINISH OF CONCRETE TO BE SPECIFIED BY LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.
7. SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR ALL SIDEWALK FINISHES AND MATERIALS.

HATCH LEGEND

-  NEW FULL-DEPTH ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVING
-  NEW CONCRETE PAVEMENT
-  NEW LANDSCAPE, SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS
-  SAWCUT LINE/LIMITS OF DEMOLITION

SEE SHEET C1.0 FOR ADDITIONAL NOTES AND LEGENDS




DRAWING NAME: \\BKF-c\c\dot\2016\160218_301_13th_Street_Oak\and\ENG\01_TPM\C3.0_Site_Plan.dwg
PLOT DATE: 10-27-17
PLOTTED BY: suld

BKF100
255 SHORELINE DR.,
SUITE 200
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065
(650) 462-6300
www.bkf.com

10 YEARS
ENGINEERS · SURVEYORS · PLANNERS

1261 HARRISON STREET
VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 10763
SITE PLAN
ALAMEDA COUNTY
CITY OF OAKLAND
CALIFORNIA



No.	Revisions

Date 10/26/17
Scale 1"=10'
Design MFC
Drawn DFS
Approved SRN
Job No 20160218

Sheet Number:
C3.0
4 OF 7





Know what's below.
Call before you dig.

GRADING NOTES

1. PROVIDE POSITIVE SURFACE DRAINAGE AWAY FROM ALL STRUCTURES BY SLOPING THE FINISHED GROUND SURFACE AT LEAST 2%, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON THE PLANS. SLOPE PORCHES, LANDINGS AND TERRACES 2% (1/4" PER FOOT) AWAY FROM STRUCTURES UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON PLANS.
2. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL CONTROLLING DIMENSIONS WITH ARCHITECTURAL PLANS.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE EARTHWORK QUANTITIES BASED ON THE TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY, THE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION AND THE PROPOSED SURFACE THICKNESS AND BASE THE BID ACCORDINGLY. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO CONFIRM IF A SEPARATE DEMOLITION CONTRACT HAS BEEN ISSUED TO TAKE THE SITE FROM THE WAY IT IS AT THE TIME OF THE BID TO THE CONDITIONS DESCRIBED IN THESE DOCUMENTS. ANY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE STATE IN WHICH THE SITE IS DELIVERED TO THE CONTRACTOR AND THESE DOCUMENTS SHOULD BE NOTED TO THE ENGINEER/ARCHITECT.
4. ALL FILL SHALL BE COMPACTED PER THE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT AND THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE AND COMPLY WITH THE CLIENT'S GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER TO TAKE THE APPROPRIATE TESTS TO VERIFY COMPACTION VALUES.
5. IMPORT SOILS SHOULD MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SOILS REPORT AND SPECIFICATIONS.
6. DO NOT ADJUST GRADES ON THIS PLAN WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE ENGINEER/ARCHITECT.
7. SITE STRIPPINGS THAT CONTAIN ONLY ORGANIC MATERIAL (NO DEBRIS TRASH, BROKEN CONC. OR ROCKS GREATER THAN 1" IN DIAMETER) MAY BE USED IN LANDSCAPE AREAS, EXCEPT FOR AREAS IDENTIFIED AS IMPORT TOP SOIL BY THE LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS. EXCESS STRIPPINGS SHALL BE REMOVED FROM SITE.
8. ROUGH GRADING TO BE WITHIN 0.1' AND FINISH GRADES ARE TO BE WITHIN 0.05', HOWEVER CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT CONSTRUCT ANY IMPROVEMENTS THAT WILL CAUSE WATER TO POND OR NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS IN GRADING NOTE #1.
9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL EXERCISE EXTREME CARE TO CONFORM TO THE LINES, GRADES, SECTIONS, AND DIMENSIONS AS SET FORTH ON THESE PLANS. ALL GRADED AREAS SHALL CONFORM TO THE VERTICAL ELEVATIONS SHOWN WITH A TOLERANCE OF ONE-TENTH OF A FOOT. WHERE GRADED AREAS DO NOT CONFORM TO THESE TOLERANCES, THE CONTRACTORS SHALL BE REQUIRED TO DO CORRECTIVE GRADING, AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE CLIENT.
10. IT SHALL BE THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO CONFIRM THE GROUND ELEVATIONS AND OVERALL TOPOGRAPHY OF THE SITE PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION AS TO THE ACCURACY BETWEEN THE WORK SET FORTH ON THESE PLANS AND THE WORK IN THE FIELD. ANY DISCREPANCIES SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE CONSTRUCTION MANAGER AND CIVIL ENGINEER IN WRITING PRIOR TO START OF CONSTRUCTION WHICH MAY REQUIRE CHANGES IN DESIGN AND/OR AFFECT THE EARTHWORK QUANTITIES.
11. TRENCHES SHALL NOT BE LEFT OPEN OVERNIGHT IN EXISTING PUBLIC STREET AREAS. CONTRACTOR SHALL BACKFILL TRENCHES, OR PLACE STEEL PLATING WITH ADEQUATE CUTBACK TO PREVENT SHIFTING OF STEEL PLATE AND/OR HOT-MIX ASPHALT REQUIRED TO PROTECT OPEN TRENCHES AT THE END OF THE WORKING DAY.

SEE SHEET C1.0 FOR ADDITIONAL NOTES AND LEGENDS



BKF100
 10 YEARS
 ENGINEERS · SURVEYORS · PLANNERS

255 SHORELINE DR.,
 REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065
 (650) 462-6300
 www.bkf.com

1261 HARRISON STREET
VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 10763
PROPOSED GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN

CITY OF OAKLAND
 ALAMEDA COUNTY
 CALIFORNIA



Revisions	
No.	Date
	10/26/17
	1"=10'
	MFC Design
	DFS Drawn
	Approved SRN
	Job No 20160218

Sheet Number: **C4.0**
 5 OF 7




811
 Know what's below.
 Call before you dig.

DRAWING NAME: \\BKF-c\c\dat\2016\160218_301_13th_Street_Oak\and\ENG\01_TPM\C4.0_Grading_Plan.dwg
 PLOT DATE: 10-27-17
 PLOTTED BY: sulid

UTILITY NOTES

1. VERIFY ALL CONNECTION POINTS TO EXISTING SYSTEMS AS FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. POTHOLE ALL UTILITY CROSSINGS. REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES AND CONFLICTS TO ENGINEER FOR REVIEW.
2. DOMESTIC WATER, FIRE WATER, AND SANITARY SEWER LATERAL SIZES TO BE CONFIRMED DURING DETAILED DESIGN PHASE.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE GRAVITY UTILITY WORK WITH ALL JOINT TRENCH/RULE 20 UNDERGROUNDING WORK. IF JOINT TRENCH SCOPE OF WORK IS TO BE PERFORMED FIRST, CONTRACTOR SHALL STAKE LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS OF ALL PROPOSED GRAVITY UTILITY CROSSINGS. JOINT TRENCH TO BE INSTALLED WITH MINIMUM 12" VERTICAL CLEARANCE TO PROPOSED GRAVITY UTILITY AT ALL CROSSINGS.
4. ALL GRAVITY UTILITY INSTALLATION SHALL BEGIN AT THE FURTHEST DOWNSTREAM POINT OF THE SYSTEM AND PROCEED UPSTREAM.
5. INFORMATION REGARDING EXISTING SUBSURFACE IMPROVEMENTS AND UTILITIES SHOWN ON THESE PLANS WAS TAKEN FROM RECORD DATA. IT IS NOT MEANT TO BE A FULL CATALOG OF EXISTING CONDITIONS. CONTRACTOR SHALL CONDUCT FIELD INVESTIGATIONS AS REQUIRED TO VERIFY THE LOCATION AND ELEVATION OF ALL EXISTING SUBSURFACE IMPROVEMENTS AND UTILITIES, WHETHER SHOWN ON THESE PLANS OR NOT, PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF WORK. UPON DISCOVERY OF ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN EXISTING CONDITIONS IN THE FIELD AND INFORMATION SHOWN ON THESE PLANS.
6. ALL AREA DRAIN AND LANDSCAPE DRAIN GRATES WITHIN PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBLE AREAS SHALL MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS.
7. ALL TRENCHES SHALL BE BACK FILLED PER THE SPECIFICATIONS WITH APPROPRIATE TESTS BY THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER TO VERIFY COMPACTION VALUES.
8. FOR GRAVITY FLOW SYSTEMS CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY (POTHOLE IF NECESSARY) SIZE, MATERIAL, LOCATION AND DEPTH OF ALL SYSTEMS THAT ARE TO BE CONNECTED TO OR CROSSED PRIOR TO THE TRENCHING OR INSTALLATION OF ANY GRAVITY FLOW SYSTEM.

SEE SHEET C1.0 FOR ADDITIONAL NOTES AND LEGENDS



DRAWING NAME: \\BKF-c\c\dot\2016\160218_301_13th_Street_Oak\and\ENG\01_TPM\C5.0_Utility_Plan.dwg
PLOT DATE: 10-27-17
PLOTTED BY: suid

BKF100
 255 SHORELINE DR.,
 SUITE 200 CITY, CA 94065
 REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065
 (650) 482-6300
 www.bkf.com
10 YEARS
 ENGINEERS · SURVEYORS · PLANNERS

1261 HARRISON STREET
VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 10763
PROPOSED UTILITY PLAN
 ALAMEDA COUNTY
 CITY OF OAKLAND
 CALIFORNIA




No.	Revisions

Date 10/26/17
 Scale 1"=10'
 Design MFC
 Drawn DFS
 Approved SRN
 Job No 20160218


Sheet Number:
C5.0
 6 OF 7

811
 Know what's below.
 Call before you dig.


No.	Date	Revisions
10/26/17	1"=10'	
	Design	MFC
	Drawn	DFS
	Approved	SRN
Job No 20160218		



3 - ADA RAMP
NTS




2 - CITY STD CURB & GUTTER
NTS





1 - CITY STANDARD DRIVEWAY
NTS


DRAWING NAME: \\BKF-c\dot\2016\180218_301_13th_Street_Oak\and\ENG\01_TPM\C6.0_Details.dwg
PLOT DATE: 10-27-17 PLOTTED BY: suld



13th Street Streetscape Enlargement



Ground Level Alley & Streetscape



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	08/01/17	DEV. REVIEW	BB

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LANDSCAPE GROUND LEVEL

Streetscape Materials



Special Paving
Stepstone pavers
Color: Fench Gray



Pattern in special paving
Stainless Steel Inlay



Bike Racks

Alley Materials



Stamped Concrete



Tivoli Lights

Streetscape Planting



Correa 'Dusky Bells'



Ceanothus x pallidus



Lomandra longifolia Breeze



Phormium Tom Thumb




Street Tree
Ginkgo biloba 'Princeton Sentry'
H: 40'
W: 20'

OWNER
Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT
Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER
BKF Engineers
300 Frank H Ogawa Plaza, #380
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone:

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone:



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	08/01/17	DEV. REVIEW	BB

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LANDSCAPE GROUND LEVEL MATERIALS

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 | SHEET NUMBER: **L1.2**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT

#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	08/01/17	DEV. REVIEW	BB

ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LANDSCAPE 13TH AMENITY LEVEL

PROJECT NUMBER: 16-051 SHEET NUMBER: **L2.1**

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



13th Amenity Level Materials




Custom Lounge Seats



Play Water Feature




Modular Seating and Planting



Climbing Wall



BBQ and Community Table



Paving: Esprit Porcelain Pavers

13th Amenity Level Planting



Asparagus densiflorus Meyers



Pelargonium tomentosum



Polystichum polyblepharum

OWNER

Pinnacle RED Group, Inc.
12 South 1st Street, Suite 1108
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: 408.300.2425

ARCHITECT


Lowney Architecture
360 17th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510.836.5400
Fax: 510.836.5454

CIVIL ENGINEER

BKF Engineers
300 Frank H Ogawa Plaza, #380
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone:

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

PGAdesign
444 17th Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone:



#	DATE	ISSUES & REVISIONS	BY
1	08/01/17	DEV. REVIEW	BB


ENTITLEMENT DESIGN

LANDSCAPE 32ND AMENITY LEVEL

PROJECT NUMBER:
16-051

SHEET NUMBER
L3.1

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT



32nd Amenity Level Materials



Fire pit



Dining Table




Trellis



Sloped Lawn



Couch Seating




Paving: Esprit Porcelain Pavers

32nd Amenity Level Planting



Correa Dusky Bells



Leucospermum Sunrise



Grevillea



Dianella Cassa Blue



Lomandra nyalla



Myrica communis