

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION  
ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS:**

**Vince Sugrue, Chair  
Klara Komorous, Vice-Chair  
Chris Andrews  
Ben Fu  
Marcus Johnson  
Nenna Joiner  
Tim Mollette-Parks**

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION  
ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES:**

**September 21, 2020  
Special Meeting 5 PM  
Via: Tele-Conference**

.....

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – by Board Chair Sugrue @ 5:05pm**

**ROLL CALL**

**Board Members present: Andrews, Fu, Johnson, Joiner, Komorous,  
Mollette- Parks, Sugrue**  
**Board Members absent:**  
**Staff present: Pete Vollmann, Betty Marvin, Catherine Payne**

**WELCOME BY CHAIR - Board Chair Vince Sugrue** welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked **Pete Vollmann, Board Secretary**, to give a helpful explanation on the meeting. He gave some pointers on how this works for everyone in attendance either by Zoom or by phone. **By Zoom:** he asked all attendees to lower any hands that are raised and only raise them if you're interested in speaking on an item when it's called. This will help us avoid confusion and calling speakers for the wrong item. The system will keep track of the order of hands that are raised and it's important that once you raise your hand, keep it raised, unless you change your mind about speaking. Lowering and raising your hand will bump you to the end of the line. Each speaker will have a maximum of 2 minutes to speak and during this time, speakers cannot concede time. When it's your time to speak, the City will unmute you and then you will need to unmute yourself on your device to begin speaking. **By phone to comment:** you press \*9 to engage the raise your hand feature. When it's your time to speak, the City will refer to you by the last four digits of your phone number and then press \*6 to unmute yourself. If you do not wish to speak on any item, you can also view the hearing on KTOP Live on television as well, instead of this platform if you so choose.

**BOARD BUSINESS**

**Agenda Discussion - None**  
**Secretary Reports - None**  
**Board Matters - None**  
**Sub-committee Reports - None**

**OPEN FORUM – Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** – asked the LPAB, if they would be able to schedule a report on the buildings that caught fire in Chinatown, (Wed., 9/16/2020). The buildings are in an API (Area of Importance) and OHA would be very interested in hearing about what is going on with the restoration/repair of the buildings and, make sure that the Board has a chance to weigh-in, since this is part of a key Historic District in Oakland.

### **BOARD COMMENTS**

**Board Sugrue** - suggested the Board address this issue. **Andrews** – thanked Ms. Schiff for pointing this out and wanted to know if the LPAB has the protocol for what happens when a historic building has been damaged, with much publicity about it, or rather it's something the City thinks about in terms of our Board. **Vollmann** – at this point, it's still pretty-fresh, we don't know the extent of the damage yet. There's probably going to be insurance issues and the owners coming in for permits for repairs. Before we can bring something to the Board, we would have to track down the property owner's, find out the extent of the damage and what discussions have been happening thus far. There's some work that we need to do on our end before we'd be ready to bring a report or present this to the LPAB. **Marvin** – it's case by case and often, any comment comes about when the owner comes in to demolish it. We have this one point of entry through 'permit info by email', I suppose a note pointing out to 'whom it may concern' in the Building Dept., that this is a Historic resource and not just any old repairs are likely to be OK, but we haven't systematically policed fire and other damage. The 'good news' is that, it doesn't look that bad on the outside.

**Sugrue** – moving forward in the event, that the owners do the repairs, could some sort of flag go up, (because it's in an API), that would trigger them having to come before our Board, at a minimum, for comments and feedback. **Vollmann** – I would advise that we wait to see what repairs are needed. If the whole façade and everything visible from the street is in 'good shape', and they are trying to move forward with just doing repairs to the interior, (to get the building back-up and running), I'd be concerned about further delaying that by bringing it before the Board, *if* there is nothing that has an impact on the historic aspects of the building. **Andrews** – I read a news report that two of the restaurants are intending to rebuild. Since we've gone on record with concerns about this, maybe a report by staff would be appropriate. **Vollmann** – we can keep an eye out for permits, to see what is happening. If they are just doing a TI (interior Tenant Improvement), we could bring it back as an item for discussion. **Komorou** – If this about the interiors of restaurants they want to re-build and come back, we need to support that. Is it possible (as Betty mentioned), if they could put a note that said, 'this is a historic building', and to flag it if it effected the exterior, just so it doesn't get lost. She noted the damages were primarily due to water damage and both restaurants want to come back but it would be about 6 months before that could happen. **Vollmann** – on our Accela Database System, the property will come up as a historic building already. We can put in a note, that won't stop the permits going forward. But it's just a note that 'pops-up' to notify us (staff, Betty or myself) when a TI or repair permits come in, so we can get flagged for an update. **Sugrue** – thanked Board member Andrews for flagging this item and was very glad the Board had this discussion.

**INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS** – No informational presentations were scheduled.

**APPLICATIONS**

<b>Location:</b>	<b>495 10<sup>th</sup> Street (APN: 002 -0047-003-00)</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	Installation of a rooftop Telecommunication Macro-Facility on the “Washington Inn Hotel”.
<b>Applicant:</b>	J5IP for AT&T Mobility
<b>Phone Number:</b>	415-420-4922
<b>Owner:</b>	<b>Keshava LLC</b>
<b>Case File Number:</b>	PLN20065
<b>Planning Permits Required:</b>	Regular Design Review for installation of a rooftop telecommunication facility. Conditional Use Permit for a Macro-Telecommunications Facility. Variance for facility to meet the 1:1 height to setback ratio from exterior building wall.
<b>General Plan:</b>	Central Business District
<b>Zoning:</b>	CBD-P Central Business District Pedestrian Retail Commercial Zone / S-7 Preservation Combing Zone
<b>Environmental Determination:</b>	Determination Pending, Environmental analysis to be conducted prior to any discretionary action.
<b>Historic Status:</b>	Local Register; Area of Primary Importance (API): Old Oakland. OCHS Rating C1+ “Washington Inn Hotel”
<b>City Council district</b>	3
<b>Status:</b>	Pending
<b>Finality of Decision:</b>	Review development proposal and provide comments to staff for Zoning Manager decision.
<b>For further information:</b>	Contact Case Planner: <b>Jose M. Herrera-Preza</b> @ 510-238-3808 or <a href="mailto:jherrera@oaklandca.gov">jherrera@oaklandca.gov</a>

**Jose Herrera-Preza, staff planner** – the purpose of this meeting tonight, is to seek input and recommendations from the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) regarding a proposed unmanned telecommunications facility on the rooftop of the Washington Inn, which is a Local Register Designated Historic Property (DHP). The subject property is rated ‘C’ by the Office of Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS) and contributes to the Old Oakland Area of Primary Importance (API). The application is for the installation of 9 antennas on the proposed facility rooftop with 3 rooftop locations. All other accessory equipment will be visible. The reason for bringing this item before the LPAB, is to get direction as to what would be the preferred method of screening this new facility, as you see in the staff report and the attachments. There have been extensive discussions on doing a perimeter screen on these antennas, individually screened on each antenna or leaving all the antennas unscreened. In all 3 scenarios, they will be visible from the rooftop of the building.

**J5IP/AT&T, Derek Turner, applicant** – did a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed overall site plan. He stated, they’ve re-designed the site at least 3 or 4 times, set-back accommodations and the aesthetics of the skyline, (as much as they could) to accommodate Planning and Landmarks. We are locating here, to keep coverage in the area for; businesses, First Response, First Net and all Police and Fire Departments in the area. We’ve given Landmarks 3 different options for the colored FRP screens for the antennas or bare antennas with paint to match. Landmarks determined, that the paint to match the FRP screening, would be most appropriate for this situation. He says they are open to different designs, methods and aesthetics for the skyline and, it comes down to the LPAB’s decision on the coloring and what they deem appropriate for the neighborhood.

**BOARD QUESTIONS – Sugrue** – asked about the FRP screens and the FRP faux vents and, if any other designs are being proposed. **Turner** – those are the two main ones that work aesthetically for that area, either one would fit the neighborhood. **Komorou** – wanted clarification on the three options, especially the bare antenna option. **Turner** – the bare antenna, is the less aesthetically pleasing for the neighborhood. **Andrews** – asked staff, why is the bare antenna not desirable and asking the applicant (J5IP) to present other options. **Herra-Preza** – it was staff’s opinion that the bare antenna was referred as a design alternative. The other two options, felt very-forced on top of the building. The 350-degree boxy screen around the antennas, on top of the rooftop stairwell, created a monolithic structure detracted from the building and the individual roof vents approach was an unnatural addition to the building. The third option, bare, was least intrusive to the building. **Fu** – assuming height is a consideration, were there any discussions as to what extent could the antennas be mounted at a lower height or different location on the building, so, that it’s not quite as visible from certain angles or mounted on the existing rooftop structure. **Turner** – the site was designed about a year ago and we’ve had three different design changes based on Planning’s recommendations. We’ve designed it to reach all AT&T’s objectives for the site, while maintaining the most set-back possible and the least visibility of the FRP screens. The height is maxed out and we’re right now, configured to where we need to be for the site to work properly.

**Fu** – I’m assuming the discussions you had with staff, were about evaluating radius maps to look at the frequency and the design ability with connection levels at the current location. Is that how you came up with the design in terms of location and height and is this the bare minimum in height that you can reduce to the best coverage. **Turner** – yes, we’ve reduced everything to a smaller capacity, including the antennas. **Fu** – can you describe the coverage needs for this area that resulted in your proposal. **Turner** – we have an existing site about a block away, so we needed to stay within this search range to keep the site viable. We did an extensive search and had a willing participant to sign a lease. We procured this lease, and it will keep coverage in the area for all businesses and residential. **Mollete-Parks** - wanted to know from staff, if the ‘3’ bulleted items (last page of the staff report) about potential modifications, are those items still ‘up for grabs’ as far as direction forward. **Herra-Preza** - those ‘3’ options were put in the staff report to explain the extent of items we have reached to this point. These were chosen by the applicant and part of the review/analysis brought up as an option.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS – Alexis Schroeder, Oakland resident** – stated she’s concerned about an Accela antenna installation on the Washington Inn rooftop, that’s supported by an electrical system that can’t support the guest elevator & hot water service. She wanted to get clarification on the three sectors, in which you are showing Sector ‘3’, but there will be an A&B sector as well, with each sector having three antennas for a total of nine. She wanted to get a confirmation from staff/applicant if there is a photo showing all three sectors (including the antennas) on the roof. **Turner** – we had professionals come in and do a 30 day ‘load study’ to ensure that everything is going to work correctly, in the future. Regarding the sectors, sectors ‘B&C’ are located on one FPR box, and sector ‘A’ is above the penthouse. **Herra-Preza** – wanted to clarify where the sectors are on the rooftop and the direction the antennas are facing; three are facing the parking lot, three additional ones that face the driveway existing off Washington and the three we refer to as Sector ‘C’, are on the top of the stairwell access, face the market across from Washington.

**BOARD COMMENTS – Andrews** – I don’t have a problem seeing the antennas and prefer that rather than seeing big boxes. They are modestly scaled and don’t have a negative effect on the historic character on the area. It’s nice to see how a City works, cell antennas are part of the City, these don’t seem egregious or interfere with the aesthetics of the building. **Komorou** – in terms of seeing the antennas, it would be better if they were lower and a RFP panel would make more of an impact and less intrusive. Overall, the towers look better alone, express the latest technology but they look temporary, (something

you can put in and take off) which has been an issue with Historic Preservation. **Fu** – agrees with both Komorous and Andrews on the structure (penthouse) that houses the antennas stating, it's typically meant to hide the antennas but it has a presence of a natural operation for the building. In this case, Sector 'C' does appear to be a little higher and more visible. And to the point of a historic, rather that's something that can be easily removed or not, the structure itself probably is less likely to be removed than the three panels themselves. So, I'd rather see the three and there's no certainty that they could be removed and at some point, three more could be added once we approved this location and it becomes acceptable.

**Sugrue** - appreciated everyone's thoughtful comments on this item. He stated, the antenna Sector 'C' is modest, not over bearing and it's in an area that's 'graffiti heavy', especially these days with all the 'street art' (he loves). He sees the vents and the screening being target opportunities. He liked what Andrews said, 'that it is good to see how a City works' and again thanked everyone for their comments.

A motion was presented by **Board Vice-chair Komorous** – of the three options presented by the applicant, the Board prefers the options with the FRP panel *but* we recommend that the FRP panel be covered with 'Public Art', such as a Mural, in order to, discourage tagging in the future.

All Board members were in favor of the motion, motion passes. (Vote: 6+, -0)

**Footnote** – the Board had a discussion (amongst themselves) regarding the issue of 'graffiti' that may or may not happen on the Sectors. Secretary Vollmann will research and discuss the issue with the City's Attorney's.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS - None**

**UPCOMING – No**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES - for August 10, 2020 – Andrews** – moved to approve minutes.  
**Komorous** – seconded. (vote; +6 - 0) Minutes approved.

**ADJOURNMENT – 6:13p**

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING: October 12, 2020**

Minutes prepared by LaTisha Russell