

5132 Telegraph Meeting

LOCATION Rockridge Library, 5366 College Avenue, Oakland, California

ATTENDEES

George Hauser, Hauser Architects Will Mollard, Hauser Architects Dan Paris, Hauser Architects David Ceaser, Hauser Architects

RCPC board: Stu Flashman, Ronnie Spitzer, Danica Truchlikova, Richard Smith, Jeff Small, Magaret Wahlberg, Ellen Peterson, Peter St. John

DISCUSSION

Introduction:

George Hauser of Hauser Architects gave a presentation on the proposed project for 5132 Telegraph Avenue to the Rockridge Community Planning Council (RCPC). The presentation reviewed the history of the project to date. It focused on changes that have been made in the proposed design as documented in a community presentation on February 15, 2006 and in presentations before the Planning Commission's Design Review Committee on April 25 and May 23, 2007. Mr. Hauser used the power-point files from the three presentations as the background for his explanation of project revisions. Major design changes that were highlighted by Mr. Hauser are listed below. These changes were made in response to concerns of the neighborhood, planning staff and members of the Design Review Committee.

- Project density: The original proposal for 144 units was first reduced to 115 units and now has been reduced to 105.
- Building height: Portions of upper floors have been removed by creating stepbacks along Claremont Avenue and along Clarke Street. The perceived height of the Telegraph building has been reduced by setting the building face back from the street.
- Building setback: A plaza has been placed along Telegraph Avenue which sets the Telegraph building back 35 feet. The Clarke building has also been set back three feet along Clarke Street.
- Parking impact: The parking ratio has been increased. The original proposal provided 105 spaces for 115 units. The current proposal provides 105 spaces and 105 units which is equal to one parking space per unit.

After the presentation, Hauser Architects responded to the questions and concerns of those present. The order of the questions has been herein adjusted so that similar topics are grouped together. Some of the questions have been consolidated for brevity and to eliminate repetition.

Feedback and Concerns:

- What is the future timeline of the project?

- **Hauser Architects:** The traffic study has just been completed by DKS. Next will be a hearing before the full Planning Commission. The project planner is currently on paternity leave and the Planning Commission does not meet in August, so it is probable that the hearing will take place in September.
- Is there concern about flooding of the basement parking area?
 - **HA:** No. A structural analysis of the portion of the culvert under the property shows that it is in excellent condition. The floor of the culvert was replaced with a reinforced concrete channel in the 1970's. Also, the floor of the garage is above the top of the culvert so there is no dancer of a lateral breach between the culvert and the garage

Is there potential for daylighting Temescal Creek at the project site, in the future?

HA: The design of the building has been adjusted to allow this potential for the future. The building has been set back and a public plaza placed along Telegraph Avenue adjacent to the Civiq I plaza. This open area will serve as a beautiful public amenity. If, at some future date, the funds and political will for daylighting that section of Temescal Creek present themselves, then it will be possible.

- Will the Telegraph plaza remain public?

• HA: There is no conceivable benefit to privatizing the plaza. This plaza will be adjoined on two sides by ground floor commercial spaces. Foot traffic from non-residents will be essential for the economic survival of these businesses. Filling in the plaza would adversely impact the proposed commercial and obscure the residential entry to the Telegraph building.

- Is there a connection between the plaza and the greenway?

• **HA:** There is no public connection between the plaza along Telegraph Avenue and the greenway extension although building residents would be able to transit the garage or the podium. There is a connection between 51st Street and Clarke Street near the terminus of FROG park, since the Civiq project has made accommodations for this feature.

- How wide is the greenway?

- HA: The proposed greenway extension will be 22 feet wide. Ten feet will be on the Creek Side property and 12 feet on the Civiq property.
- How tall are the buildings along the greenway?
 - HA: The Creek Side building will be 40 feet tall along the greenway. The Civiq building will reach 55 feet in height.

- What is the orientation of the greenway and what plants will grow there? Won't it be too dark for plants to grow?

- **HA:** The greenway runs in a north-south direction. The project landscape consultant has stated that there are plants that will thrive in the proposed environment.
- Who will maintain the greenway?
 - **HA**: The greenway will be maintained by a landscaping company employed by the project owners. The area will be serviced on a regular basis. Since the project will have a condominium map, the future owners could include one or more homeowners associations.
- Will the greenway be a public easement?
 - HA: No, the greenway will not be a public easement. It will be provided as a public amenity. The greenway owners could fence or otherwise limit access if the area is misused or becomes difficult to maintain or secure. But, the intention is to always make it visible by the public.
- Has Hauser Architects met with the owner or residents of the Claremont Apartment building? There is a potential that Creek Side will limit light to windows in the Claremont Apartment building facing the property line wall. The building, which serves section 8 residents, might be heavily impacted because of the loading area and the noise and fumes generated from the trash storage and vehicle access.
 - HA: One resident of 5160 Claremont attended one of our community meetings. The concern that she expressed was about minimizing construction disturbance to residents. The building's resident manager presented comments at the May 23, 2007 hearing and Hauser Architects will interact with the building owner to better understand the impacts of Creek Side.
- What is the current median price of units in The Creek Side? At the start of the project, the median price was listed at \$385,000.
 - **HA:** The predicted median price has risen slightly owing to an increase in the average unit size. The median price now appears to be just over \$400,000.
- Will the project include below market rate housing?
 - **HA:** That is currently under discussion in negotiations with ULTRA (Urbanists for a Livable Temescal Rockridge Area) to obtain their support for the project. ULTRA is requesting that we include affordable units. Agreement to provide BMR units would be conditioned on obtaining a minimum project density, height, massing and building aesthetic.
- What is the probable number of affordable units to be included in the project?
 - **HA:** The number of affordable units is still under consideration.

When will the percentages of inclusionary housing be announced?

• HA: As soon as Hauser Architects has evaluated the feasibility of providing affordable units and before the full Planning Commission hearing.

- Is ULTRA representing the city?

• HA: Absolutely not.

- What is the current parking ratio?

• **HA:** The current ratio is one to one (one parking space per housing unit). To make more use of the parking garage, it will feature a "managed parking system" which will allow commercial users in the garage during business hours.

- What are the challenges with adding another layer of underground parking?

• HA: There are numerous challenges, not the least of which is the immense cost.

- Will the one to one parking ratio work with restaurant traffic in the evenings?

• **HA:** Hauser Architects believes restaurant parking can be provided in the garage in the evenings. Also, they will work with the merchants association to improve the parking situation.

- Is the faux creek completely removed from the project plan and if so, why?

• **HA:** The faux creek was intended to commemorate Temescal Creek. The project has been revised to replace the faux creek with a fountain on the Telegraph plaza to serve as the commemorative element. It was suggested that the water feature on the front of the building, in view from Telegraph Avenue, is superior than it being located in the back of the building.

What assumptions were made regarding trip generation in the traffic study?

- **HA**: This information will be available in the forthcoming traffic study prepared by DKS Associates. This study will be available through the project planner.
- The drawings are beautifully done and the building is very attractive. But, the density and building height are excessive. The scale of the Clarke building is also inconsistent with the one story houses along Clarke Street. Would Hauser Architects make concessions in these areas to obtain RCPC support for the project?
 - **HA**: Everything is still on the table but time is of the essence. It becomes more difficult to revise the project as time goes on. It would be best if RCPC proposed revisions in the next two weeks