

MINUTES
ALAMEDA COUNTY PARKS, RECREATION AND HISTORICAL
COMMISSION

Thursday, February 7, 2008
224 West Winton Avenue, Room 160
Hayward, CA
(Approved March 3, 2008)

I. Call to Order – Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m. by Commissioner Allen, Chair.

Commissioners Present:

Annalee Allen
Marie Cronin
James Loughran
David Sadoff
Julie Machado
Harry Francis
David Tam (arrived at 5pm)
Stephen Sanger
MaryAnn McMillan
Dennis Waespi

Staff Present:

Liz McElligott
Angela Robinson-Pinõn
Nilma Singh

Commissioners Excused:

Ellen Wyrick-Parkinson
Al Minard

Guests:

Craig Ragg
James Coleman
Howard Lee, Project Planner, TR-7918,
21019 Baker Rd, C.V.
Mark Gerry, PM-9611, 21796 Princeton St
Alan Frank, Pacific Locomotive Association
Jason Preece, 10366 So. Flynn Road, Liv.
James Langon, TR-7819 (21019 Baker Rd, C.V.)

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of January 3, 2008. Commissioner Sadoff made the motion to approve the Minutes as submitted and Commissioner Francis seconded. Motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Sanger abstaining.

III. OPEN PUBLIC FORUM - Any member of the public may address the Commission on a matter not on the regular agenda. No discussion or action may be taken on these items.

Alan Frank, Pacific Locomotive Association, as requested by the Commission at the last meeting, presented a draft listing of historical assets of Niles Canyon Railroad. There is sufficient documented evidence why the entire county-owned railroad should be declared a historical district. He requested that the matter be agendaized next month for discussion. The current study is incomplete as only a small portion was studied in detail for contributing elements. Twenty-five elements were found of historic importance in the 1 ½ miles studied. The most important asset is the right-of-way itself, explored in 1850s, completed as a railroad in 1869 and still in service as a railroad on the original bed. It is the most valuable single County owned asset. The Chair asked if the Association will continue the above work. Mr. Frank replied yes, hopefully, to be completed this year and it is being done without any funding from the County. Staff will continue working with Mr. Frank and provide concurrent up-dates to the Commission. Commissioner Machado requested that the next meeting include

an item to consider additions to the current inventory. In response to the Commission, Mr. Frank stated that the study is being conducted by historians and the Association, a non-profit organization, leases the property from the County, operates the railroad and owns the rolling stock.

James Coleman stated that he three of his properties on St. James Court, Castro Valley, are on the List. He had specifically bought these properties in areas where homeowners association did not exist. He did not want his properties on the Registry.

IV. CHAIR and STAFF REPORT(S): *These items include information and discussion by the Commission:*

- A. **CHAIR REPORT** – *None*
- B. **STAFF REPORT** – *None*

V. OLD BUSINESS – *All old business will include information, discussion and/or action by the Commission.*

- A. **Update on 21019 Baker Road – The Commission will discuss the historic resource evaluation conducted for this site.** Staff presented the staff report. Commissioner Sanger asked if the Diocese of Oakland was consulted or referenced in any part of the study. David Langon, property owner, said that he had made a reference at the December meeting but thought that perhaps it was not factual at that time. Mr. Davis, Carey & Company, confirmed that the Arch Diocese was not consulted. This building was purchased in the late 40 by the Lady of Grace Confraternity, to be transferred to the Our Lady of Grace Catholic Church which did not occur although services were held for a few years while waiting for a new location (page 7). Mr. Langon added that Our Lady of Grace was contacted and confirmed that there was no affiliation. Commissioner Francis concurred with Mr. Davis. Commissioner McMillan thanked for a great report including the photographs. *Commissioner Francis made the motion to accept the staff report. Commissioner Waespi seconded, which carried unanimously.*

VI. NEW BUSINESS – *All new business will include information, discussion and/or action by the Commission.*

- A. **Access to Parkland and Environmental Justice at East Bay Parks** – Staff noted that this item was agendaized at Commissioner Tam’s request and no action is required. Commissioner Tam added that the Kibel report has been extensively discussed and is still under discussion for possible refinement. While under discussion, he had looked into the reasonable standards of developed open space and park acreage for cities which is 5 acres of developed open space for 1,000. Several cities fall short of this requirement. He also noted that the Park District has been developing shoreline parks that are adjacent to the flatlands. He did not recommend any further discussion unless strongly urged by a member of the public or another Commissioner. The Chair added, as an example, the new public transit-access Middle Harbor Shore Park in Oakland, which is maintained by EBRPD.
- B. **East Bay Regional Parks District’s proposed project list for acquisition and development funding for the AA Renewal** – Staff noted that this item was added at Commissioner Sadoff’s request and no action is required. Commissioner Sadoff

added that the intention had been to provide Commission awareness. Commissioner Tam stated that there is a similar spreadsheet reflecting three planning areas: West Metro (Western County) Alhona (Southern) and Mt Diablo (Eastern County). Commissioner Sanger noted that the Subcommittee has been waiting for this information and recommended a meeting followed by a report to this Commission.

C. 21796 Princeton Street – The Commission will discuss a proposed demolition.

Commissioner Machado asked if the two-story building will remain and requested clarification on the environmental exemption. Mark Gerry, applicant, confirmed that only the building in the rear will be removed. His father had bought the property in 1952 and the front two-story house was relocated from Sunset, which he intends to keep in the family. Staff explained that an infill project is categorically exempt. In response, Commissioner Machado expressed concern. In response to Commissioner Sanger, staff explained that a CUP will not be required. The Chair asked if this property could be a possible candidate of Mills Act contract when available. Staff said she was not sure but if the property is on the List, the owner could apply for Mills Act tax exemption. Commissioner Machado noted that the List includes the property at 21798 Princeton. Mr. Gerry confirmed that this is his property---the duplex in the front (21798 and 21780 Princeton). *Commissioner Sadoff made the motion to accept the staff report and Commissioner Tam seconded. Motion carried unanimously.*

D. Comments from the City of Livermore, Historic Preservation Commission on the draft Register –

Staff pointed out that City of Livermore has submitted clarifications on properties currently on the List. Commissioner Machado discussed various Commission actions. Mr. Davis, Carey & Company, explained that the Government takes the lead in preserving their buildings which are not exempt from regulations. Regarding Olivina Gate, Mr. Frank Guido, City of Livermore, has given Carey & Company the ‘go-ahead’ to complete paperwork to nominate it as a State Point of Historic Interest. Commissioner Sadoff clarified that Foothill Road Adobe structure had been previously listed as Sunol Adobe and Commissioner Sanger added that Chateau D’Yquem is listed as Murietta’s Well Winery. Staff confirmed that the List will be modified to reflect the corrections submitted by City of Livermore.

E. 20540 Forest Avenue – The Commission will discuss a proposed demolition.

Staff presented the staff report. Craig Ragg, on behalf of the Applicant, said he was available for questions. Planning Commission had a Preliminary Plan Review hearing on Monday, February 4th, and was in favor of the project. One neighbor was in attendance with questions. Although the dwelling was built in 1930-40, it has been modified significantly and the rear was added on also. The house, a rental unit for many years, will be demolished. At the request of the Chair, staff explained the notification process which included 300 feet radius and telephone pole postings and in response to Commissioner Sanger, explained that staff does not prepare architectural reports but is submitted by the Applicant. Commissioner Sanger requested a Title Search or a summary report. Mr. Davis described City of San Francisco’s process of a preliminary report including a list of occupancy, photographs and modifications to the building but does not include a conclusion. If a historical significance is identified, then a historical resource evaluation is requested. Commissioner Sadoff felt that a title search would be helpful. *Commissioner Waespi made a motion to accept the report as written and Commissioner Francis seconded. Commissioner Sadoff requested, in future, a basic title search be requested for similar projects and Commissioner*

Machado added that perhaps a search be requested for all applications. Staff indicated that she would advise Planning staff. Motion carried unanimously.

- F. Historic Preservation Ordinance Timeline** – Commissioner Sanger asked for the number of public hearings to be held per the Consultant’s contract. Ms. McElligott indicated that this Timeline reflects more workshops than allowed in the Contract and a check would have to be made with the Consultants. The Chair stated that the Commission’s intention is to obtain as much public comments as possible.

Jason Preece said he owns a property on the List. This is the first time he has become aware of this process, the Registry and he further stated his objection that he had not received any other information until ten days ago. Although this is a good project, he asked if any public participation was taken into consideration in the development of the List and thought that the property owners were not appropriately notified. He bought his property two years ago which is small and old, and expressed concern about ‘red-tape’ or unnecessary costs. In response to Commissioner Tam, he further described his work as an environmental consultant and title searches. Since his property is located in the East County, Mr. Preece hoped that a future workshop would be centered in the East County. Commissioner Sadoff advised him that the Draft Ordinance is available on-line.

- VIII. COMMISSIONER REPORTS** – Commissioners will report on areas of concern and/or informational items concerning parks, recreation and historical preservation issues within the supervisory districts they serve. **This item was continued to the next meeting.**

- A. District 1: Haggerty** - Commissioners Cronin and Minard
- B. District 2: Steele** - Commissioners Francis, McMillan and Machado
- C. District 3: Lai-Bitker** - Commissioners Loughran and Sanger
- D. District 4: Miley** - Commissioners Allen, Sadoff and Waespi
- E. District 5: Carson** - Commissioners Tam and Wyrick-Parkinson

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE

- A. Agenda Items for future meetings** – Commissioner Machado requested additions to the Draft Inventory and Commissioner Tam requested Measure AA Subcommittee’s report.

- X. ADJOURNMENT:** There being no other business, Commissioner Tam made the motion to adjourn and Commissioner McMillan seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm.