

## NANCY McPeak

---

**From:** Dorothy Freeman <dfreeman@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2020 8:22 AM  
**To:** dfreeman@pacbell.net  
**Cc:** Jeffrey Cavanaugh; Ronald Curtis; Hanson Hom; Rona Rothenberg; Teresa Ruiz; Asheshh Saheba; Alan Teague; NANCY McPeak  
**Subject:** Planning Board March 23rd, 7B Boatworks Project,

\*\*\* **CAUTION:** This email message is coming from a non-City email address. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact the Help Desk with any questions. \*\*\*

March 23, 2020

Jeffrey Cavanaugh  
Ronald Curtis  
Hanson Hom  
Rona Rothenberg  
Teresa Ruiz  
Asheshh Saheba  
Alan H. Teague

Honorable Planning Board Members,

The history of the land known as Boatworks is long. In 1991, the City of Alameda placed plans for a 10 acre park, at that time also called Estuary Park, in the city's General Plan. The park would be along the Northern Waterfront at the end of Oak Street. I will refer to the planned park as Oak St Estuary Park. The 10 acres of land would come from what was, at that time, Dutra property, Fox property and Frances Collin's property.

In the early 2000's Mr. Collins started plans for a residential development on his property which fronted on Oak Street and Clement Street. The community came together and created the (Oak St) Estuary Park Action Committee. The committee worked for many years with the city planning department and the City Council advocating for the park, but funding to purchase the land needed for the park was not secured. This project has come before the Planning Board and the City Council too many time to count. During the following years it was agreed that the park space needed to be at least 2 acres.

We would all like to see the land finally developed. But houses are not all the makes a neighborhood livable. The area that will be served by the open space on the Estuary is the park poorest area of the City of Alameda. McKinley Park at 1.2 acres, is the only city park that's not a long walking distance from the new developments on the Northern Waterfront. While McKinley Park is an active park, there is very little active sports area. McKinley Park will not be able to serve the addition of the recently completed 52 units at the Mulberry Development, the 760 units presently under construction at the Alameda Marine, and the 182 units at Boatworks. That's 994 new units less than 3 blocks from McKinley Park.

The open space in this development has been whittled down becoming inconsequential. Basically it's nothing but a walk along the waterfront with a small play structure for toddlers. Once houses are built on this land, houses are all you will have. The opportunity to have proper open space is gone. We want to see our community improved. Houses are an important part of that. But, home is not just a building.

People need ample open space to get out of their dense housing developments to play and enjoy the out of doors. McKinley Park will not do the job. The space along the shoreline needs to be returned to the 2 acres that has been supported for the many years of negotiation with this development.

The housing on the East end along the Estuary encroaches on the 100' BCDC setback for the tide lands. The housing units along this portion need to be pushed back so that land can be part of the open space these new tenants will need. The waterfront space belongs to all the citizens of Alameda and should be reserved for their enjoyment. Open space set asides like this create an appearance that the land belongs to the people who live within the development and gives that appearance to the property owners. The space always feels like non-resident visitors are encroaching upon space that belongs to the land owners.

The Covid-19 virus has shown us how important lots of open space is. Even in normal times people need to be able to get out of their homes, especially when units are small as some of the units in this development are.

On another note, placing all the non-market rate units into the apartment building is unacceptable. This stigmatizes the people as being unwanted within the community. When the units are spread out among the market rate units, they don't stand out as people who are different than the others. Another problem with putting all the lower income people into one building makes it easier for the building not to be maintained to the same degree as when it's residents are spread out among the development. Please reconsider this request from the developer.

Respectfully,

Dorothy Freeman

cc: Andrew Thomas, Nancy McPeak