



November 2, 2022

Re: Item 5.2 – Downtown Precise Plan Temporary Office Cap

Dear Chair Cranston and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission:

The LWV supports mechanisms to address the existing jobs/housing imbalance and revising plans to reflect Mountain View's needs and values. We thank the City for acting on public sentiment, including ours, regarding the 590 Castro Street project.

As such, we are in support of the proposed action to temporarily limit the construction of new office space in Downtown. This time-bound action provides a more stable environment for the City to revise the Downtown Parking Strategy and the future of housing in the Downtown Precise Plan while continuing to allow existing office buildings to renovate under their current FAR.

(Please send any questions about this email to Kevin Ma at housing@lwvlamv.org)

Karin Bricker, President of the LWV of Los Altos-Mountain View

cc: Krisha Penollar

Eric Anderson

Aarti Shrivastava

From: Robert Chang

Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2022 4:56 PM

To: Anderson, Eric B. <Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov>

Subject: Comments on Temporary Downtown Precise Plan Office Cap

Hi Eric,

In regard to the Temporary Downtown Precise Plan Office Cap expected to be enforced, it is understandable that the measure is aim to allow time for the city to formulate a longer-term approach for downtown. However, the current increasing rate of small office vacancies in downtown Mountain View is another major issue that property owners are concerned about. We are hoping the city could help bringing more startups or entrepreneurs to downtown to fulfill the rising office vacancies, while planning for the future. It would be highly appreciated if the city would also take some time to figure out how to better accommodate startups and entrepreneurs to attract them to move to downtown.

Thank you for taking this matter into consideration.

Sincerely yours,
Alice Huang

From: Chee-Yee Chong
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 4:26 PM
To: epc@mountainview.gov
Cc: Anthony Ho; John Frolli
Subject: Temporary downtown precise plan office cap

Dear Commission Members,

I represent the owner of No. Castro Street, at the corner of Castro and Villa. We have been working with the planning staff on developing the back patio to add more office space because our tenants need space for expansion. We were encouraged to move ahead with the project but were not warned that a temporary cap is coming. We would have appreciated an advance notice before spending time and effort with the design.

Thanks,

Chee-Yee Chong

Hanson America, LLC

From: James Kuszmaul

Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 8:33 PM

To: epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: Public Comment on Item 5.2 Downtown Prices Plan Temporary Office Cap

Members of the EPC,

I want to write to ask you not to impose an office cap on downtown office development. If there is any place in the city where we should want office to be built, it is downtown where the office will be near transit, near existing restaurants, and in walkable, bikeable areas. As with housing, if the office is not built in transit-rich areas, the office will get built in far-flung areas that drive large amounts of driving, with all the negative effects that implies.

The concerns raised in the staff memo regarding parking and AB2097 should be considered a non-issue. It is a good thing to have office space built with substantially less parking, and if we are concerned about spillover effects from parking, I would hope that it is within the city's capacity to implement a street parking permit program faster than a new office building can be designed and constructed. We should be strongly encouraging new buildings with no parking, not trying to stall so that we can find ways to build more parking.

As for concerns about the jobs-housing imbalance, this is an understandable concern, but should not be seen as a reason to try to restrict office development (since, as noted, trying to restrict office development just moves it to places that force longer commutes). Instead, we should be aiming to allow for and encourage even more housing in our downtown area. Any new office that does get built will not get built instantaneously--we have time to rezone and encourage new housing to be built on timelines that would bring it online at around the same time that any new office would get built.

As a city, I hope that we do not fall into the trap of trying to freeze the city in amber simply because the future is uncertain--we should trust in our own ability to solve these problems and not stand in the way of allowing more people to be able to find jobs in Mountain View and to further enliven our downtown area.

Best Regards,
James Kuszmaul

From: Isaac Stone
Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2022 12:51 PM
To: epc@mountainview.gov
Subject: Agenda Item 5.2

As a resident of Old Mountain View I find the proposed temporary office cap does not make sense.

The jobs-housing imbalance urgently needs addressed. But I don't see how this proposal addresses it.

The Jobs-Housing balance is citywide, not specific to downtown. An office cap will not prevent office from being built. If there is demand it will be built at another location instead. Downtown has the best transit access, so if office is to be built... downtown is a good place.

The temporary cap will just push the problem onto another neighborhood, and likely increase VMT.

The parking argument is easily solved: parking should not be free. For the sake of the environment, this should have been done long ago. EPC should be instating a temporary charge for parking, rather than a temporary ban on office. Or a temporary reduction of fees for housing, or a citywide temporary cap, or any other of a number of more sensible policies.

I agree with the motivations, broadly, but I disagree with the implementation.

Thanks for taking the time to read my thoughts,

- Isaac Stone

Date: October 31, 2022

To: Environmental Planning Commission (SENT VIA EMAIL: epc@mountainview.gov)

From: Boyd and Lund Smith, Smith Development

Subject: **Agenda Item 5.2-** Downtown Precise Plan Temporary Office Cap; Mixed-use project at 705 W. Dana [PL-2019-344 & PL-2022-224]

Dear Commissioners,

We respectfully submit these comments to the proposed Temporary Downtown Precise Plan Office Cap for consideration at your November 2, 2022 meeting, as they relate to our proposed mixed-use project at 705 W. Dana Ave (“Property”) and parking in the Downtown core. In deliberating the merits of an Office Cap, we ask that you consider the 3-year history of our project applications and exempt our project because (despite the recent passage of AB 2097) we are committed to mitigating any parking concerns in the Downtown area.

For background, our project proposes to replace the existing vacant auto shop at the Property, with a three-story mixed-use restaurant/office building, with one level of underground parking. The project is fully compliant with development regulations for the Downtown Precise Plan (Area H), including parking compliance, both by providing onsite parking and in-lieu parking fees. Given it has taken many years for our project review, despite the new parking legislation (AB 2097), we are committed to parking our project. Thus, if AB 2097 exempts our project from some or all parking requirements in the future, we will voluntarily park our project and pay the appropriate in-lieu fees. Alternatively, as a community benefit our project team is open to entering into a Development Agreement to contribute a voluntary fixed-fee toward a future Downtown Parking Garage.

We would like to highlight the major project application milestones to show how our project has evolved based on stakeholder feedback and to demonstrate our commitment to mitigating overflow parking. In the first half of 2019, we informally met with 6 council members as well as Dennis Drennan, Aarti Shrivastava, Stephanie Williams and Rebecca Shapiro to introduce our project and informally receive feedback. After considering their collective comments, in October, 2019, we formally submitted an application. Then, throughout 2020 and 2021 (with some interwoven pandemic delay) and into 2022, our project was under active review. During this time, we went through 2 rounds of comments from all City departments.

Our application has also been reviewed multiple times by City Council member(s). At these informal meetings, we received a majority support and constructive feedback to iterate the project. Since that

time, we worked to meet the City Council's requests, most of which are included in our current Project application.

In early 2022, at the encouragement of staff and City Council members we made several attempts to combine the adjacent parcel, located at 743 W. Dana Street ("Adjacent Parcel") and it seemed we were to be successful. Because adding the Adjacent Parcel would require a new application, we allowed our application to be withdrawn, as of July 11, 2022. Unfortunately, while our neighbor fully supports our project, we were ultimately unable to reach agreement in combining the Adjacent Parcel with our project.

Once we were unable to include the Adjacent Parcel, we met anew with various City Council members to understand their goals for parking our project. We also used this time to discuss parking options with neighbors Louise Katz from Livable Mountain View and Robert Chang, former MV Environmental Planning Commissioner and Downton Committee Member and held a meeting with the Old Mountain View Neighborhood Association. Ultimately our current application (submitted on October 28, 2022) incorporates the new feedback. And while we were assigned a new application number, the application is not 'new' rather it is an update to the project that has been under consideration since 2019.

Our Project is ready for discretionary review. While not yet deemed complete, the application is *akin* to complete because it addresses concerns and incorporates feedback from the past 3- years. We also cannot overlook the fact that the pandemic contributed to the time our application has been under consideration. Given our unique history, we respectfully request that our project be except from the office cap, so that it can move forward without delay. If the proposed office cap of .35 FAR were to be imposed, we would not be able to proceed with the proposed project despite the support we have received. Unfortunately, this would mean leaving the building abandoned and fenced off for the foreseeable future.

We respectfully request that you consider the history of this project and allow it to move forward for discretionary approval, exempt from an office cap, provided we agree to voluntarily park our project regardless of AB 2097 exemptions. **To that end, we propose you consider adding a 5th exemption from the office cap for "projects with pending applications which voluntarily park and/or pay in-lieu fees, despite AB 2097."**

Our team will attend the hearing on November 2nd and would welcome the opportunity to answer questions, address concerns and/or to provide further context.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Boyd Smith".

Boyd Smith, Smith Development

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lund Smith".

Lund Smith, Smith Development