



Google LLC
1600 Amphitheatre Pkwy
Mountain View, CA 94043

August 17, 2021

Chair Cranston
Vice Chair Lo
Commissioner Capriles
Commissioner Dempsey
Commissioner Hehmeyer
Commissioner Schmiesing
Commissioner Yin

Re: North Bayshore Gateway Master Plan

Dear Chair, Vice Chair, and Commissioners,

We write in reference to the City's draft Gateway Master Plan that was publicly released August 13, 2021. Since the City initiated the planning effort for the Gateway Master Plan in May 2019, we have been closely watching the City's progress.

We would like to acknowledge the City's engagement with Google throughout the Gateway Master Plan process, and we have appreciated the positive collaboration over the past 18 months. We are supportive of the City's overall vision for an office and mixed-use entertainment area. We look forward to coordinating with the City and other property owners to ensure that the vision for the Gateway Master Plan can be realized.

This is another exciting step forward for North Bayshore, and a great opportunity to realize the 'complete neighborhood' ambition and to deliver much needed housing.

Sincerely,

Michael Tymoff
Director, Real Estate District Development
Google LLC

Cc: Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager
Aarti Shrivastava, Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director
Martin Alkire, Principal Planner
Javier Gonzalez, Head of California Local Government Affairs, Google

August 18, 2021

Via Electronic Mail

City of Mountain View
Environmental Planning Commission
Chair William Cranston
Vice Chair Kammy Lo
Margaret Capriles
Hank Dempsey
Preeti Hehmeyer
Joyce Yin

RE: Opposition to approval of the North Bayshore Gateway Master Plan
Agenda Item No. 5.1

Good evening Chair Cranston and members of the Environmental Planning Commission:

As a long-time member of the Mountain View community and one of the two primary property owners, we endeavored to work with staff and staff consultants on the City-led Master Plan process as a collaborative endeavor and provide constructive comment along the way. We provided staff real world information related to the types of uses being contemplated in the Master Plan. With decades of experience in residential, commercial and office development, we believed that this input would be useful in the development of a plan that could realize the goals set out in the North Bayshore Precise Plan for the gateway area. In having now reviewed the Staff Report and ancillary material, it is clear this Master Plan and the unrealistic land use minimums imposed on the property owners makes it even further infeasible that the gateway will develop in the manner envisioned by the community. There remains a significant disconnect and we are dismayed to see the City essentially 'force' their conclusion to this process without actual buy-in and support of the property owner(s) most directly affected by this plan. We believe our input has been largely dismissed and must oppose this Master Plan in its current form. I note as an example a few of the serious issues:

- 1) **Lacks financial feasibility** - While lofty in its expectations, the City's own financial consultant validated this Master Plan lacks the financial feasibility for any development to actually occur. The staff is aware of this fatal flaw, and has made no adjustments to the final Master Plan to address this issue.
- 2) **The underlying assumptions are all based on a world 'pre-Covid'** - A significant shift has occurred in retail and restaurant, and office and entertainment demand and formats rendering the underpinning and assumptions that form the basis of all these uses antiquated. One glaring example; no one can honestly assume that unanchored small retail/restaurant density nearing 100,000 square feet that must line street fronts

is, or ever will be again, 'feasible' in a post-Covid world, not to mention that it needed to be fully underwritten to be viable pre-Covid.

- 3) **District Parking** - The stated parking capacity maximum fails to realistically address true requirements and use allocation based upon individual demand. The concept surrounding shared parking use is a valid model. Using artificially low capacities and use differentials just to "make the numbers work" is destined for failure. Also, absent is any reference stating that uses or developments lying outside the Master Plan area can never utilize or rely on parking capacities within the Master Plan area.
- 4) **Transportation** - The City needs to definitively state whether it is relying on any assumption the City will need to institute an increased requirement for TDM and SOV measures within the Master Plan area that is in excess of requirements already in effect for other properties within the existing North Bayshore Precise Plan area.

As long-term property owners (over 50 years), residential and commercial developers, we remain interested in engaging in an open and constructive dialog with Staff, and the one other landowner subject to this Master Plan, such that we can finally formulate a comprehensive Master Plan that is both realistic and feasible for all parties involved.

Respectfully,

SyWest Development

William Vierra

Bill Vierra
President and COO

cc: Martin Alkire
Aarti Shrivastava

From: Lenny Siegel

Date: August 18, 2021 at 12:34:43 PM PDT

To: caprilesmountainview@gmail.com, wcranstonmv@gmail.com, Hank Dempsey <hankdempseymv@gmail.com>, preeti.hehmeyer@gmail.com, kammy.lo.mvepc@gmail.com, allieschmiesingmv@gmail.com, jyin.mvepc@gmail.com

Cc: epc@mountainview.gov, "Alkire, Martin" <Martin.Alkire@mountainview.gov>

Subject: North Bayshore Gateway (Item 5.1 tonight)

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

I am writing to support the proposed Master Plan for the North Bayshore Gateway and the associated inclusion of 1555 Plymouth in the Gateway area.

I have not reviewed all the details, but the proposed Master Plan offers a path forward to expedite the development of a mixed-use complete neighborhood in this portion of North Bayshore.

Mountain View's strategy of adding substantial amounts of housing in historically commercial areas is superior to statewide proposals that emphasize the increase of density in existing residential neighborhoods. We will be providing housing near employment without undermining existing neighborhoods or, if the city adopts anti-displacement policies, demolishing naturally affordable (older) multi-family housing.

Furthermore, as the VMT Assessment demonstrates, locating housing near our major high-tech employers is an effective tool in our efforts to reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions. I actually believe that more people will choose to live near work than projected in the assessment. Thus, I expect that we'll see a greater reduction in emissions per service population.

In addition, I have reviewed the Hazardous Materials section of the Initial Study, and it is my professional opinion that the steps being taken by Mountain View and the environmental regulatory agencies will protect future building occupants from exposure to toxic vapors from the Teledyne/Spectra Physics TCE plume.

My one concern is that the city is falling behind in its planning for improved public transit serving the North Bayshore area.

Lenny

--

Lenny Siegel