

From: [Serge Bonte](#)
To: [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#)
Cc: [McCarthy, Kimbra](#); [City Clerk](#); [City Attorney](#)
Subject: re: 04/12/2022 Meeting - 590 Castro Street
Date: Sunday, April 3, 2022 9:02:47 AM

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

It has come to my attention that the developer of a project on Castro, Fairmont and El Camino Real has been mentioning a possible closed session City Council meeting to discuss sale of a portion of Fairmont and/or Hope Street. I want to urge you to refuse starting any evaluation of this project behind closed doors. Any time there is consideration of selling a public asset, there are important policy decisions to be made prior to negotiating a price. These policy decisions ought to be made in public.

This prompts me to share advanced comments on 590 Castro Street as this project too started with closed session meetings where important policy decisions were made.

While I don't think any decisions made during these closed session meetings were ever shared with the public, it seems fair to assume they had to do with preserving vehicular access and surface level parking for the City property rented in quasi-perpetuity to the Chamber of Commerce.

Looking at the proposed plans, they seem to show the current surface parking near the park is preserved and creating potential conflicts with vehicles going to/from the underground garage.

Because this policy decision was made in closed session, it is really unfortunate that the public didn't have a chance to weigh in to suggest:

- unbundling parking for the Chamber of Commerce (in fact it's not even clear parking is included in the rent charged by the City)
- negotiating some parking for the Chamber of Commerce in the underground garage
- providing parking for the Chamber of Commerce in other nearby City parking

Any of these suggestions would have resulted in less vehicular conflict to/from the underground garage, more space to serve as a greener buffer with the park (maybe even a place to relocate some heritage trees).

If it's still possible to revisit that closed session decision to preserve that surface parking, by all means do so.

I wanted to share another comment on this project. The project seems to preserve the existing angled street parking on Castro. While angled parking is easier to enter for drivers, it is extremely dangerous when pulling out. Cars back up into traffic without any visibility and without much warning; creating stress and hazard for cyclists (and other street users). The city should remove angled parking any time there is a redevelopment, and I am urging you to do so for this project. Doing so will also reclaim more space for sidewalk and/or street trees/planters. It would also provide more space to put a bike lane in the future. Personally, I

would remove all street parking on the Castro side of the project. But switching to parallel parking would still reduce safety risks while providing for more space for sidewalk/street planting.

As to the 590 Castro Street project as a whole, I would have preferred to see housing but it's not mandated in the Precise Plan which the project adheres to. I really like the proposed paseo (a huge improvement over the current conditions and an improvement spelled out in the Precise Plan), I also like the fact that the developer will make the garage available for public parking in evenings and week-ends; hopefully deferring a costly city investment in another parking structure.

Sincerely,
Serge Bonte



From: [Serge Bonte](#)
To: [City Council FORWARD](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Hicks, Alison](#)
Cc: [Pancholi, Diana](#); [Shrivastava, Aarti](#)
Subject: re: 4/12/22 Agenda Item 8.2 - Commercial Development at 590 Castro Street
Date: Thursday, April 7, 2022 6:18:11 PM

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

While I would have preferred to see housing on that site, the proposed project adheres to the Precise Plan and is worth supporting.

I especially like:

- The public plaza/paseo -which was contemplated in the Precise Plan- a vast improvement over the current conditions
- "The project applicant voluntarily offering to provide public use of the first floor of the parking garage (91 parking spaces) during non office business hours (6:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.) and on weekends and Federal holidays (7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.).". This offer alone is a huge benefit for the City as it might delay the need and exorbitant costs of yet another public parking structure.

I have two suggestions to further improve the project. The decisions rest primarily on you, and I would imagine the developer can quickly adapt the project.

1. Get rid of the six public surface parking spaces in the back of the building and replace them with more landscaping/trees

Surface parking is the absolute worst possible land use ... especially Downtown. I am actually shocked to read that preserving these six spots will require an encroachment on Pioneer Park AND the removal of on Heritage Tree.

"As part of the proposed development project, the existing driveway is proposed to be modified to provide a compliant driveway-access width with the relocation of the existing six public parking spaces. A portion of the relocated parking spaces will encroach into a small portion of Pioneer Park. The applicant is voluntarily proposing to fund and complete the construction of these six replacement public parking spaces. This necessitates the removal of one Heritage cherry tree in the park."

Choosing Heritage Parking over Heritage Tree and portions of a public park ,doesn't sound like any of the Council Priorities nor any of your campaign platforms. Please remove these parking spots. I am certain the City and/or the developer can find an alternative to accommodate the Chamber of Commerce parking needs. Removing these spots would save one heritage tree and instead of encroaching on the park, you'd be able to slightly enlarge the park via additional landscaping (and possibly more trees).

- 2, Get rid of angled street parking on the Castro side of that project:

The existing angled parking is convenient when parking (just need to drive in) but it's an extremely dangerous maneuver when pulling out as cars back out into traffic without much visibility. With the adoption of Vision Zero, the City should try to enhance safety any chance it gets. And here's your chance to remove a dangerous type of parking fronting that project. My preference would to remove all that street parking as it would enhance the view of the paseo. But at minimum you should re-configure parking to be parallel. Either way, this would enhance safety on Castro and provide more space for trees/planters/people.

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte

██████████ Mountain View

From: [David Shreni](#)
To: [City Council FORWARD](#)
Subject: Agenda Item on 590 Castro
Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 7:37:24 PM

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

Hello City Council.

I'm in favor of this type of development in the downtown core space, but the impact on traffic/parking will be larger than the staff or developer have indicated. The Traffic study prepared by TJKM was based on less office space and retail space (97K and 6.5K sq ft, respectively) than the size of the space proposed in this project stated in the agenda: 105K and 14K sq ft, respectively. I have enclosed below a screenshot of parking analysis that was undertaken using the smaller square footage than the proposed amount in the agenda.

The retail space proposed is DOUBLE (which is great) but will require DOUBLE the amount of retail parking proposed and generate DOUBLE the retail traffic indicated in the traffic study. And that's just the retail piece. The Office space proposed will be 10% larger, which will require...ten percent more parking. I would expect many of those excess parking needs to end up parking on our neighborhood streets (or probably in the library parking lot!)

Please require additional parking, especially for retail needs, or ask the developer to limit the total number of employees allowed in the building.

Warmly,

David S


Consultants, Inc.). This results in 295 parking spaces required (Table 20).

Table 20. Downtown Precise Plan Required Parking vs. Proposed Parking

Land Use	Gross SF	Required Rate (1 Space/x SF)	Required Spaces	Proposed	Difference (deficit)
Office	95,688	333	287		
Office Parking Reduction (5%)			-14		
			273	236	37
Retail	6,646	300	22	19	3
Total			295	255	40

While providing adequate parking is essential to the economic vitality of a downtown, providing too much parking can be counter to many of Mountain View's goals, such as reducing congestion, increasing transit ridership, creating a walkable environments and encouraging successful infill development.

Table 7. Project Trip Generation

Land Use & ITE Code	Building Area	Units	Daily		AM Peak						Midday P		
			Rate	Trips	Rate	In %	Out %	In	Out	Total	Rate	In %	Out %
Proposed Land Use													
General Office Building (ITE Code 710) ¹	97.693	k.s.f	10.62	1,037	1.21	86	14	101	17	118	0.97	14	86
Reduction : Office Land Use - Employment near a Major Bus Stop, 2% ²				-21				-2	-1	-3			
Retail (ITE Code 820) ³	6.500	k.s.f	37.75	245	0.94	62	38	4	3	7	3.24	41	59
Reduction : Retail Land Use Peak Hour Pass by Trip Reduction (as per VTA guidelines) , 30% ⁴			N/A		N/A						N/A		
Proposed Trips (A)				1,261				103	19	122			
Existing Land Use													
General Office Building (ITE Code 710) ¹	9.228	k.s.f	11.40	105				0	0	0	1.09	14	86
Reduction : Office Land Use - Employment near a Major Bus Stop, 2% ^{2,5}				-2				0	0	0			
Existing Trips (B)				103				0	0	0			
Total Trips Increased (A)-(B)				1,158				103	19	122			

Notes: Source - ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017)

¹Fitted Curve Equations for Office Land Use Daily: $\ln(T) = 0.97\ln(X) + 2.50$; AM Peak: $T = 0.94(X) + 26.49$; PM Peak: $\ln(T) = 0.95\ln(X) + 0.36$. Where T = Average Vehicle Tr

From: David
 To: City Council (20230520)
 Subject: Re: Agenda Item on 150 Castro
 Date: Sunday, April 10, 2022 9:24:22 PM

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

A correction: according to the Plan Set, the proposed retail is 10.5k sq feet on the ground floor, 40% more than the transit study indicated. (Not double). The ground floor has 14k sq ft in OFFICE space and is already included on the office space total.

Thank you,

David



On Apr 10, 2022, at 7:37 PM, David Shreni <shreni@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello City Council.

I'm in favor of this type of development in the downtown core space, but the impact on traffic/parking will be larger than the staff or developer have indicated. The Traffic study prepared by TJKM was based on less office space and retail space (97K and 6.5K sq ft, respectively) than the size of the space proposed in this project stated in the agenda: 105K and 14K sq ft, respectively. I have enclosed below a screenshot of parking analysis that was undertaken using the smaller square footage than the proposed amount in the agenda.

The retail space proposed is DOUBLE (which is great) but will require DOUBLE the amount of retail parking proposed and generate DOUBLE the retail traffic indicated in the traffic study. And that's just the retail piece. The Office space proposed will be 10% larger, which will require...ten percent more parking. I would expect many of those excess parking needs to end up parking on our neighborhood streets (or probably in the library parking lot)

Please require additional parking, especially for retail needs, or ask the developer to limit the total number of employees allowed in the building.

Warmly,

David S
 Nilda Ave

Consultants, Inc.). This results in 295 parking spaces required (Table 20).

Table 20. Downtown Precise Plan Required Parking vs. Proposed Parking

Land Use	Gross SF	Required Rate (1 Space/x SF)	Required Spaces	Proposed	Difference (deficit)
Office	95,688	333	287		
Office Parking Reduction (5%)			-14		
			273	236	37
Retail	6,646	300	22	19	3
Total			295	255	40

While providing adequate parking is essential to the economic vitality of a downtown, providing too much parking can be counter to many of Mountain View's goals, such as reducing congestion, increasing transit ridership, creating a walkable environments and encouraging successful infill development.

Table 7. Project Trip Generation

Land Use & ITE Code	Building Area	Units	Daily		AM Peak				Midday					
			Rate	Trips	Rate	In %	Out %	In	Out	Total	Rate	In %	Out %	
Proposed Land Use														
General Office Building (ITE Code 710) ¹	97,693	k.s.f	10.62	1,037	1.21	86	14	101	17	118	0.97	14	86	
Reduction: Office Land Use - Employment near a Major Bus Stop, 2% ²					-21					-2		-1	-3	
Retail (ITE Code 820) ¹	6,500	k.s.f	37.75	245	0.94	62	38	4	3	7	3.24	41	59	
Reduction: Retail Land Use Peak Hour Pass by Trip Reduction (as per VTA guidelines) - 30% ²					N/A					N/A				N/A
Proposed Trips (A)					1,261					103	19	122		
Existing Land Use														
General Office Building (ITE Code 710) ¹	9,228	k.s.f	11.40	105						0	0	1.09	14	86
Reduction: Office Land Use - Employment near a Major Bus Stop, 2% ²					-2					0	0	0	0	
Existing Trips (B)					103					0	0	0		
Total Trips Increased (A-B)					1,158					103	19	122		

Notes: Source - ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017)

¹Fitted Curve Equations for Office Land Use Daily: Ln(T) = 0.97Ln(U) + 2.50; AM Peak: T = 0.9400 + 26.49; PM Peak: Ln(T) = 0.95 Ln(U) + 0.36. Where T = Average Vehicle Tr

Table 7. Project Trip Generation

Land Use & ITE Code	Building Area	Units	Daily		AM Peak						Midday P		
			Rate	Trips	Rate	In %	Out %	In	Out	Total	Rate	In %	Out %
Proposed Land Use													
General Office Building (ITE Code 710) ¹	97,693	k.s.f	10.62	1,037	1.21	86	14	101	17	118	0.97	14	86
Reduction : Office Land Use - Employment near a Major Bus Stop, 2% ²				-21				-2	-1	-3			
Retail (ITE Code 820) ³	6,500	k.s.f	37.75	245	0.94	62	38	4	3	7	3.24	41	59
Reduction : Retail Land Use Peak Hour Pass by Trip Reduction (as per VTA guidelines) , 30% ⁴			N/A		N/A						N/A		
Proposed Trips (A)				1,261				103	19	122			
Existing Land Use													
General Office Building (ITE Code 710) ¹	9,228	k.s.f	11.40	105				0	0	0	1.09	14	86
Reduction : Office Land Use - Employment near a Major Bus Stop, 2% ^{2,5}				-2				0	0	0			
Existing Trips (B)				103				0	0	0			
Total Trips Increased (A)-(B)				1,158				103	19	122			

Notes: Source - ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017)
 Fitted Curve Equations for Office Land Use Daily: $\ln(T) = 0.97\ln(X) + 2.50$; AM Peak: $T = 0.94(X) + 26.49$; PM Peak: $\ln(T) = 0.95\ln(X) + 0.36$. Where T = Average Vehicle Tr

Consultants, Inc.). This results in 295 parking spaces required (Table 20).

Table 20. Downtown Precise Plan Required Parking vs. Proposed Parking

Land Use	Gross SF	Required Rate (1 Space/x SF)	Required Spaces	Proposed	Difference (deficit)
Office	95,688	333	287		
Office Parking Reduction (5%)			-14		
			273	236	37
Retail	6,646	300	22	19	3
Total			295	255	40

While providing adequate parking is essential to the economic vitality of a downtown, providing too much parking can be counter to many of Mountain View's goals, such as reducing congestion, increasing transit ridership, creating a walkable environments and encouraging successful infill development.

From: [Raquel McJones](#)
To: [City Council FORWARD](#)
Subject: 590 Castro Street development
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 6:45:10 AM

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

I am completely scandalized that city staff and the zoning administrator feel that a 20-times increase in employees (from 20 at the old Wells Fargo to 400 at this new building) and only providing parking for half of them will not have any environmental impact on the surrounding area!

Please do not approve this plan.

Raquel McJones

Mountain View, CA

Sent from my iPad

From: [LWormald](#)
To: [City Council FORWARD](#)
Subject: 590 Castro St - on April 12, 2022 agenda
Date: Monday, April 11, 2022 7:16:33 AM

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

590 Castro St.

I request the City Council NOT approve this project without further study.

Major development going thru without notifying the public in ways the public actually gets the information. This is our downtown!

- Notifying the nearby owners is inappropriate in this case– city hall and the actual developer themselves.
- Why no environmental impact study?
- Why are the heritage trees allowed to be removed?
- Housing impact fees – why so low?
- Why is parking not adequate for planned volume of workers?

Sincerely,

Lorraine A. Wormald

Mountain View, California 94041