

From: [Hue Simpson](#)
To: [Panos, Carly](#); [Blount, Terry](#)
Subject: comments on Prometheus application #: 337-15pcza; 31-16-pm
Date: Wednesday, September 07, 2016 2:00:59 PM

I live around the corner from this project so am part of the impacted neighborhood.

Please put my email address on the mailing list to hear what's going on with the Prometheus project.

Here are my objections/comments/questions for presentation at Sept 7 hearing of the EPC:

1. Additions of this size and scope will have a huge impact on the neighborhood. While there are plans for PARKING for the new vehicles to be added to the streets, there's nothing about new TRAFFIC concerns. I know in the past the City's stand on future traffic planning has been a wait and let's see what happens. Have we not learned to do impact studies before hand to add to the planning process? Is this already in place?
2. What does the 35% state density bonus request with waivers mean? Allows higher density than what is current?
3. Removal of Heritage Trees. Studying past projects, I see there was a mitigation study done by the Urban Forestry Group for the Senior Center project. Is there such a study for this project? 103 trees, not ok.
4. Looking online and living here, I see the huge MGP Phase II project has been approved and construction has started. That has over 100,000 square feet of retail commercial space while Prometheus adds 11,000. Really, people need more shopping, can't walk across the street to that complex?
5. My alternate suggestions: Scale it down to three stories so one can see the sky while out walking and reduce slightly the extra traffic that will come with new residents, redesign pipelines to let the majority of the trees stay, and instead create a park somewhere there, a green belt, as a BALANCE to the concrete jungle that is the MGP project.

OR, wait and see what the demand is for commercial/retail space once the MGP project has filled, or not, the space with leasers before adding yet another office building/commercial/retail tower.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: [Planning Division](#)
To: [Panos, Carly](#)
Subject: FW: Community Benefits for 400 San Antonio Project
Date: Wednesday, September 07, 2016 8:30:18 AM

Carly, this is for your file records. I'll print this out for the EPC members

-----Original Message-----

From: Nancy Morimoto [<mailto:nancy94040@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, September 04, 2016 10:21 PM
To: epc@mountainview.gov; Blount, Terry; Cox, Robert; Ellen Kamei; Lisa Matichak; Margaret Capriles; John Scarboro; mvpamelab@gmail.com; preeti.hehmeyer@gmail.com
Subject: Community Benefits for 400 San Antonio Project

Dear Environmental Planning Commissioners and Mr. Blount,

I was very happy to read about the possible uses of the public benefit contributions that Prometheus would be donating due to the size of the proposed development at 400 San Antonio Road. Many more residents with urgent needs will be able to be served by Community Services Agency with \$500,000.

Also, as a "North of El Camino parent" on the Los Altos School District's site committee, I feel it is really important for the district to invest in a school site in this area. The approximately 4.5 million would be very helpful in that regard. Plus, it would be great if the park funds generated by this development (and others) would also be used by the city for land adjacent to any site purchased by the district, for a park next to the school.

However, it may be that because of timing issues, or political or financial reasons, the district may end up using its own land for two schools on one site, or for larger schools, or different grade configurations to solve the growing enrollment situation. As the staff report mentions, since 25% of the district's enrollment comes from Mountain View, and much of the future growth will come from there too, I would like the wording to allow the funds to be used towards either a new site, in Mountain View or not, or towards current school site modifications meant to address increasing enrollment. The following schools all have students from Mountain View in their enrollment areas:

Covington, Santa Rita, Almond, Springer and Egan Junior High, so there would be no problem using up the money for facilities used by Mountain View students.

Other developments, such as office or retail in the area can contribute money for general infrastructure improvements, but such a large housing development should focus on benefiting the local school district as it tries to deal with growing enrollment.

By the way, I am very happy to read that there will be a variety of sizes of apartments in the development, and not more of just the studio and one bedroom units, that seem to be the norm for new housing. I think that's a really important piece of creating a balanced neighborhood now and also in the years ahead. I hope that piece doesn't get lost in any "wheeling and dealing" in the coming months.

Thank you for your diligence in oversight for this and the many projects in the San Antonio area.

Nancy Morimoto

Whits Road, MV

From: MV Serge [mailto:serge4mv@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 05, 2016 2:09 PM
To: Lisa Matichak; robert.cox@intel.com; Margaret Capriles; John Scarboro; Ellen Kamei; pamkbassoc@jps.net; preeti.hehmeyer@gmail.com
Cc: Blount, Terry
Subject: re: 09/07/16 Agenda Item 5.3 400 San Antonio project.

Dear Mountain View Environmental Planning Commission:

I do plan to attend your meeting on Wednesday. But you have a full agenda and I'm not sure I will have the stamina to stay through the whole meeting nor to deliver oral comments on that agenda item. So here are my written comments:

Public Benefits:

I fully support the proposed public benefits.

1. I can not think of a Mountain View organization more deserving of help than the CSA. That \$500,000 contribution will help countless Mountain View residents in need of urgent assistance for food, health, housing....
2. As a former renter in the Crossings and as a current Los Altos School District resident (and taxpayer), I've long advocated for more school facilities to serve the hundreds of LASD students living "North of El Camino". I fully support using the majority of the public benefit to be earmarked for that purpose. I would respectfully request however that the City adds language or provide assurances that this money not be tied to a school site in Mountain View. As you all know, in the current market, it is extremely challenging and astronomically expensive for school districts to find and acquire land in the San Antonio change area. Despite its best efforts, it is possible the Los Altos School District will wind up adding school capacity outside of Mountain View. In that case, I feel the City should let the earmarked money "follow the kids" as regardless of geographic location the added school capacity will benefit students from the San Antonio area. Should LASD be successful in securing a site "North of El Camino", I also hope the City will consider using a significant part of the park in lieu fees to acquire park land adjacent to that site.

Affordable Housing:

I wanted to comment on the following paragraph in the Staff Report:

"The Housing Element identifies this project site as a potential redevelopment location for housing units affordable to lower-income households (0 percent to 80 percent area median income (AMI)). While a portion of the proposed units will fall within these affordability

levels, the proposed project is primarily a market rate development. The City expects the addition of residential units within the North Bayshore Change Area to more than make up for the number of units that could have been provided on this site. "

It would be beneficial for the community to have quantitative data: how many affordable units (and as a percentage of total units) could have been provided on this site? how many more (and as a percentage of total units) are expected to be provided within the North Bayshore area? Such numbers would certainly help guide the current revisions to the North Bayshore Precise Plan.

Bike/Pedestrian Improvements:

Just like with the 394 Ortega project, I am surprised that there are no references to the fairly detailed bike circulation plan that was developed for the San Antonio Precise Plan. Specifically the plan had called for improved crossings by Fayette Drive (adjacent to the project) and for bike lanes on San Antonio. If I recall correctly the bike lanes were originally planned as a benefit from Merlone Geier Phase I and later on from Merlone Geier Phase II. If I recall correctly one of the issues was getting enough right of way from other developments to make room for the bike lanes. I didn't see these bike lanes in any of the exhibits for the 400 San Antonio project. Prior to approval, the City should confirm that the bike lanes will still be built as promised with Merlone Geier Phase II and that whatever required right away is provided by the 400 San Antonio project. The bike lanes on San Antonio would seem key for both Merlone Geier and Prometheus to achieve their TDM goals.

Mass Transportation (where are the bus stops)

The proposed TDM measures rely quite a bit on mass transportation. One of the best ways to get more residents to use mass transit would seem to be by providing a bus stop in front of the project. There are currently no bus stops on that side of San Antonio from Central to El Camino. A bus stop could also serve as a pickup/drop off area for the many tech shuttles that future residents will be likely to take. In the absence of a bus stop, the project should clearly identify where tech shuttles would stop (on San Antonio they might block the right lane traffic, on Fayette or Miller they might be blocking all traffic).

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte
Lloyd Way, Mountain View