

City Council Questions
November 5, 2019 Council Meeting

ITEM 3.1 GATEWAY MASTER PLAN

1. What happens if the property owners are not interested in developing in accordance with the Master Plan? How would this affect development in the rest of the North Bayshore area?

The City's goal is to create a Master Plan for the Gateway that will meet the City's objectives while taking into account private property development interest. To help with implementation, staff will return to Council in 2020 with options on how the remaining North Bayshore Bonus FAR could be allocated to incentivize the implementation of both the Gateway Master Plan and the rest of North Bayshore Precise Plan.

2. How much will the environmental review for the Master Plan cost the City? Will the City be on the hook for the cost if the property owners do not develop the Gateway site?

The Master Plan CEQA cost is approximately \$60,000 for a compliance checklist review. Some of the initial costs borne by the City for the Master Plan process will be reimbursed by the property owners upon development. A full CEQA review will not be part of this initial master plan phase but will occur with specific project submittals.

3. How much would removing the fitness center improve the viability of the Plan, financially and in terms of traffic impacts?

The financial analysis evaluates four scenarios, and the Medium Office Reduced Retail scenario tests the financial impact of excluding a 100,000 square foot fitness/entertainment retail use such as SyWest's proposed fitness center. The potential value of a fitness center or similar retail entertainment use is significantly less than development costs given the specialized building improvements and structured parking associated with this use. As a result, the residual land value for this retail use is negative. As the financial analysis indicates, the residual land value for the entire Gateway development improves substantially from about \$500,000 per acre (for the Medium Office scenario that assumes 300,000 SF of retail) to \$1.9 million per acre (for the Medium Office Reduced Retail scenario with 200,000 SF of retail).

The fitness center and, to some degree, the theater, are regional attractions that would attract vehicle trips throughout the day. The fitness center is of particular concern because of the potential inbound trips in the AM peak period that would conflict with inbound commute trips.

4. How much do the hotel and theater harm the viability of the Plan, financially and in terms of traffic impacts?

The hotel and theater uses require specialized building improvements and structured parking. The financial performance of the theater is similar to what is described above in response to the prior question about removing the fitness center. The financial performance of the hotel will depend on how much of the costs for offsite and onsite infrastructure as well as

community benefits are allocated to the hotel. For purposes of the initial financial analysis, the hotel is assumed to contribute to these costs while the retail uses are not.

The traffic impacts are not assumed to be significant since these vehicle trips would not generally occur during the most impacted peak hour periods.

5. How will shared/district parking work in the “Existing Property Line” alternative? Can the City require that shared parking be required across property lines?

Under the existing property line alternative, it is assumed that shared access and parking agreements will be needed between both property owners in order to fulfill the objectives of the Gateway Master Plan and create the most efficient development pattern. Staff will explore this potential option further with the property owners and if there are any other legal or other ramifications to this approach.

6. Why are we putting land uses that are regional draws in an area that cannot take more regional traffic and where we’re trying to increase internalization, not externalization?

Two of the Precise Plan’s principles are to promote economic diversity and promote retail, entertainment, and the arts. The Precise Plan also emphasizes that the Gateway include a variety of land uses and be next to transportation infrastructure such as the Shoreline Boulevard dedicated lane bus service. Some of these uses, such as the fitness center, theater and hotel, need to attract both regional and local patrons in order to be financially viable. The theater use has been retained in order to fulfill the object of the Gateway character area to include entertainment uses. The fitness center has been added because Sywest has indicated that this would be a key feature of their redevelopment.

The Gateway Master Plan is attempting to balance a financially viable mixed use center that achieves the vision of the Precise Plan, with the area’s transportation limitations. Further transportation modeling will occur after a draft land use program is endorsed by Council, and then this information will be shared later during the Master Plan process.

7. Have we talked to Google about specific ways to change their bus services to improve the situation? What is the potential for our shuttle study and reorganization to improve the traffic situation here? Is there potential for synergy between future Google bus and Mountain View shuttle services? I’ve heard that few buses now use Shoreline. Will this likely change much with the reversible bus lane?

The Google buses currently serve about 34% of the Google commuters entering North Bayshore. The buses primarily enter in the morning from San Antonio and Rengstorff, travel down Charleston and exit on Shoreline in the reverse commute direction. They operate in the reverse direction in the afternoon. Therefore, most of their buses are not adding to the traffic in the peak direction on Shoreline Blvd during the morning and afternoon commute periods, but they are taking a substantial number of cars off the road.

In conjunction with the current North Bayshore Circulation Study, there have been discussions with Google about their future service plans. Upcoming work on the Circulation Study may identify needed modifications or expansion of current service that we can discuss further with

Google, including where there may be opportunities to use new infrastructure, such as the reversible transit lane. The current Shuttle Study is investigating the possibility of expanding and integrating current shuttle services. It is also assumed that the MVgo shuttle service on Shoreline will expand with future employment growth and the expansion of Caltrain service helping to address the increasing demand. The Google buses serve longer distance trips, which is a different travel market than these shuttle services; however, opportunities for “synergies” between these services will continue to be explored, especially for trips originating along the Caltrain corridor.

8. Have we ever considered a bridge over Stevens Creek connecting Charleston with Wright, RT Jones and Moffett? If so, why was that idea dropped? If not, why not?

The bridge over Stevens Creek is still under consideration and was identified in the Precise Plan. The Circulation Study is exploring its feasibility and preliminary design. The bridge is currently planned to only serve transit and pedestrians and bikes.

9. Regarding placemaking, the staff report says, “The Gateway Master Plan will include a mix of uses and building place types. These will add to the overall urban character of the Gateway area... with strong ground-floor design elements.” Recent development on El Camino and San Antonio lack ground floor design elements that engage with pedestrians and would have encouraged walking over driving. How can we make sure this mistake is not repeated in the Gateway area in general and specifically along Shoreline?

The Master Plan will include policy language requiring that buildings include strong ground floor design elements such as locating the building adjacent to sidewalks and open spaces, and include design elements such as entries, windows, lobbies, stoops, storefronts, etc. When a Master Plan project is proposed, staff will review the proposal to ensure it meets these key placemaking policies. Shoreline Boulevard to the extent possible will include key ground floor elements, but in some areas, such as the frontage where the bike/ped bridge is proposed, this may not be feasible. The Final Master Plan will include additional design policies that address the Shoreline Boulevard frontage conditions.

10. The report says that active uses, “such as retail, restaurants, cafés, and services, will be required on key ground floors to activate and enliven pedestrian areas and streets. Both commercial and residential buildings will also include strong pedestrian design elements such as lobby/entries; porches; arcades; seating areas; public art; and other elements.” Recent development on El Camino and San Antonio does not have very open and engaging active uses like these. How can we make sure they happen here?

The Final Master Plan will include additional design policies that address this issue. Council can offer additional suggestions regarding this topic now or at a later stage.

11. How can we ensure that parking does not dominate the scene? How can we make sure Shoreline doesn’t become a corridor lined with parking garages?

The Precise Plan includes policies that state that parking structures need to be oriented towards the interior of a site or along Highway 101 and that no parking structures on Shoreline Blvd shall front on the street. This language will be referenced or addressed in the Master Plan.

12. The EPC said that we should use, “off-site FAR to make placemaking elements more viable.” What does that mean?

The financial analysis indicates that key placemaking elements in the Gateway, including pedestrian and bike improvements, “complete streets,” open space improvements and a significant amount of retail uses, affect the financial viability of Gateway development. If 500,000 SF of office were to be approved in Gateway, the remaining office FAR could be allocated to other areas in North Bayshore. The value in the remaining FAR could be used to subsidize placemaking elements at the Gateway and in North Bayshore.

13. On page 17 of the staff report it says “using off-site FAR to make placemaking elements more viable.” What does this mean? Is this transferring the FAR to another location?

See response noted above on this question.

14. The EPC said they had, “Concern over the size and function of Shoreline Boulevard; that it will become a ‘mini-101’ and detract from placemaking.” What steps can we take to make sure that doesn’t happen?

Per the Precise Plan, Shoreline Boulevard is envisioned as a multi-modal street with cycle tracks and the dedicated bus/transit lane. It will, however, still need to serve a substantial number of vehicle trips in the peak hours. As much as possible, the Precise Plan includes strategies such as multi-modal improvements and building ‘build-to’ setback lines to help create a more comfortable streetscape. But as noted, it will still be a relatively wide street that will continue to serve a large number of commute vehicle trips.

15. Under the Medium Office scenario, will the gateway area be the densest residential use in North Bayshore?

No. Both the Gateway and Core areas of the Precise Plan allow up to 4.50 FAR for residential uses. Because of the desired other uses in the Gateway (retail, entertainment, etc.), it might have less residential relative to other neighborhoods.

16. What is the timeframe for the information in Table 3, revenues and costs?

The economic analysis assumes build-out of the Gateway plan, which would likely occur over a seven to nine year period including predevelopment and construction. The development revenues and costs are presented in 2019 dollars.

17. In both master plan scenarios, are the locations of land use meant to have any flexibility? If so, how much flexibility?

Yes, the Master Plan assumes some land use flexibility. The amount of flexibility will depend on how much a future proposal differs from the Gateway Master Plan. Any potential land use difference will be analyzed and compared against the Gateway Master Plan and then brought to the EPC and Council as part of the specific master plan approval process.

18. What is the existing office sf in the gateway area and is all of it scheduled to be replaced in the gateway area, in addition to the 500,000 new sf?

There is no traditional office SF in the Gateway. 1555 Plymouth Street, owned by Google, is a 40,000 sq. ft. building most recently used as a data center.

19. What is meant by a 10% circulation factor?

This is the percentage of vehicles that are expected to be circulating the parking structure at any time---either waiting to enter a parking structure or circulating within the structure looking for available parking. In large parking structures, particularly for district parking between shared uses, it is standard to add a circulation factor after reducing demand for shared uses. Fehr and Peers recommended we add the 10% circulation factor as part of their shared parking analysis.

20. Is residential parking completely unbundled or is it 1 space included and the rest unbundled?

All the residential buildings are parked at a minimum ratio of 0.4 spaces per unit and all spaces are expected to be unbundled. Additional parking for guests may be included within each residential block up to 0.6 spaces per unit or located in the shared parking structures.

21. In the assumptions, are the school fees applied to residential and office developments? How does the \$17 sf sync with recent Council direction on school fees?

The initial financial analysis was prepared prior to the Council study session regarding school contributions. Subsequently, Seifel Consulting analyzed the financial effect of the Council direction that school contributions apply to both residential and office developments, which did not significantly affect the residual land value analysis for the Medium Office scenarios. Staff will confer with the economic consultant and provide the dollar amount at the study session.

22. Does the economic feasibility analysis include community benefits, and if not, why not?

The economic feasibility analysis assumed an estimate of overall on-site and off-site financial contributions, but did not break this out into a specific community benefit amount per use or per square foot. Based on Council comments related to this initial high level analysis, and further economic analysis, community benefit contribution options will be brought back to Council with the next step of the Gateway Master Plan

ITEM 4.3 Santa Clara County Planning Collaborative

1. The staff report says that on September 10, 2019, the City Council adopted a resolution authorizing the City to join a Santa Clara Countywide Subregion as part of the Association of Bay Area Governments' (ABAG's) Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Process. This is not my recollection. The Council took no action on this item. The minutes reflect my recollection. Can the staff report be corrected?

The staff report is in error. The Council discussed the issue on that date, but didn't adopt a resolution. Council did adopt a [resolution](#) related to the effort on September 25, 2018.

2. Does staff think it is a good idea to join the Planning Collaborative? Will staff get any benefit out of it?

Although it will require additional staff resources, staff believes there is value to creating a forum for discussing regional housing issues in this initial one year pilot project.

ITEM 6.2 MINOR AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 36 (ZONING) OF THE CITY CODE AND THE R4 MULTI-FAMILY STANDARDS HANDOUT

1. The Council discussed revisions to the TRAO that could be made more quickly than the other displacement response programs. Since the TRAO is in the Zoning Code, could we include the minor changes that were incorporated into the conditions of approval for recent projects involving displacement as part of these amendments, rather than have a separate agenda item?

Based on Council direction provided on October 28, staff is comprehensively reviewing the displacement response strategy and identifying what items can be covered as part of a narrower scope of text amendments earlier, versus a larger scope. At this point, staff is continuing to review the TRAO discussion items and is not prepared to present text amendments to Chapter 36. In addition, all text amendments to Chapter 36 must be reviewed and receive a recommendation from the EPC to Council which was not provided as part of the current text amendments. So, once the TRAO text amendments are ready, staff will review them with EPC and Council at future hearing dates.

2. P. 2 – The short-term rental changes appear to be merely about where you find the information. Is that correct?

Yes, the intent of the text amendments are to improve user experience by directing interested parties to the pertinent regulations (Chapter 44) and provide clarity that short-term rentals are exempt from Zoning permits.

3. The staff report says, "The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) passed a declaratory ruling... which specifically restricts cities' regulatory authority of **small** wireless facilities in the public right-of-way and on public property... Because [Mountain View's] Zoning Ordinance currently requires a discretionary zoning permit for communication facilities in the public right-of-way, staff proposes to amend the text to... remove the zoning permit requirement for new or modified wireless facilities in the public right-of-way." The FCC ruling seems to only apply to small wireless facilities. How small is small? Are wireless facilities in the public right-of-way and

on public property sometimes large? Should larger facilities still require a discretionary zoning permit?

The declaratory ruling applies to all types of facilities used to provide wireless services – big or small. With this proposed amendment, it would effectively mean any wireless facility proposed in the public right-of-way or on City property will go through the Public Works Permit process. In addition to these regulations, there continues to be specific shot-clock and other rules that govern certain wireless facilities, i.e., generally those less than 50 feet tall and on antennas less than three cubic feet. These small cell facilities also go through a Public Works Permit process (see Public Works Application handout for more info) and are not subject to a Zoning Permit if located on City property or in the public right-of-way. Thus, with the federal regulations in place today, the only wireless facilities that can be subject to a discretionary Zoning permit are those proposed on private property as a Tier 2 or Tier 3 project as described on the Planning Division’s Telecom/Wireless Communication Facility Application Form.

The City is currently reviewing three permits with three different telecom service providers – AT&T, Verizon, and ExteNet – for cell facilities on power poles in the City right-of-way.

4. Is there a step-back requirement for rooftop screens?

No, there is not a step-back requirement for roof-screens. Staff has found that there are innumerable variations on building sizes and shapes and the type and location of equipment that roof screens are meant to screen, so requiring a one-size-fits-all setback standard creates unnecessary limitations on design and function that can be addressed on a case by case basis.

5. Have some rooftops screens that have already been approved and/or installed been greater than 4 feet tall?

Yes, there are examples where existing roof screens are taller than four feet in order to fully screen the roof equipment. In most cases, the buildings are not at the maximum height limit of the district so the roof screen can be taller than four feet or are in a precise plan area which has different standards.

ITEM 6.3 EAST WHISMAN PRECISE PLAN

1. What was the community benefit (in dollars per square foot) that the LinkedIn project paid? What were the community benefits provided by other gatekeepers in East Whisman that were approved in advance of the Precise Plan?

The following table shows the amount of community benefits provided by the two most recent office gatekeeper projects approved in East Whisman (since 2016). Two other office projects were approved in 2013 and 2014, but the community benefits were similar to 600 Clyde Ave. For the purpose of comparison, each is calculated based on the floor area over 0.4 FAR.

600 Clyde Ave.	\$ 6.76/sq. ft.
700 Middlefield Ave. (LinkedIn)	\$19.04/sq. ft.

2. The expectation of gatekeepers approved in advance of the Precise Plan is that they will comply with the Precise Plan requirements. What requirements of the EWPP will LinkedIn and the other gatekeepers need to comply with? What are the requirements that they will NOT need to comply with?

LinkedIn is an entitled project, so the entitlement conditions can't change at this point.

<u>Precise Plan Requirement</u>	<u>LinkedIn</u>	<u>Other Gatekeepers (LASD TDR Office Projects)</u>
LEED Platinum	Y	Y
EWPP Trip-cap	Y	Y
Community Benefits	Y (see above)	Y
Public Paths	Y	Y
Public Open Space	Y	If applicable
Jobs-Housing Linkage	Pre-paid Housing Impact Fee (did not create units in East Whisman and did not create units based on EWPP ratio)	N (but all TDRs together, other than Vanni, will meet the Jobs-Housing ratio)
School Strategy	N	Y
Infrastructure Impact Fee (action item, to be kicked off later this year)	Y (through DA)	Depends on timing and any possible grandfathering provisions (based on results of Nexus Study expected in fall 2020)

3. Does the TMA currently have any residential developer members? How much progress has been made on establishing a separate tier or membership category for residential developers?

The TMA currently has two residential members: Prometheus (joined August 2019) and Lennar Multifamily Communities (joined September 2019). In addition, Summerhill Homes, Lux Largo, Fortbay and Avalon Bay are all expected to join the TMA over the next two to three years.

The TMA Board of Directors has adopted a new tiered membership fee structure which sets fees for residential members differently than commercial members and accommodates members of various sizes (square footage or headcount). The new fee structure was adopted by the TMA Board in September 2019.

4. What benefits and programs does the TMA currently provide residential development?

The TMA has made progress over the past year with analyzing and implementing new services that will benefit incoming residential members. A new shuttle route serving the residential members in the San Antonio area is currently under development. It will provide the two new residential members with "first-mile" service to the Caltrain station as well as direct service to jobs in the North Bayshore area. This new shuttle route is expected to begin operation in the spring 2020. In addition, the TMA has a residential TDM study underway to identify the

services and programs the TMA may provide to residential members, such as a commute coordinator to actively promote the use of alternative transportation options, as well as various incentives to encourage mode-shift. As the residential membership of the TMA expands, the revenue pool will increase, allowing the TMA the financial ability to invest more in TDM solutions to support residential members.

The TMA is also currently providing the following two pilot programs which are available to the general public in Mountain View, which also benefits the TMA residential members: 1) the MVgo Mid-Day Mobility Program offers residents and employees in Mountain View a discount of up to \$5 per trip for both Uber and Lyft shared rides between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m., which can help encourage commuters to leave their cars at home. Trips must either start or end in Mountain View; and 2) the MVgo Carpool Program in which the TMA has partnered with Waze Carpool to offer carpoolers a flat rate of \$2 per trip for all trips starting or ending in Mountain View. Both programs have been funded through December 31, 2019. At their December 3 Board meeting, the TMA will vote on the 2020 budget which will determine the level of support to continue these programs in 2020.

5. Does the El Camino Real Precise Plan require residential developers to join the TMA?

Yes, though when it was written it wasn't clear that the citywide TMA would operate outside East Whisman and North Bayshore, so the language allows developers to join "the TMA or other association." As implemented, we have been requiring projects to join the citywide TMA.

6. Are the community benefit obligations net of the school strategy assumptions? In other words, without the school strategy, would the community benefits be \$15/sq. ft. for residential and \$45/sq. ft. for office?

For office, that is the case. It is net of the school strategy assumption and would be about \$45 per square foot without it.

For residential, the community benefit value is based on a relatively small amount that also ensures residential projects contribute to benefits in the neighborhood. The residential recommendation would be the same amount no matter how the school strategy is set.

7. The Jobs-Housing Linkage, as I understand it, is intended to create a market that would incentivize office development to subsidize residential development in exchange for the residential to allow the office to access bonus FAR. What are some ways this can play out? Could we make it more flexible and allow, for example, office developers to partner with affordable housing developers outside of the East Whisman Precise Plan area?

The Draft Jobs-Housing Linkage Guidelines (Attachment 6) include some scenarios for how the City would review residential and office projects under the Jobs-Housing Linkage Program. These include the following:

- A residential project is approved and starts construction. Then, it sells its partnership to one or more office developers (within five years). The office developer can then apply for bonus FAR.

- A mixed-use project applies (or an office and residential developers apply together through a Master Plan), and the Council reviews its implementation plan, ensuring the residential is built first, or that the residential development has some certainty within a limited time.
- An office project applies, and dedicates property to a non-profit affordable housing developer.

If Council wishes to add the flexibility to partner with an affordable housing developer outside East Whisman, it would be a fairly simple change (modifications to sections 6.1.1(2) for office projects and 6.1.5(2e) for residential projects). However, this would almost certainly result in fewer than 20% affordable units in East Whisman, and the goal would need to be revised.

8. I don't see the June 25, 2019 minutes from the Council meeting posted online. Are they available?

The minutes of the June 25, 2019 Council meeting have not gone to Council for approval. The City Clerk will provide an excerpt of the draft minutes of the June 25 East Whisman Precise Plan Study Session in advance of tonight's meeting.

9. I do not recall the majority of Council supporting studying additional building heights near the Middlefield Station. Which Councilmembers supported this at the June 25 meeting?

The draft minutes will be provided later per the previous question. However, our initial assessment is that it was brought up by Councilmember McAlister at the end of the meeting, among other topics, including bird-safe design, additional monitoring intersections and purple pipe standards (which Public Works staff responded to at the meeting). Staff summarized these items verbally and the Mayor requested if any Councilmembers *didn't* want staff to study these items, which no one responded to (except one member regarding bird-safe design).

10. Can we combine the community benefit and school strategy contribution into one total obligation to the City and then the City determines a set amount to give to the school districts?

Yes, but two separate values are more consistent with Precise Plan language. It also ensures that the school district contributions do not come at the expense of other community benefits unless Council specifically authorizes it.