



Google Inc.
1600 Amphitheatre Parkway
Mountain View CA 94043

650 253-0000 main
google.com

June 2, 2017

Environmental Planning Commission
City of Mountain View
500 Castro Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

**Re: June 7, 2017 Environmental Planning Commission Meeting:
East Whisman Precise Plan – Policy Framework on Circulation/Transportation**

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of Google, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the East Whisman Precise Plan – Policy Framework on Circulation and Transportation. We appreciate the City's work on this Precise Plan and we submit the following comments for your review and consideration.

1. Google Supports the Addition of Mixed-Use, Residential, and Additional Office.

Within the East Whisman Precise Plan area, Google supports new mixed-use transit oriented developments to optimize density and maximize the benefits of existing public transit (light rail and bus lines) in the area. We also support keeping land uses as flexible as possible and allowing a Master Plan process in the East Whisman Precise Plan area, similar to the Master Plan process that is currently being proposed in North Bayshore. Such flexibility and Master Plan process will ensure flexibility for developers, while meeting critical City goals.

2. Google Supports the Addition of More Bike and Pedestrian Connectivity.

The important goals of increased bike and pedestrian connectivity within the East Whisman Precise Plan area and with other City neighborhoods can be implemented as part of the East Whisman Precise Plan. To minimize the need for additional pavement in the area, we support utilizing mixed-use trails, separated from vehicle traffic, for the majority of the increased bike and pedestrian connectivity.

3. Google Discourages New Streets Unless Necessary.

Google feels the number of new streets in the East Whisman Precise Plan is unnecessarily high. East Whisman is well positioned to take advantage of public transit and become a walkable community. The new streets undercut a developer's ability to

create that friendly, walkable space. Google supports eliminating any specific requirements for new roads. Developers will need to be held accountable for roads needed for emergency access and to meet the traffic impacts of their proposals; current policies cover this sufficiently. Beyond that, we prefer that developers be allowed to bring their own solutions for where to place the necessary streets, and that non-auto paths should be prioritized where possible.

4. Google Supports the City's Efforts to Partner With Other Agencies.

Google supports the City's efforts to partner with the SFPUC and VTA.

As part of the East Whisman Precise Plan, the City has some unique opportunities to partner with the SFPUC regarding bike and pedestrian access on the Hetch Hetchy easement in East Whisman and other areas in the City.

The City also has the opportunity to partner with VTA regarding an increase in connectivity through additional pedestrian crossings.

5. Creating a 24-Hour Community.

In order to create a vibrant and active 24-hour community, we agree that other programs/uses should be permissible, such as housing and ground floor retail. Furthermore, a critical mass around the clock is necessary to support existing and future retail and services in the area.

Thank you and we look forward to working with the City on the East Whisman Precise Plan.

Very truly yours,



Mark Golan
Vice President
Real Estate and Workplace Services, Bay Area
Google Inc.

Keenan-Lovewell Ventures

June 7, 2017

Environmental Planning Commission
City of Mountain View
Castro Street
Mountain View, Ca.
94039

REF: East Whisman Precise Plan - EPC Staff Report dated June 7, 2007

Dear Planning Commissioners,

With regard to the block bounded by Whisman, Middlefield, Ellis and Fairchild, we offer the following comments:


1. The Staff Report requests input on the proposed circulation network, a threshold issue for the rest of the Plan. The Conceptual Vehicle and Bicycle Network plans are not feasible for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed East-West and North-South streets would involve substantial taking of property and elimination of critical parking. Such taking could only happen in conjunction with cooperative redevelopment with the property owners, unlikely to occur within the 2030 Plan horizon, or significantly later. Most of the existing buildings are relatively new and functional.
 - b. Obtaining agreement from all the property owners affected is problematical (The Vineyard alone includes 58 small business owners).
 - c. The proposed north-south street is blocked by entitlements to build two buildings and two parking structures on The Quad property.
 - d. Adding public streets through the middle of the block would break up the cohesiveness, integration and identity of The Quad and potentially add to security concerns of tenants. It would reduce the appeal to full-campus tenants and potentially damage the value of the property. A secure campus with room for dedicated employee activities has been a significant factor in making this area a success.
 - e. The inclusion in the plan of a bicycle or pedestrian multi-use path along the south side of the Hetch-Hetchy easement would be self-defeating,

because it would make redevelopment infeasible. Redevelopment will never happen because of the inefficiencies created. The primary utility of the Hetch-Hetchy property is on grade parking, circulation, and delivery truck access; structures are not permitted. Parking, circulation, and truck access, would all be adversely affected. Site planning for larger buildings would be extremely difficult. Isolated by itself, the Hetch-Hetchy parcel does not park efficiently because of its dimensions. Pedestrian/bicycle use of a multi-use path would not be compatible with trucks backing on to, or crossing, the path to access building dock areas.

- f. As part of the bicycle/pedestrian path along the Hetch-Hetchy, a second crosswalk at Ellis Street would be constructed very close to the existing crosswalk, which already adequately serves bicycles and pedestrians. A second crosswalk is not needed.
2. The Conceptual Pedestrian Plan appears very similar to the plan already approved by the city as part of the 10-year development agreement, and will be feasible in that context.

Please feel free to contact us with regard to any of the points raised in this letter.

Sincerely,



John B. Lovewell
Keenan Lovewell Ventures