

Public Comments and Staff Responses

Track changes show new comments and revised City responses since December 22, 2022.

General Comments

Description	Source	Action/City Notes
Inadequate Analysis		
Inadequate analysis for non-vacant sites and probability of redevelopment is not thoroughly analyzed; should do additional rezonings	MV YIMBY <u>Farella, Braun + Martell (12/22/22)</u>	<u>Additional discussion on suitability of non-vacant sites included in Appendix E. Questions in Staff Report for EPC/Council about additional rezonings. More rezonings would need environmental review.</u>
Use 5 th Cycle projections to measure likelihood of development for 6 th cycle; at current pace, MV unlikely to meet requirements; should rezone so housing capacity reflects realistic build-out	YIMBY Law & Greenbelt Alliance MV YIMBY (2/14/22; 3/7/22)	Additional discussion on suitability of non-vacant sites included in Appendix E. Questions in Staff Report for EPC/Council about additional rezonings. More rezonings would need environmental review.
Inaccurate/unrealistic/assumptions on affordability levels	LWV (3/6/22) Kevin Ma (2/15/22) Serge Bonte (2/16/22; 5/13/22) Daniel Hulse (3/7/22)	Assumptions based on HE law
Unrealistic build-out of Pipeline Projects	MV YIMBY Daniel Hulse (3/7/22)	HCD informal input and comparable approved
Unrealistic build-out of Opportunity Sites	League of Women Voters (2/15/22; 3/6/22; 5/16/22) Daniel Hulse (3/7/22) John Lashlee (3/8/22) MV YIMBY (3/7/22)	Housing Elements support draft HEU methodology. Alternate methodology may require additional rezonings included as programs. (Questions in Staff Report).
Inadequate constraints analysis	League of Women Voters (5/16/22) MV YIMBY (5/18/22)	Constraints analysis was revised to include additional information.

Unrealistic ADU assumption; should use HCD's safe harbor estimate	MV YIMBY	Not a comment from HCD <u>ADU affordability assumption is based on a regional analysis used cities in the ABAG region.</u>
Concerns about the likelihood of Master Plans resulting in affordable housing build-out within 6 th Cycle; include progress benchmarks to development	MV YIMBY SV@Home League of Women Voters (5/16/22; <u>1/3/2023</u>)	<u>Master Plan proposals that were Pipeline Projects are now categorized as Opportunity Sites. Additional programmatic actions are included in Program 4.5 and respond to HCD comments.</u> Not requirement of HE law; could possibly discount capacity; added more details to projects' benchmarks after HCD feedback. Alternate methodology may require additional rezonings (Questions in Staff Report).
Lacking Program Details		
<u>No connection between outreach, housing needs and constraints to programs in draft; programs must provide objectives, metrics, timelines</u>	MV YIMBY (5/18/22; 6/14/22) SV@Home League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	<u>HCD Comment – revised programs</u>
Outreach		
<u>Translations and interpretations should be presented to the satisfaction of community; bilingual presentations should be done by someone specialized in the matter.</u> No connection between outreach, housing needs and constraints to programs in draft; programs must provide objectives, metrics, timelines	<u>Mountain View Tenants Coalition (12/29/22)</u> MV YIMBY (5/18/22; 6/14/22) SV@Home League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	<u>Additional outreach conducted and full Housing Element (except Appendices) translated into Spanish and Chinese, and provided at same time as English version.</u> HCD Comment –

		revised programs
--	--	------------------

Sites Inventory

Description	Source	Action/City Notes
Add Sites/Rezoning		
Include a major rezoning component	YIMBY Law & Greenbelt Alliance (4/21/22) MV YIMBY (1/19/23)	<u>Several back-pocket sites included in Sites Inventory and rezoning program identified in Program 1.1. Several additional programs involving upzoning added</u> Questions in Staff Report for EPC/Council about additional rezonings. More rezonings would need environmental review.
Include underutilized sites		Questions in Staff Report for EPC/Council about additional rezonings. More rezonings would need environmental review. <u>See below for details.</u>
- Charleston Plaza	Lenny Siegel (2/15/22; 3/7/22; 5/17/22) Serge Bonte (2/16/22) Dave Offen & Gail Nyhan (2/16/22; 3/7/22)	<u>Not included.</u>
- Downtown	Serge Bonte (2/16/22; 5/13/22) MV YIMBY (1/19/23)	<u>Added in Program 4.5 metric for 65 additional affordable units in downtown or City-owned site.</u>

	MV YIMBY	
- R3 Zoning Update	Serge Bonte (2/16/22) MV YIMBY (6/10/22)	<u>Not included.</u>
- Non-residentially zoned properties	MV Chamber of Commerce (6/7/22)	<u>Not included.</u>
- R1, R2 Zones	MV YIMBY (2/14/22; 3/7/22) Daniel Hulse (3/7/22)	<u>R2 rezoning included in Program 1.3</u> These areas would require significant outreach before including in Housing Element
- Cuesta Annex	Lenny Siegel (2/15/22; 3/7/22) Serge Bonte (2/16/22) Dave Offen & Gail Nyhan (2/16/22; 3/7/22) MV YIMBY (3/7/22)	<u>Would require significant outreach before including in Housing Element.</u>
- Commercial-zoned properties	YIMBY Law Progressive Action (6/13/22)	Some sites are included in Rezoning with HEU <u>and in Program 1.1.</u> some sites are in Back Pocket list
- Blossom Valley shopping center	Lenny Siegel (2/15/22; 3/7/22; 5/17/22) Dave Offen & Gail Nyhan (2/16/22; 3/7/22) MV YIMBY (3/7/22) LWV	Included in Rezoning with HEU
- On top of parking lots	Serge Bonte (2/16/22)	May be facilitated through commercial rezonings
- Housing on ECR/Phyllis	Carolyn (8/25/22)	Received letter from El Camino Health and removed from inventory; not viable site per property owner request
- Add 901 N Rengstorff	Mario & Liz Ambra (3/7/22; 5/17/22; 9/15/22)	Council declined to include on June 14, 2022

- Add properties at corner of Castro and El Camino	Bill Maston (5/17/22) Lenny Siegel (5/17/22)	
- <u>Add 850 Leong Drive</u>	<u>C.K. Shah (2/24/23)</u>	<u>Included in Sites Inventory and rezoning action added to Program 1.1</u>
Sites should prioritize owner-occupied housing and commercial uses over those with existing rent-	YIMBY Law	Sites inventory reflects this (Note: this is comment

controlled units or other rental housing with lower income residents		<u>against</u> including R3 in the HEU)
Location/Distribution of Sites		
Infill should occur in all neighborhoods not just along El Camino Real	Edward Swierk (3/5/22)	HEU sites and additional programs (<u>1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.7, 2.2, 4.5</u>) distribute development throughout the city; AFFH analysis support site distribution; <u>included additional metrics in Program 1.4, 2.6, and 4.5 to further fair housing opportunities in higher resource areas and separately account for “no net loss” of lower-income capacity in Program 1.11</u>
Sites inventory is not distributed fairly across the City; does not include sites south of El Camino; does not meet AFFH requirements	League of Women Voters (2/15/22, 3/6/22) Kevin Ma (2/15/22) Serge Bonte (2/16/22) MV YIMBY (2/16/22; 6/14/22; <u>1/19/23</u>)	
Sites are not located in Highest Opportunity Areas (south of ECR); rezone in high resource, exclusionary neighborhoods	YIMBY Law/California YIMBY John Lashlee (3/8/22) League of Women Voters (5/16/22) Leora Ross (3/9/22)	
Integrate neighborhoods; high-level of multi-family housing north of ECR; many Black/Latino population around Castro school	MV YIMBY	
Concerns about adding too many sites to inventory (concerns about lack of infrastructure and water shortages)	Carol and David Lewis (3/8/22) Shari Emling (10/17/22)	Studied in EIR
<u>Concerns about 121 E El Camino/Grant Road redevelopment and loss of commercial uses, traffic impacts, and safety issues</u>	<u>David Rosen (3/8/23)</u> <u>Billy Yuen (3/8/23)</u> <u>Shari Emling (3/7/23)</u>	<u>Site was already rezoned in January</u>
Concerns about locating residential in high traffic areas like Grant Road and creating unsafe area for students	Nancy Ballweber (9/11/22) Carolyn (9/3/22) Tom & Nancy Anderson Carolyn Blatt (8/2/22)	Removing Grant Park Plaza would require upzoning in another area to replace the lost units under SB330.

Concerns related to loss of commercial retail within neighborhoods; traffic impacts; or infrastructure; water/electricity usage due to future redevelopment of shopping centers	Stephen Carney (7/4/22) Norma Jean Galiher (8/14/22) Lisa Weyland (8/27/22) Tom & Nancy Anderson (8/31/22)	No loss of retail with Village Center zoning; Environmental review will occur with project review.
---	---	---

	Tracy Yuan (8/27/22) Carolyn (9/3/22) Nancy Ballweber (9/11/22) Sharon Calcagno (6/12/22) Ron Sackman (6/14/22) Marit Barton (6/14/22) Tracy Hovda (5/22/22)	
Support future redevelopment of shopping centers but should require commercial retail (density = walkability and diversity in commercial tenants; improve livable neighborhoods)	Livable Mountain View (2/14/22) Serge Bonte (5/13/22) Dwight Rodgers (6/12/22) Allison Davis (6/12/22) Terri Goldberg (6/12/22) Fariba Samadani (6/13/22) Jean Myer (6/13/22) Toni Rath (6/13/22) Mary Hodder & Edward Falk (6/13/22)	

Constraints

Description	Source	Action/City Notes
Parkland Fees		
Revise the basis and process for Parkland Dedication Fee calculation to increase predictability and decrease the per-unit cost of the fee and changes should have meaningful impact on housing feasibility	MV Chamber of Commerce (6/7/22) League of Women Voters (5/16/22; 8/2/22) MV YIMBY (1/19/23) MV YIMBY	Included in Program 1.8; <u>added additional actions related to Nexus Study and review of impact of cumulative fees</u>
Parkland is important and should find creative land use and funding solutions	Bill Lambert (5/18/22) Robin Lin (6/14/22)	
Do not reduce developer fees and do not reduce standards as any reductions only benefit developers	Carol and David Lewis (3/8/22) Toni Rath (6/13/22)	Some fees and standards are constraints and will

Support collection of fees, such as Parkland Dedication Fee, to be put in real estate public investment trust (REPIT) fund to develop larger parklands instead of accepting small parks	Daniel Shane (6/2/22)	need to be reduced pursuant to purpose and intent of HE law (Program 1.8); detailed procedures for parkland will be determined through the Parks and Rec Strategic Plan.
Other Impact Fees		
Increase Housing Impact Fee	Progressive Action (6/13/22)	Addressed in Program 4.3
Cap fees on all new housing; evaluate timing of collecting fees at various points (like at final occupancy instead of early in the process)	YIMBY Law	Various programs include fee reductions. Alternate times of collection can be studied with those fee Reductions <u>(e.g. Program 1.8)</u> .
City should study readjusting in-lieu fee/onsite inclusionary requirement to maximize the # of BMR units	MV YIMBY	Program 1.9 - BMR Study already includes evaluation
Cumulative impact of combined impact fee stack is a constraint and not evaluated thoroughly	SV@Home	Revisions address cumulative impact <u>and included in Program 1.8.</u>
Process and Staffing		
Ease government constraints such as discretionary approval processes or impact fees, that may impede the rate of development	YIMBY Law & Greenbelt Alliance (4/21/22) <u>MV YIMBY (1/19/23)</u>	Program 4.1 includes review of timelines, processes, and approval body levels; <u>action added to identify ministerial approval thresholds; commitment to “Matrix Study” process and technology improvements</u>
Delays in approval process; streamline permitting process; reduce public meetings, leaving as much to administrative processes as possible	MV YIMBY (6/10/22) SV@Home League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	<u>Program 4.1 includes review of timelines, processes, and approval body levels</u>
Include specific process improvements (as listed in Matrix Study) to reduce entitlement and building permitting processes	MV Chamber of Commerce (6/7/22) League of Women Voters (5/16/22) <u>MV YIMBY (1/19/23)</u>	Program 4.1 includes review of timelines, processes, and approval body levels <u>Program 4.1 includes</u>

|

		review of timelines,
--	--	----------------------

		processes, and approval body levels
Remove requirement for Council approval from higher tier densities in precise plans	MV YIMBY (3/7/22) Leora Ross (3/9/22)	Addressed in Rezoning part of HEU
Application process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compile SB35 objective standards into one accessible document • Simplify application materials to a minimum and streamline deadlines • Limit staff comments to compliance with objective development and design standards for all projects 	League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	Program 1.3 includes a review of all multifamily residential standards, which can support simplification of requirements. <u>Program 4.1 addresses timelines, processes, and approval body levels.</u>
Low staff capacity	MV YIMBY (6/10/22) League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	This is affected by other City priorities (not a Housing Element issue)
Current Project List to include original app date, most recent app date, other milestones (Transparency)	MV YIMBY (6/10/22)	HCD Comment – addressed in Program 4.1
City should make housing feasible to build without need to rely on office construction (like job-housing linkage) to get affordable housing	MV YIMBY (6/10/22)	Multiple programs address issue of feasibility and constraints
Unsure about effectiveness of community engagement; more outreach has not reduced community opposition; outreach only reaches 15% of renters despite MV being renter-majority	League of Women Voters	Updated Program 4.7 to change focus
More and earlier public engagement during development review process	Daniel Shane (5/18/22; <u>12/23/22</u>)	Partially included in Program 4.7
Parking Standards		
Eliminate/reduce minimum residential parking requirements; unbundle parking for rental units; set parking maximums for residential near transit; reduce	James Kuszmaul (2/14/22; 3/7/22) YIMBY Law League of Women Voters (5/16/22) <u>MV YIMBY (1/19/23)</u>	Program 1.2 responds to parking standards for affordable housing. <u>residential in transit-oriented areas, and other cases.</u>

parking per AB2097; clearer regulations tying the relation between TDM policies and parking reductions	Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning & GreenspacesMV (5/18/22) Leora Ross (3/9/22)	development; also a question for EPC and Council in this Staff Report (for all residential development)
Reduce parking requirements as spaces go unused	MV Chamber of Commerce (6/7/22)	
Reduce or eliminate parking minimums especially for senior and affordable housing; require unbundled parking for TOD; Implement TDM (VTA smart passes for residents)	Transform	
Do not reduce parking requirements; developers should provide sufficient parking	Carol & David Lewis (3/8/22) Toni Rath (6/13/22)	Opposite view of same Question; Program 1.2 targets specific areas to eliminate parking minimum standards, to reduce government constraints
<u>Reduction of parking standards should only apply to affordable housing. Citywide TDM program can address parking in market-rate developments.</u>	<u>Livable Mountain View (2/6/23)</u>	<u>Included exemptions to vehicular parking standards for projects (outside of the Precise Plan areas) that meet enhanced transportation demand management (TDM) measures</u>
Other Zoning Standards		
Removing the 1-acre minimum in the R4 guidelines	League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	Adopting amendment to reduce minimum lot size, and lot width for 100% affordable housing
Multi-family housing should not require CUPs	YIMBY Law	CUPs do not add to constraints – DRP is concurrent and has same level of review
Tree preservation requirements can be constraint to development	League of Women Voters	Would not constrain zoning-compliant residential project

Permitting emergency shelters by-right in more zones	League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	CUPs have not been shown to be a constraint on this Use <u>Included rezoning El Camino Real Precise Plan (Program 1.1) to allow emergency shelters by-right consistent with AB 2339</u>
Zoning standards should not conflict with density; ensure density will accommodate the presumed density	YIMBY Law <u>MV YIMBY (1/19/23)</u>	Addressed in Program 1.3; <u>revised to evaluate cumulative effects of standards</u>
Provide sufficiently zoned capacity to accommodate all income levels and 30% minimum No Net Loss buffer	YIMBY Law	Draft HEU includes this for lower-income

Lack of by-right capacity means projects require to apply for zone change and EIR	MV YIMBY	Issue is not zoning capacity; those seeking the longer process choose that when there are many other viable residential sites (rezoning is profitable because land is cheaper without zoning in place); <u>Additional Gatekeeper exemptions and establishing Gatekeeper hearing schedule included in Program 1.3.</u>
Gatekeeper process requiring Council authorization is preventing housing developments	MV Chamber of Commerce (6/7/22)	

Specific Program Recommendations

Below Market Rate/Affordable Housing		
Provide an accessible single source BMR housing portal to reduce the # of times applicants need to resubmit their information	MV YIMBY (2/16/22; 3/7/22) Mountain View Tenants Coalition (3/8/22; 6/10/22) John Lashlee (3/8/22)	Already have for affordable units; will join regional effort when created; improvements in Program 2.4
Build an intradepartmental dedicated permitting team to handle all affordable housing applications and assign a Permit Navigator per Matrix Study	League of Women Voters (5/16/22) MV YIMBY (6/10/22) MV Chamber of Commerce (6/7/22)	Already addressed in Program 4.1
Set affordable housing projects as the top priority for processing ASAP	League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	Affordable housing is already prioritized and have different process (NOFA); Program 4.1 will review NOFA process
Update 1.11 BMR Review to define concrete steps	Housing Choices (6/21/22)	Included additional steps in Program 1.9

Incentivize land donations for BMR inclusionary housing; avoid trap of requiring affordable units be sprinkled	YIMBY Law	Already an option in BMR program, will study further through Program 1.9.
---	-----------	---

throughout market-rate or look exactly the same as market-rate		
Update BMR program guidelines to prioritize people with disabilities requiring modified units in all available accessible housing	Housing Choices (6/21/22)	Will explore in Programs 1.9, 2.1
<u>Update BMR program by reevaluating usage of the area median income guideline which has outpriced households most in need</u>	<u>Reach Potential Movement/Cafecito (1/4/23)</u>	<u>NOFA and 100% affordable housing projects better serve households most in need (e.g., ELI) and acknowledged in Program 2.1</u>
<u>Eliminate requests for social security numbers for affordable housing rental assistance</u>	<u>Reach Potential Movement (1/4/23)</u>	<u>Included in Program 2.4</u>
Displacement/Relocation/Tenant Protection		
Discourage the loss of rent-controlled or other naturally affordable housing	Lenny Siegel (2/15/22; 3/7/22) Mountain View Housing Justice (6/12/22) Terri Goldberg (6/12/22)	Program 3.2 partially addresses this, as well as the replacement question for EPC and Council in this Staff Report. Also, the Sites Inventory and rezonings do not include any sites with existing housing.
Develop local No Net Loss for rent-controlled units; 1:1 replacement with right of return at current rate; temporary relocation assistance	MV YIMBY (2/16/22; 3/7/22) Mountain View Housing Justice (6/12/22) <u>Reach Potential Movement (1/4/23)</u>	<u>Included language about Council evaluation of local replacement requirements in Program 3.2</u> Question in Staff Report for EPC/Council about rent-controlled unit replacement.

<p>Expand Eviction Prevention Program; more staff resources and funding for MEP Team; educate tenants and landlords about rental rights</p>	<p>MV YIMBY (2/16/22; 3/7/22) Mountain View Tenants Coalition (3/8/22; 6/10/22) Mountain View Housing Justice (6/12/22) <u>Reach Potential Movement (1/4/23)</u></p>	<p>Included in Programs 1.12, 2.5; <u>added clarifying language on objectives to address landlord retaliation.</u></p>
<p>Tenant protection (housing replacement program, temp housing vouchers, right of return, demolition controls)</p>	<p>YIMBY Law/California YIMBY <u>Reach Potential Movement (1/4/23)</u> <u>Mountain View Tenants Coalition (12/29/22)</u></p>	<p>Program 3.2 partially addresses this; <u>Added objective to evaluate the efficacy of the Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance (TRAO), as well as the replacement question for EPC and Council in this Staff Report.</u></p>
<p>Specify strategies to replace the VTA safe parking lot on Evelyn; add more safe parking with emphasis on</p>	<p>League of Women Voters 3/6/22; 5/16/22)</p>	<p>Not specific to HE; proposed expansion to</p>

locations for long-term RV dwellers; provide permanent, low-rent mobile home park	Lenny Siegel (2/15/22; 3/7/22) MV YIMBY (2/16/22; 3/7/22) Mountain View Housing Justice (6/12/22)	increase the City's Safe Parking program to over 120 spaces (requires collaboration with State and County to remediate environmental impacts)
Mobile home protections: costs are too high and will force tenants to homelessness; MHRSO not strong enough; put cap on annual general adjustment to "\$150 or whichever is lower"; mobile homes no longer an affordable option; property owners are not complying with law to provide rental data for MV's Rent Registry	MV Mobilehome Alliance (9/28/22) Anna Marie Morales (9/28/22) Susan Morales (9/28/22) Alex Brown (5/18/22)	Already in Programs 1.12, 3.2; <u>includes review of reductions in annual allowable rent increases in Program 3.2</u>
Update 3.2 to specifically include mobile home residents and strong right of return policy based on SB330 (part of Displacement Response Strategy)	League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	Added to Program 3.2
Include Displacement Response Strategy	League of Women Voters (5/16/22) Cafecito (5/18/22)	Already in Program 3.2
Include community-owned housing opportunities like COPA/TOPA, CDCs, CLTs	MV YIMBY (2/16/22; 3/7/22) Mountain View Tenants Coalition (3/8/22; 6/10/22; <u>12/29/22</u>) Cafecito (5/18/22) League of Women Voters (5/16/22) Mountain View Housing Justice (6/12/22) Marilu Cuesta (6/14/22) <u>Reach Potential Movement (1/4/23)</u>	Already in Program 2.1
<u>Add modification to Mountain View Rent Stabilization Ordinance to lower annual general adjustments maximums</u>	<u>Mountain View Mobile Home Alliance (2/25/23)</u>	<u>Added study on reductions in annual allowable rent increases in Program 3.2</u>
Funding		
Develop strategy to overcome weak links that arise in the funding chain for affordable housing	Lenny Siegel	Addressed in Programs 2.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5

Provide local funding through transfer tax, vacancy tax, commercial linkage fee; expand preservation of existing housing and clearly define types of revenue sources to be	YIMBY Law League of Women Voters (5/16/22) Progressive Action (6/13/22)	Addressed in Program 4.3
--	---	--------------------------

examined such as vacancy and transfer taxes and clearly define steps		
Increase relocation assistance funds	Mountain View Tenants Coalition (3/8/22; 6/10/22)	Addressed in Program 3.2
Update 2.1 to provide more detail on how funding will meet housing needs of underserved populations (such as supportive services and ELI household) and clearly define steps	Housing Choices (6/21/22)	Addressed in Program 4.3
Special Needs/Groups Population		
Update Reasonable Accommodation to include review of townhouse/rowhouse elevator access standards so seniors can age in place in these developments and increase marketing and awareness to new tenant about rights and community resources to request Reasonable Accommodations and offer one annual Reasonable Accommodations training for tenants and landlords	League of Women Voters (5/16/22) Housing Choices (6/21/22)	Review of Reasonable Accommodation requirements included in Program 2.3
Update 3.1 to acknowledge that ELI are most likely to experience homelessness and must make commitments to incentivize and increase production of ELI housing	Housing Choices (6/21/22)	Addressed in other programs <u>Acknowledged in Program 2.1</u>
Update Goal 2 to include amendments to building code to improve inclusive design addressing cross-disability beyond ADA requirements	Housing Choices (6/21/22)	Added to Program 2.1 for subsidized projects
Market accessible units to community organizations that support those with disabilities; require developers to expand outreach beyond local neighbors of the project and include special needs groups (disabilities, unhoused, seniors)	Housing Choices (6/21/22)	Added to Program 4.7
Support homeownership by creating opportunities for-sale housing to excluded groups	YIMBY Law Allison Davis (6/12/22)	Already in Program 2.1
Provide teacher housing	Olya Sorokina (7/14/22)	Employee housing addressed in Program 4.6

Provide special housing protections and prioritization for essential workers	Mountain View Tenants Coalition (3/8/22; 6/10/22)	Program 3.2 includes anti-displacement measures that will protect many essential workers
<u>Provide 24-7 shelter solutions for women and children, including domestic violence beds for women and children</u>	<u>Reach Potential Movement (1/4/23)</u>	<u>Included expanded partnerships with countywide efforts in Program 3.1</u>
<u>Provide amenities in or around affordable housing developments such as childcare, community gardens, etc.</u>	<u>Mountain View Tenants Coalition (12/29/22)</u>	<u>Included objective to create a priority list of amenities for affordable housing developments in Program 4.5</u>
ADUs		
Incentivize ADUs, including those that are rent-restricted or low/no interest loans; reduced ADU standards to increase quantity and diversity of housing options; increase incentives for ADU production such as financing program and deed-restriction for ELI rent for 15 years	YIMBY Law/California YIMBY Housing Choices (6/21/22) League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	HCD Comment; Council request; included in Programs 1.7, 2.2
Incentivize SB9 subdivisions and DUO such as financing assistance	League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	
<u>Make programs occur earlier (1.6, 1.7, 2.2)</u>	<u>League of Women Voters (1/3/23)</u>	<u>Program 1.7 modified to reflect Countywide effort deadline</u>
Other		
Addressing the jobs/housing imbalance (such as the East Whisman Linkage Program)	League of Women Voters (5/16/22) Lenny Siegel (2/15/22; 3/7/22) Dave Offen & Gail Nyhan (5/18/22)	Programs 4.2, 4.3, and 4.6 addresses the impacts of jobs/housing imbalance on housing costs
Update 1.5 to commit to additional local Density Bonus incentives beyond State Law (such as incentives for ELI); allow additional Bonus FAR on top of Precise Plan standards	Housing Choices (6/21/22) League of Women Voters (5/16/22)	City's density bonus program already includes additional density for 100% affordable projects

Historic Home registry and designation process is unclear and needs significant changes.	Deniece Smith (9/28/22)	Not specific to HE law; project currently underway to update the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Register of Historic Resources
RV ban on streets against AFFH	Kevin Ma (8/31/22) Salim Damerджи (8/31/22)	Housing Element is focused on the construction of dwelling units, as defined by State

Consider fair labor standards	Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning & GreenspacesMV (5/18/22)	City has adopted Wage Theft Ordinance
Rent moratorium to prevent rent increases (not to exceed 1-2%)	Maria O (6/13/22)	CSFRA controls rent increases
Support quality, low-carbon buildings, and infrastructure-sensible landscaping	Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning & GreenspacesMV (5/18/22)	Addressed in Program 1.13; other requirements may add constraints
Make green building rules even stricter with respect to construction waste, using less cement, insulation and efficiency and use of recycled products, solar and built to high electric standards.	Allison Davis (6/12/22)	
Include environmental and natural requirements such as tree protections, sensible landscaping, native biodiversity; hire qualified environmental staff	Daniel Shane (5/18/22)	
Waive any city fees and expedite permits for installing solar panels/electric upgrades	Serge Bonte (6/13/22)	Environmental Sustainability Action Plan includes fee waivers. Other processing exemptions also apply.
Plan for more housing to strengthen school districts due to low enrollment; housing insecurity affecting student performance	Olya Sorokina (7/14/22)	Sites inventory addresses comment's goal to increase housing
The loss of trees and green space, increase in tenants and vehicles have worsened air quality.	Kaia Wang (8/14/22)	Studied in EIR
Feels that neighborhood streets are currently unsafe with homeless and litter	Kaia Wang (8/14/22)	Several programs in HEU address this issue
The cost of housing is expensive which drives up housing rental costs and forces businesses to cut operations/close	Kaia Wang (8/14/22)	Several programs in HEU address this issue

From: [Tim Liu](#)
To: [Yau, Ellen](#)
Subject: Comments on the City of Mountain View Housing Element plan
Date: Sunday, February 26, 2023 10:06:16 PM

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

Hi Ellen,

My name is Tim and I live in Mountain View. I saw that there is a meeting about the housing element plan next month. I may not be able to attend, but would like to submit some comments about the plan. Please let me know if there is another place to submit comments.

I am very supportive of the housing element plan and am excited by the goal to:

"

...increase in housing opportunity equal to more than 60 percent of existing units and twice the City's 6th cycle RHNA

"

I strongly support more housing in Mountain View, and am excited that Mountain View is striving to dramatically increase housing.

I saw parts of the East Whisman precise plan and am also strongly in support of it. I support the creation of dense, walkable communities and am excited by the plan to have density bonuses and allow higher construction near public transportation.

Overall, I am very supportive of the Housing Element plan.

Tim

From: David Rosen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 8, 2023 8:37 PM
To: City Council <City.Council@mountainview.gov>; epc@mountainview.gov
Subject: Grant/El Camino (121 El Camino) Please No Development!!!

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

Dear City Council and Environmental Planning Commission,

I am writing about the designation by the Housing Element Update for the Shopping Center at 121 El Camino and Grant Road as potentially being rezoned for >50 living units in an already highly congested area!

This center is great as is serving essential needs like having a pharmacy and low cost supermarket and supplies great commercial assets providing food, music lessons, and a culturally iconic japanese market. The businesses that exist there shouldn't be evicted to build housing in an area that is already quite busy.

The proposed rezoning would overpopulate and overcrowd the area which is already a main thoroughfare on Grant Road to schools, a place of entry and exit onto two freeways, an access to two hospitals/medical centers.

Please drive near 121 El Camino Real any time of day, to see the gridlock at this very dangerous corner, and imagine what additional housing would do to destroy and endanger the entire area. Already, we sit through lights at this corner several times of day - and an increase of traffic would be untenable. Freeway 237 ends at this El Camino intersection, and the multiple lanes are often pouring onto Grant Road and El Camino by drivers switching lanes at the last moment and multiple drivers ignoring the lights and proceeding through the red lights at this intersection as though they don't exist. It is already one of the most treacherous intersections in our City.

The local Elementary School causes gridlock twice a day, Then add the traffic of the very sizeable Grant Road Shopping Center, the carwash, the IN and OUT restaurant, the laundromat, the two gas stations, local businesses on the East side of Grant and the children using this route to school - and you have a negative impact that barely is tolerated now. Please do NOT add this painful increase of population, and cause this intersection to be even more deadly. Tragically, a young boy was killed in an accident at this corner less than a year ago. The planned sizable addition of housing would unfortunately expose and endanger an equally sizable number of children to this danger.

Please note the tremendous increase in noise, automobile pollution, massive traffic gridlock, and negative impact to personal safety for residents when looking for housing sites. 121 El Camino is inappropriate for this increase in population in so many devastating ways.

I thank you for your reconsideration.

David Rosen
[REDACTED]
Mountain View CA

From: Billy Yuen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 8, 2023 9:52 AM
To: epc@mountainview.gov; City Council <City.Council@mountainview.gov>
Subject: Housing development at the Grant Rd/El Camino corner

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

Dear City Council and Environmental Planning Commission,

I am writing to comment on the designation by the Housing Element Update for the Shopping Center at 121 El Camino and Grant Road. This shopping center has, unfortunately, been rezoned for housing from 65-111 living units. Given I have been living around the corner ([REDACTED]) for 20 years, this will have a big impact for my family and neighborhood safety.

1. My mom also lives in the elderly center and most seniors there can only walk to the grocery store and pharmacy (Walgreen). The Walgreen is the only pharmacy within walking distance. Most of the kids in my neighborhood also walk to this shopping center for food and grocery shopping. If the shopping center is gone, it will have a big impact on both the seniors and kids in my neighborhood.
2. Last year a middle schooler was killed in the section by Grant and El Camino. It is a very busy (traffic congestion) and dangerous intersection. Many seniors walk around the corners and kids are busy going to school in the morning and afternoon. There was even discussion to reroute the traffic to avoid future accidents (with nothing prevail). The conversion will only make the matter worse.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me if you need more information.

Sincerely,
Billy Yuen

[REDACTED]
Mountain View

From: [ckshah](#) [REDACTED]
To: epc@mountainview.gov
Cc: [Anderson, Eric B.](#); [Yau, Ellen](#); [ckshah](#) [REDACTED]
Subject: Housing Element
Date: Friday, February 24, 2023 9:11:39 PM
Importance: High

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

To Whom It May Concern:

County Inn LLC, owner of 850 Leong Drive, Mountain View CA 94043 is requesting to be included in Housing Element. Please confirm our request.

Sincerely,

C. K. Shah, Managing Member of the County Inn LLC

Mountain View Mobile Home Alliance

February 25, 2023

Mountain View City Council
City of Mountain View
500 Castro Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

Re: Addition of MHRSO amendment to the City's Housing Element Draft

Dear Councilmembers:

With this letter, we are asking you to add modification of the Mountain View Rent Stabilization Ordinance (MHRSO) to your Housing Element draft. For decades, mobile homes have been considered naturally affordable housing throughout the nation, but the AGAs (annual general adjustments) in Mountain View's Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Ordinance (MHRSO) are too high for the majority of mobile homeowners who populate the city's six parks.

This year (2022-2023), rents are going up 5% for all residents of Mountain View due to inflation, which has increased the AGA.

Historically, mobile home rents in Mountain View tended to go up by 2% to 3% per year. However, this changed in 2015-2016 when the largest park owner decided to jack up all space rents in his parks to \$2000. Other park owners began to follow suit. This is what led to the call for the Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Ordinance. It was intended to cap the annual increase a park owner could demand by setting an AGA.

The AGA specified in the MHRSO for Mountain View's mobile home parks is 100% of CPI, with a ceiling of 5% and a floor of 2%. While this offers some protection, the 5% cap is still too high. If the economy enters a prolonged inflationary period and the CPI stays at 5% or higher, the rents will become unsustainable for many residents. In the next decade, residents who live on fixed incomes will be displaced.

Recently, a new report found that Mountain View has the most expensive rents in the Bay Area. We also know that mobile home space rents are higher in Mountain View than many other cities in California. Bay Area cities like Antioch, Richmond, and San Leandro now have ordinances capping space rents at 3% or lower, with the amount pegged to a percentage of CPI, and we'd like to see an amendment to those levels.

Mobile Home Park owners and landlords are making a generous profit in Mountain View and a 5% rent increase is not needed to assure them of a fair rate of return.

There are roughly 1000 mobile homeowners in Mountain View's mobile home parks who pay park owners \$1000 to \$2200 a month in space rent.

Additionally, over the years, the owner of the two largest mobile home parks has been purchasing homes when their owners die or move, often for "fire sale" prices. They then turn around and rent them out at market rates for windfall profits.

Mobile home tenants who are currently near the limit of what they can afford to pay are quite reasonably frightened that they will soon be living in cars, tents, or RVs. Their space rents are already high, and a 5% AGA on top of their current monthly rents will soon put them outside of the window of affordability.

For example, one resident who got her 90 day notification asked me "I thought we had rent control, what happened?" Another asked a park manager why her increase was so high, and was told ""that's what you get for going to the city to get rent control."

Still another was frightened by the inclusion of the City's "Notice of Applicability of Mobile Home Rent Control" attached to her 90-day notification. It was intended to reassure residents that their homes were now rent controlled, but because of the park owner's customary threats, she suspected that it was included to intimidate her, and she feared dire consequences if she "accepted" rent control.

Fear is the dominant emotion in the mobile home parks for residents who get notification of rent increases. They won't protest because they fear retaliation, but those who do confess to being frightened relay stories of residents who were forced out when their rents exceeded what they could pay, or when their parent leaseholders died. Everyone knows that people who have had to leave have had a very hard time, and that it could happen to anyone.

There are already many projects planned for the city's Housing Element, but amending the mobile home ordinance should have high priority because it was designed to help the most vulnerable renters. The 5% rent increase that is currently being applied throughout the parks is causing distress among seniors and disabled people who are living on Social Security and SSI.

We hope you'll agree that the time is right to add amendment of MHRSO at lower AGA caps to the city's Housing Element draft. If you'll agree to add consideration of this amendment to what is otherwise a reasonable Housing Element, we will be happy to send a letter to HCD endorsing your amended Housing Element documentation.

Sincerely,

Bee Hanson on behalf of Mountain View Mobile Home Alliance

Cc: city.council@mountainview.gov
Wayne.Chen@mountainview.gov
Anky.vanDeursen@mountainview.gov
Micaela.Hellman-Tincher@mountainview.gov
tgonzalez@coronorcal.org
Ellen.Yau@mountainview.gov
Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov

From: [Cox, Robert](#)
To: reid.miller@hcd.ca.gov; melinda.coy@hcd.ca.gov; paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc: [Shrivastava, Aarti](#); [Anderson, Eric B.](#); [Yau, Ellen](#)
Subject: Livable Mountain Comment on City of Mountain View Draft Housing Element Document
Date: Monday, February 6, 2023 6:06:01 PM

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

February 7, 2023

Reid Miller Reid.Miller@hcd.ca.gov

Melinda Coy Melinda.Coy@hcd.ca.gov

Paul McDougall Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov

Aarti Shrivastava, Director of Community Development, City of Mountain View, aarti.shrivastava@mountainview.gov

Eric Anderson, Principal Planner, City of Mountain View, eric.anderson2@mountainview.gov

Ellen Yau, Senior Planner, City of Mountain View, ellen.yau@mountainview.gov

Livable Mountain View has been closely following the development of the City of Mountain View's Housing Element and previously met with city staff to provide input. We are sure there are various points of view on the Housing Element, and we believe city staff has struck a great balance and no further changes to the Housing Element are necessary. We are pleased with the current draft.

Before we provide a few comments, a brief description of Livable Mountain View might be helpful. Livable Mountain View was formed in 2017, with the mission of advocating for city policies that would make Mountain View the most livable city in the San Francisco Bay Area. We have been very active in several projects and proposed development in the city, including:

- Update of the city's historic preservation ordinance
- Redevelopment of the city's transit center
- Update of the development standards in the R3 zoning district
- Review of the North Bayshore and East Whisman Precise Plans
- Many individual housing and office project developments

Although the names are similar, Livable Mountain View is not a chapter of, nor affiliated with, Livable California. We were established a year before Livable California was founded in 2018.

Overall, we are very supportive of the draft, and ask that only minor revisions be made to it. We are especially supportive of many of the programs the city listed that will help further implementation of the Housing Element. We do, however, want to comment on some of the programs that are particularly noteworthy.

1.2 Eliminate Parking Standards for Affordable Housing Developments - Codify exemptions to parking standards for 100% affordable housing developments.

We appreciate that this might help affordable housing developers build more affordable housing. They know their market best and will make the right decision as to how much parking to provide. Given the lack of comprehensive public transit in the city, it is important to not force residents in affordable housing to only commute by bicycle or walking, or worse, drive around late at night trying to find a parking space on a street. Until such time as there is this comprehensive transit, many will still be relying on a car to get to and from work. Residents who qualify for BMR housing will include tradespeople, service workers, office and residential cleaners, and child care workers whose job sites are anywhere and everywhere and who work all hours. Current Mountain View transit is focused on supporting arterial streets and would require these workers to leave behind the tools of their trades while using it.

We agree that this limitation of parking standards should only apply to affordable housing. The city is developing a city-wide Transportation Demand Management program that will address parking in

market-rate developments. The Transportation Demand Management programs that exist in some of the city's Precise Plans have been very effective at reducing vehicle travel.

1.4 Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing - Religious and community assembly sites are typically larger sites and are located throughout the city, with several in the city's highest opportunity neighborhoods. This program would allow affordable multifamily housing on these sites.

Most of the affordable housing developments in the city leverage the state density bonus law to build higher density housing. It makes sense to estimate that the base density will be approximately 30 to 40 dwelling units per acre on the residential portions of the sites in R1 and R2 districts. While some might find the stated density to be too low, using the state density bonus law, the developments will be more in the 60 to 80 dwelling units per acre range for a 100% affordable housing development.

1.5 Non-conforming R1 and R2 Multifamily Developments - Update the Zoning Ordinance to allow replacement of multifamily development in the R1 and R2 districts with non-conforming density to preserve units above the allowed density in the underlying zone.

We are very supportive of this program as it will preserve hundreds of naturally affordable units for a longer period of time than otherwise might be possible if upgrades and structural alterations were not done. We appreciate staff bringing this program forward.

1.8 Park Land Ordinance Update - Complete Phase 2 of the Park Land Dedication Ordinance update and the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan.

Livable Mountain View believes that city parks are key to supporting the livability and quality of life of our residents, workers, and visitors to the city. The city has already made several significant changes to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance. These changes make the cost of contributing to the funding of parks more certain for developers, while also providing developers more flexibility in meeting the city's park land goals by allowing a portion of privately owned, publicly accessible (POPA) park land to count towards the requirements.

Phase 2 of the update should be enough to further address the costs of this program. No changes should be made to the scope of work for the program in the Housing Element.

1.9 BMR Program Review

Mountain View's BMR program has been very effective in driving the construction of inclusionary units as well as land dedication for 100% affordable housing developments. Programs can always be tweaked to make them even better, but this program is top notch!

1.11 No Net Loss of Housing Element Sites - Monitor and update the availability of sites to accommodate the remaining unmet RHNA in accordance with No Net Loss rules.

In addition to satisfying the RHNA requirements, the Housing Element current draft has healthy additional buffers (23% Low Income, 14% Moderate Income, 86% Above Moderate Income, 49% Total). The site inventory does not need to be changed in the draft. Since the inventory will be monitored, new sites can be added as needed to ensure no net loss. Back pocket sites have been identified for this very purpose so should be kept in reserve for now. It was very thoughtful of city staff to identify and include the back pocket sites in the EIR so that they can easily be added to the Housing Element if/when needed. Given the rules on the re-use of sites in future housing elements, it is prudent to keep the back pocket sites as back pocket sites until they are needed.

The back pocket sites are spread throughout city. Many are close to neighborhood-serving retail. The housing produced will help strengthen our village centers, making them places where people can live and meet their daily needs (i.e., high resource areas). There is no need to identify more or change the back pocket sites in this Housing Element.

2.1 Subsidize and Support Affordable Housing Programs - Make funding available and support programs that allow for the city to increase the number of affordable housing units for underserved populations.

Mountain View has done an outstanding job in requiring and building affordable housing, and has tapped into external funding opportunities to do more than the city could do on its own. Mountain

View has been a leader in the Bay Area.

We agree with staff that the city could add to the diversity of affordable housing by adding units for larger households, people with special needs, permanent supportive housing, and middle-income residents. And we agree that additional sources of funding are needed to build more affordable housing at a faster rate. But again, Mountain View should be celebrated for the affordable housing it has produced and its continuing determination to bring even more affordable units to the city.

2.6 Affirmatively Further Fair Housing - Continue to prepare and update the City's Assessment of Fair Housing and implement actions as necessary to remove barriers to fair housing choice, as required by HUD and State Housing Element law.

Mountain View has the most diverse population of any city in the Bay Area and the type of development throughout the city is also diverse. Two of the city areas which will undergo significant change are the North Bayshore and East Whisman Precise Plan areas. Both areas will be transformed from resource-poor to resource-rich areas. They will have good transit, goods and services for both residents and workers, parks and open space, a mixture of housing types, including significant affordable housing. The areas have been intentionally planned to be desirable places to live. Years of council, planning commission, and staff hours have gone into that planning.

The other sites in the site inventory are spread throughout the city and are mostly sites near public transit. There are high-quality transit buses on El Camino Real and Middlefield Road, and Caltrain and VTA light rail are within walkable distance. Goods and services (shopping center sites) are also within a walkable distance.

Mountain View has seen a great deal of housing development in the past, and growth does not seem to be slowing. Developers are even now finishing up and starting many new development projects.

Thank you for taking our input into consideration.

Robert Cox, Louise Katz, Muriel Sivyer-Lee, Leslie Friedman, Toni Rath, Hala Alshahwany, Li Zhang, Nazanin Dashtara, Mary Hodder, Julia Ha, Lorraine Wormald, Jerry Steach, and Jamsheed Agahi

For the Steering Committee of Livable Mountain View

From: Salim Damerdji

Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2023 4:04 PM

To: Yau, Ellen <Ellen.Yau@mountainview.gov>; Anderson, Eric B. <Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov>; MV YIMBY <mv-yimby@googlegroups.com>

Cc: reid.miller@hcd.ca.gov; Shrivastava, Aarti <Aarti.Shrivastava@mountainview.gov>

Subject: HEU + MV YIMBY

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

Hi Ellen and Eric,

Since the first housing element meetings in 2021, Mountain View YIMBY volunteers have dedicated hundreds of hours to helping the city produce a compliant housing element that addresses the housing crisis.

Unfortunately the city is on track to miss the 1/31/23 deadline for adopting a compliant housing element. With additional penalties beyond a builder's remedy looming, we hope we can be of assistance in ensuring the city avoids additional penalties for extended non-compliance. To this end, **the attached pdf contains our recommendations on programmatic changes and site inventory changes that we believe would best position the city to avoid any risk of extended non-compliance.** For your convenience, we provide recommendations in the form of tracked changes on the December draft. We would endorse a draft that includes substantially similar programs, and we would invite an ongoing dialogue to work towards our shared goals of ensuring compliance with housing element law and addressing the housing crisis.

Best,
Salim Damerdji

Recommended site inventory changes:

1. Add two additional city-owned lots downtown to the site inventory.
2. Add all sites from the “back pocket” into the site inventory.
3. Add R2 sites in high opportunity areas South of El Camino with density assumptions derived based on SB 10’s allowance for 30’ heights and ten-plexes.

Recommended programmatic changes

[1.2 Eliminate Parking Minimums Standards for Affordable Housing Developments](#)

[1.3 Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards](#)

[1.4: Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing](#)

[1.8 Park Land Ordinance Update](#)

[1.11 No Net Loss of Housing Element Sites](#)

[1.14 Cumulative Fees](#)

[1.15 Replacement of the Gatekeeper Process](#)

[2.6 Affirmatively Further Fair Housing](#)

[4.1 Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions](#)

1.2 Eliminate Parking ~~Minimums Standards~~ for ~~Affordable~~ Housing Developments

Codify exemptions to parking ~~minimums standards~~ for ~~100%-affordable~~ housing developments.

Objectives and Metrics

- Streamline review by reducing studies and uncertainty, and facilitate ~~100%-affordable~~ housing developments by eliminating parking ~~standards minimums~~

Milestones and Timeframe

- Update zoning ordinance and (if necessary) zoning or Precise Plan amendments by December 31, 2024.

1.3 Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards

Review development standards to ensure they reflect contemporary building types, improve ease of implementation and improve consistency across districts.

- A. Ensure development projects can meet their allowed densities **and are economically feasible**. Conduct a development prototype study, update definitions as necessary for consistency between plans and districts, and revise multifamily development standards in major districts (including R3) and Precise Plans to ensure projects **are economically feasible** and can meet their allowed density.
- B. Compile, evaluate and refine requirements outside the Zoning Ordinance, include Heritage tree preservation and Public Works requirements
- C. Ensure that zoning code is updated to reflect densities and other standards as required by state law (e.g., SB 478)
- D. Adopt a TDM Ordinance that provides clear requirements for residential trip reduction across all precise plans and zoning districts and update precise plans as needed. Through the ordinance, study the cost of TDM requirements on typical residential developments, and allow residential developers to meet TDM goals through lower-cost options. ~~Update the zoning ordinance to allow residential parking reductions for projects that implement TDM.~~
- E. Study live-work as an allowed residential use near retail areas, major corridors and other viable locations
- F. **Mitigate each constraint identified by Opticos to housing development in R3 areas, including at minimum the constraints identified in their October 13th, 2020 presentation.**
- G. **Revise Bonus FAR provisions in relevant precise plans to be authorized via a ministerial pathway under objective criteria.**

Objectives and Metrics

- Streamline the development review process by updating definitions for standards such as height, open area, common usable open area, floor area ratio, personal storage, pavement coverage and building coverage, and ensuring definitions are consistent with contemporary building types and across the Zoning Ordinance and precise plans.
- Reduce government constraints in multifamily zoning districts (R3, R4, CRA) and four Precise Plans (El Camino Real, San Antonio, North Bayshore and East Whisman) by ensuring that projects can build up to their allowed density.
- ~~Reduce government constraints by allowing reduced parking for projects that implement TDM.~~
- Expand small business access to opportunity by creating live-work spaces in appropriate residential areas

Milestones and Timeframe

- Conduct prototype study and evaluate standards outside the Zoning Ordinance by June 30, ~~2024~~ **2026**
- Update Zoning Ordinance and precise plans to reflect reduced standards and live-work by December 31, ~~2024~~ **2026**
- Adopt TDM ordinance by December 31, 2026

1.4: Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing

Religious and community assembly sites are typically larger sites and are located throughout the City, with several in the City's highest opportunity neighborhoods. This program would allow affordable multifamily housing on these sites.

Objectives and Metrics

- Create more affordable housing in the City's highest opportunity neighborhoods by allowing deed-restricted affordable multifamily housing up to 3 stories on non-profit, religious and community assembly sites in the R1 and R2 districts. Typical densities are expected to be approximately 100 ~~30 to 40~~ dwelling units per acre on the residential portions of the sites. Incentivize such development through ongoing actions, such as outreach, funding and promotional materials

Milestone and Timeframe

- Complete zoning amendments by December 31, 2024 ~~2026~~, including outreach to affordable housing developers, non-profit and advocacy organizations and religious and community assembly properties; development of standards and incentives; and creation of ongoing monitoring and promotional materials.

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: Development Services Fund

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

1.8 Park Land Ordinance Update

Complete Phase 2 of the Park Land Dedication Ordinance update and the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan. Analysis that would support fee reductions could include:

- Review of best-practices for parkland acquisition funding
- Pursuit of grants and other funding sources
- Review of the City's population density assumptions
- Opportunities for private development to provide public open space through existing zoning requirements (e.g., POPAs)
- Development incentives and exceptions to standards for public open space

This responds to input received from market-rate housing developers during the outreach process (see Chapter 1: Introduction, Public Participation section).

Objectives and Metrics:

- Reduce constraints on residential development by reviewing and revising the park land dedication requirements to maintain access to high quality open space while reducing the financial impact to residential development.
- Maintain the existing goal of providing 3 acres of park land per person.
- Recalibrate the park in-lieu fee so the value of land is estimated using average citywide land costs rather than the land costs for recently completed residential projects in the respective density categories.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- By December 31, 2024, including adoption of the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan (addressing anticipated open space needs and long-term funding strategies) and adoption of reduced fees, alternate mitigations and/or other programs to reduce costs on residential.

1.11 No Net Loss of Housing Element Sites

Monitor and update the availability of sites to accommodate the remaining unmet RHNA in accordance with No Net Loss rules. If a shortfall is identified in any income category, identify necessary replacement sites, considering, but not limited to ~~“Back Pocket” areas discussed during adoption of the Housing Element Update. Back Pocket areas included:~~

- R2 sites in high opportunity areas, such as South of El Camino Real and Old Mountain View.
- R3 sites without existing residential tenants.
- Sites under Program 1.5
- Sites under Program 4.2
- ~~Moffett Boulevard Change Area~~
- ~~Neighborhood shopping areas other than General Plan Village Centers (such as Bailey Park Shopping Center, Monta Loma Shopping Center, and Leong Drive), including standards to replace or preserve neighborhood commercial uses~~
- ~~Downtown Transit Center~~
- ~~Other nonresidential sites south of El Camino Real~~

The City will annually report on projects under review to see if they reduce any buffers below 5%. If they do, the City will initiate a No Net Loss rezoning process.

Objectives and Metrics

- Ensure adequate capacity for the City’s RHNA by maintaining a list of opportunity sites that accommodates the City’s RHNA and initiating a rezoning process for new sites if the buffer falls below 5 percent, after accounting for development projects under review

Milestone and Timeframe

- If the City receives an application for a new construction development project on a housing element site with fewer (or greater) units at the given income level than shown in the site inventory (including pipeline sites), those units will be provisionally removed from (or added to) the inventory. If the project is approved (building permit approval for ministerial projects), they will be officially removed from (or added to) the inventory.
- Annually update and report on the provisional and official inventories.
 - If the moderate-income provisional inventory falls below 5 percent buffer, transfer one or more sites from the lower-income provisional inventory to the moderate income provisional inventory (prioritizing lowest-opportunity neighborhoods) until the moderate-income provisional inventory is at least 5 percent buffer.
 - If the moderate-income official inventory falls below 5 percent buffer, transfer the sites from the lower-income official inventory.
 - If the lower-income provisional inventory falls below 5 percent buffer, initiate the no net loss rezoning process.
- Make necessary findings on projects that reduce the number of units on Housing Element sites
- If the number of units in the official inventory falls below the RHNA, rezone additional sites within six months

1.14 Cumulative Fees

Review all imposed fees, including community benefit requirements, on housing developments to check compliance under recent changes to the Mitigation Fee Act, and set a maximum per-unit cap on the totality of the fees. Additionally, prevent new levels on fees from being a significant constraint on development, to be determined by per-fee feasibility studies. In this section, cumulative fees are understood broadly to include impact fees, in-lieu fees, community benefits payments, and TDM/TDA-related payments.

Objectives and Metrics

- Ensure city imposed fees are reasonable and not a significant constraint on development by capping per-unit cumulative fees at 100% AMI for a family of two.
- Comply with the Mitigation Fee Act.

Milestone and Timeframe

- Finish review of existing fees, set new fees, and set maximum per-unit cumulative fees equal to 100% AMI for a family of two by December 31, 2024.
- Annual review after December 31, 2024 to conduct a feasibility study that encompasses each fee as well as the cumulative effect on feasibility of all fees taken together.

1.15 Replacement of the Gatekeeper Process

Replace the Gatekeeper process with an 'early consideration' process, outlined as follows:

- For non-exempt requests for a zoning change, Precise Plan amendment or General Plan amendment, staff will request early consideration from city council on those requests provided the requests reasonably comply with constraints imposed by state law and the general plan. This early consideration from council will be provided within 90 days of the request and will provide staff with direction on whether to pursue further processing of the application. If the project applicant requests it, more than 90 days can be allotted for council to provide early consideration on a request.
- Requests will also be reviewed by council on the merits of the project taken on its own so that projects do not compete with each other.

Council will also expand the scope of requests that are automatically further processed by staff. Council will provide staff with a minimum set of requirements for housing projects that, if met, will greenlight staff to further process requests for a rezoning, precise plan amendment, or general plan amendment.

Eliminate the gatekeeper authorization process, which requires affirmative direction from the Council to submit an application, for residential or mixed-use projects with a significant residential component. The City will process applications for General Plan Amendments and rezonings with reasonable requirements and check-in points.

Objectives and Metrics

- Allow the development community to propose projects that provide significant amounts of new housing. The City will annually report to HCD the size of the application queue for the 'early consideration' process and the number of non-exempt units approved through zoning changes, Precise Plan amendments, or General Plan amendments.

Milestone and Timeframe

- Transition to an 'early consideration' process by December 31, 2025
- Ensure all of the projects currently in the Gatekeeper process get heard by council by December 31, 2026 if the applicant requests it.

2.6 Affirmatively Further Fair Housing

Continue to prepare and update the City's Assessment of Fair Housing and implement actions as necessary to remove barriers to fair housing choice, as required by HUD and State Housing Element law.

Objectives and Metrics

- Remove impediments to fair housing and provide equitable access to housing and opportunity.
- Plan to create housing choice in high opportunity areas to mitigate patterns of segregation. Housing choice will be measured by two metrics. First, the City will track the number of affordable units constructed South of the El Camino Precise Plan, with an objective to build at least 100 units of affordable housing there by July 31, 2027.
- Create an educational equity target by 2024 as follows. The city will identify a percentage of the overall market-rate and affordable housing RHNA targets that should be built in each neighborhood or within each elementary school enrollment boundary. These percentages shall ensure that at least 33% of the RHNA is evenly allocated among these geographic boundaries (e.g., if using the 7 elementary school boundaries, at least $33\% / 7 = 4.7\%$ of the overall RHNA should get built in each school's area).

Milestone and Timeframe

- Update Assessment of Fair Housing as required by HUD with the first update completed in 2023, and subsequent updates based on HUD guidance.
- Implement necessary actions continuously as needed.
- If 100 units of affordable housing are not constructed South of the El Camino Precise Plan by July 31, 2027, the City will survey landowners South of the El Camino Precise Plan on regulatory barriers to housing development, forward the survey results to HCD, and request HCD's reasonable recommendations on programs, including but not limited to streamlining and zoning reform, that would create more housing across the income spectrum South of the El Camino Real Precise Plan. The city will implement HCD's reasonably recommended programs to the satisfaction of HCD by July 31, 2029.
- By July 31, 2027, the City will identify whether at least half of the units required by the educational equity metric have been built and commit to additional programs (including SB 10 rezonings) if these targets are not met.

4.1 Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions

Implement processing procedures and technology improvements that will reduce Planning and Building Permit review timelines to address constraints resulting from the duration of staff review.

- a. Review and update the City's affordable Housing NOFA process to improve coordination and communication internally (e.g., coordination between Housing, Planning and other departments and internal processes in Planning and other departments) and with applicants. Encourage affordable housing developers to work with outside funding sources to leverage the City's local funds to the maximum extent possible. Initial steps in the review include additional developer roundtables, garnering consultant advice, and scanning other public agency processes for best practices. In addition, the City will continue to facilitate and support 100% affordable housing development in the review process, by allocating dedicated staff and utilizing streamlining opportunities. This responds to input received from affordable housing developers during the outreach process (see Chapter 1: Introduction, Public Participation section).
- b. Review development and post-development processes, timelines, and approval body levels to streamline permitting processes. Adopt procedures that improve internal coordination and staff throughput. This responds to input received from market-rate housing developers during the outreach process (see Chapter 1: Introduction, Public Participation section). [Implement all high-priority recommendations from the Development Review Assessment \("Matrix Study"\), including the development of a new permitting software system.](#)
- c. Acquire tools and software that will improve development review, monitoring of housing supply, management of funding, transparency of data and approvals, and other processes involved in housing development for staff and public use.
- d. [Create a ministerial approval pathway by 2025 for approving applications for all projects that are code-compliant and meet the City's inclusionary requirements, provided an applicant has submitted all materials and requirements as stipulated under SB 330.](#)

In addition, Program 1.3 will streamline development review by improving the consistency, transparency and relevance of the standards that affect residential development.

Objectives and Metrics

- Facilitate at least 1,100 units of 100% affordable development by streamlining the funding approval process, prioritizing staff review, utilizing State streamlining (e.g., SB35)
- Reduce the number of resubmittals and time between application completeness and approval through process and approval body revisions
- Bring the city fully into compliance with new transparency legislation by posting project-specific fees online.

Milestone and Timeframe

- Bring City into full compliance with transparency requirements as soon as possible.

- Review and update NOFA process by June 30, 2024.
- Update the Zoning Ordinance process and approval bodies by December 31, 2026
- Fully implement electronic review software by June 30, 2024. Acquire additional software and tools as identified.
- By December 31st, 2023, complete all high-priority recommendations from the Development Review Assessment (“Matrix Study”) that do not rely on acquisition of new software. These are recommendations 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 31, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45 in the Matrix Study.
- By December 31st, 2024, complete all high-priority recommendations from the Development Review Assessment (“Matrix Study”) that do rely on acquisition of new software. These are recommendations 8, 17, 18, 22, and 47 in the Matrix Study.

Recommended programmatic changes

[Recommended programmatic changes](#)

[1.2 Eliminate Parking Minimums Standards for Affordable Housing Developments](#)

[1.3 Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards](#)

[1.4: Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing](#)

[1.8 Park Land Ordinance Update](#)

[1.14 Cumulative Fees](#)

[1.15 Annual Gatekeeper Process](#)

[2.6 Affirmatively Further Fair Housing](#)

[4.1 Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions](#)

1.2 Eliminate Parking ~~Minimums Standards~~ for ~~Affordable~~ Housing Developments

Codify exemptions to parking ~~minimums standards~~ for ~~100%-affordable~~ housing developments in the Downtown, San Antonio, East Whisman, and El Camino Real Precise Plans, and for 100% affordable housing developments citywide.

Objectives and Metrics

- Streamline review by reducing studies and uncertainty, and facilitate ~~100%-affordable~~ housing developments by eliminating parking ~~standards minimums~~ in the Downtown, San Antonio, East Whisman, and El Camino Real Precise Plans, and for 100% affordable housing developments citywide.

Milestones and Timeframe

- Update zoning ordinance and ~~(if necessary) zoning or~~ Precise Plans ~~amendments~~ by December 31, 2024.

1.3 Review and Update Ordinance and Precise Plan Residential Standards

Review development standards to ensure they reflect contemporary building types, improve ease of implementation and improve consistency across districts.

- A. Ensure development projects can meet their allowed densities **at minimum and are, where possible, economically feasible at maximum allowable densities**. Conduct a development prototype study, update definitions as necessary for consistency between plans and districts, and revise multifamily development standards in major districts (including R3) and Precise Plans to ensure projects **are, where possible, economically feasible at maximum allowable densities** and can meet their allowed density **at minimum**. **The City will reduce or eliminate constraints identified by Opticos in their October 13th, 2020 presentation, where doing so would make it economically feasible to build prototype projects at maximum allowable densities.**
- B. Compile, evaluate and refine requirements outside the Zoning Ordinance, include Heritage tree preservation and Public Works requirements
- C. Ensure that zoning code is updated to reflect densities and other standards as required by state law (e.g., SB 478)
- D. Adopt a TDM Ordinance that provides clear requirements for residential trip reduction across all precise plans and zoning districts and update precise plans as needed. Through the ordinance, study the cost of TDM requirements on typical residential developments, and allow residential developers to meet TDM goals through lower-cost options. Update the zoning ordinance to allow residential parking requirements reductions for projects that implement TDM **outside areas mentioned in Program 1.2**.
- E. Study live-work as an allowed residential use near retail areas, major corridors and other viable locations
- F. **Revise Bonus FAR provisions in relevant precise plans to be authorized via a ministerial pathway under objective criteria.**

Objectives and Metrics

- Streamline the development review process by updating definitions for standards such as height, open area, common usable open area, floor area ratio, personal storage, pavement coverage and building coverage, and ensuring definitions are consistent with contemporary building types and across the Zoning Ordinance and precise plans.
- Reduce government constraints in multifamily zoning districts (R3, R4, CRA) and four Precise Plans (El Camino Real, San Antonio, North Bayshore and East Whisman) by ensuring that projects can build up to their allowed density.
- Reduce government constraints by allowing reduced parking for projects that implement TDM.
- Expand small business access to opportunity by creating live-work spaces in appropriate residential areas

Milestones and Timeframe

- Conduct prototype study and evaluate standards outside the Zoning Ordinance by June 30, **2024 2026**

- Update Zoning Ordinance and precise plans to reflect reduced standards and live-work by December 31, ~~2024~~ 2026
- Adopt TDM ordinance by December 31, 2026

1.4: Religious and Community Assembly Sites for Housing

Religious and community assembly sites are typically larger sites and are located throughout the City, with several in the City's highest opportunity neighborhoods. This program would allow affordable multifamily housing on these sites.

Objectives and Metrics

- Create more affordable housing in the City's highest opportunity neighborhoods by allowing deed-restricted affordable multifamily housing up to 3 stories on non-profit, religious and community assembly sites in the R1 and R2 districts. Typical densities are expected to be approximately 60 ~~30 to 40~~ dwelling units per acre on the residential portions of the sites, **such that projects can reach 100 du/ac with the State Density Bonus**. Incentivize such development through ongoing actions, such as outreach, funding and promotional materials

Milestone and Timeframe

- Complete zoning amendments by December 31, ~~2024~~ **2026**, including outreach to affordable housing developers, non-profit and advocacy organizations and religious and community assembly properties; development of standards and incentives; and creation of ongoing monitoring and promotional materials.

Responsibility: Planning Division

Potential Funding: Development Services Fund

AFFH Program: Access to Opportunity

1.8 Park Land Ordinance Update

Complete Phase 2 of the Park Land Dedication Ordinance update and the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan. Analysis that would support fee reductions could include:

- Review of best-practices for parkland acquisition funding
- Pursuit of grants and other funding sources
- Review of the City's population density assumptions
- Opportunities for private development to provide public open space through existing zoning requirements (e.g., POPAs)
- Development incentives and exceptions to standards for public open space

This responds to input received from market-rate housing developers during the outreach process (see Chapter 1: Introduction, Public Participation section).

Objectives and Metrics:

- Reduce constraints on residential development by reviewing and revising the park land dedication requirements to maintain access to high quality open space while reducing the financial impact to residential development.
- Recalibrate the park in-lieu fee so the value of land is no higher than the average citywide land evaluation rather than the land costs for recently completed residential projects in the respective density categories.

Milestone and Timeframe:

- By December 31, 2024, including adoption of the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan (addressing anticipated open space needs and long-term funding strategies) and adoption of reduced fees, alternate mitigations and/or other programs to reduce costs on residential.

1.14 Cumulative Fees

Review all imposed fees, including community benefit requirements, on housing developments to check compliance under recent changes to the Mitigation Fee Act, and continually review cumulative fees during discussion of fee increases. Additionally, prevent new levels on fees from being a significant constraint on development, to be determined by per-fee feasibility studies. In this section, fees are understood broadly to include impact fees, application fees, in-lieu fees, community benefits payments, and TDM/TDA-related payments.

Objectives and Metrics

- Comply with the Mitigation Fee Act.
- Provide Council with information on the existing cumulative impact of fees and what the cumulative fees would be given modifications proposed to in-lieu fees, community benefit payments, TDM-TDA-related payments, and other fees.
- Ensure city imposed fees are reasonable and not a significant constraint on development by capping per-unit cumulative fees at 100% AMI for a family of two.

Milestone and Timeframe

- Annual review after December 31, 2024 to conduct a feasibility study that encompasses each fee as well as the cumulative effect on feasibility of all fees taken together.

1.15 Annual Gatekeeper Process

Require the Gatekeeper Process to be conducted at least once per year.

Objectives and Metrics

- Allow the development community to propose projects that provide significant amounts of new housing. The City will annually report to HCD the size of the application queue for the gatekeeper process and the number of non-exempt units approved through zoning changes, Precise Plan amendments, or General Plan amendments.
- Expand scope of allowed exemptions to the Gatekeeper Process.
- If staff identifies that there is not enough internal capacity to take on all projects that City Council would approve but for limited staff capacity, the City must provide City Council with options to hire external staff to provide such capacity or provide City Council with options to expand the scope of Program 4.1 within a year.

Milestone and Timeframe

- Before December 31st of 2023, Council will hear outstanding Gatekeeper requests. For the duration of the Sixth Cycle of the Housing Element, Council will consider Gatekeeper proposals in batches at least once per year.
- By December 31st of 2025, the City will expand the scope of allowed exemptions to the Gatekeeper Process.

2.6 Affirmatively Further Fair Housing

Continue to prepare and update the City's Assessment of Fair Housing and implement actions as necessary to remove barriers to fair housing choice, as required by HUD and State Housing Element law.

Objectives and Metrics

- Remove impediments to fair housing and provide equitable access to housing and opportunity.
- Plan to create housing choice in high opportunity areas to mitigate patterns of segregation South of the El Camino Real Precise Plan (ECRPP), as measured by a metric that tracks the number of affordable units constructed South of the ECRPP, with an objective to entitle at least 100 units of affordable housing there by July 31, 2027.
- Create an educational equity target as follows. The City will identify a percentage of the overall market-rate and affordable housing RHNA targets that should be built in each neighborhood or within each elementary school enrollment boundary in the Mountain View Whisman School District. These percentages shall ensure that at least 33% of the RHNA is evenly allocated among these geographic boundaries (e.g., if using the 7 elementary school boundaries, at least $33\% / 7 = 4.7\%$ of the overall RHNA should get built in each school's area).
- Create more housing choice across the income spectrum in high opportunity areas (as defined by the 2023 TCAC opportunity map) in or near downtown by offering land donations for affordable housing and by zoning for additional housing South of the El Camino Real Precise Plan and in or around downtown.

Milestone and Timeframe

- Update Assessment of Fair Housing as required by HUD with the first update completed in 2023, and subsequent updates based on HUD guidance.
- Implement necessary actions continuously as needed.
- If 100 units of deed-restricted affordable housing or DUOs are not entitled South of the ECRPP by July 31, 2027, the City will survey landowners South of the ECRPP regarding regulatory barriers to housing development, and enact programs, including but not limited to streamlining and SB 10 zoning reform, that would, in expectation, yield one hundred units of affordable housing South of ECRPP between July 31, 2027 and the end of the planning period.
- By July 31, 2027, the City will submit RFPs for developing two parcels of City-owned land into affordable housing in or around downtown or South of the ECRPP.
- By December 31, 2024, the City will zone for housing in high opportunity areas near and around downtown such as the Transit Center Master Plan and Moffett.
- By December 31, 2024, the City will rezone R2 sites in high opportunity areas South of El Camino with density assumptions derived from SB 10's allowance for 30' heights and ten-plexes.
- By July 31, 2027, the City will identify whether at least half of the units required by the educational equity metric have been built and commit to additional programs (including SB 10 rezonings) if these targets are not met.

4.1 Development Streamlining and Processing Revisions

Implement processing procedures and technology improvements that will reduce Planning and Building Permit review timelines to address constraints resulting from the duration of staff review.

- a. Review and update the City's affordable Housing NOFA process to improve coordination and communication internally (e.g., coordination between Housing, Planning and other departments and internal processes in Planning and other departments) and with applicants. Encourage affordable housing developers to work with outside funding sources to leverage the City's local funds to the maximum extent possible. Initial steps in the review include additional developer roundtables, garnering consultant advice, and scanning other public agency processes for best practices. In addition, the City will continue to facilitate and support 100% affordable housing development in the review process, by allocating dedicated staff and utilizing streamlining opportunities. This responds to input received from affordable housing developers during the outreach process (see Chapter 1: Introduction, Public Participation section).
- b. Review development and post-development processes, timelines, and approval body levels to streamline permitting processes. Adopt procedures that improve internal coordination and staff throughput. This responds to input received from market-rate housing developers during the outreach process (see Chapter 1: Introduction, Public Participation section). [Implement all high-priority recommendations from the Development Review Assessment \("Matrix Study"\), including the development of a new permitting software system.](#)
- c. Acquire tools and software that will improve development review, monitoring of housing supply, management of funding, transparency of data and approvals, and other processes involved in housing development for staff and public use.
- d. [Create a ministerial approval pathway by 2025 for approving applications for all projects that are code-compliant and meet the City's inclusionary requirements, provided an applicant has submitted all materials and requirements as stipulated under SB 330.](#)

In addition, Program 1.3 will streamline development review by improving the consistency, transparency and relevance of the standards that affect residential development.

Objectives and Metrics

- Facilitate at least 1,100 units of 100% affordable development by streamlining the funding approval process, prioritizing staff review, utilizing State streamlining (e.g., SB35)
- Reduce the number of resubmittals and time between application completeness and approval through process and approval body revisions
- Bring the city fully into compliance with new transparency legislation by posting project-specific fees online.

Milestone and Timeframe

- Bring City into full compliance with transparency requirements as soon as possible.

- Review and update NOFA process by June 30, 2024.
- Update the Zoning Ordinance process and approval bodies by December 31, 2026
- Fully implement electronic review software by June 30, 2024. Acquire additional software and tools as identified.
- By December 31st, 2023, complete all high-priority recommendations from the Development Review Assessment (“Matrix Study”) that do not rely on acquisition of new software. These are recommendations 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 31, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45 in the Matrix Study.
- By December 31st, 2024, complete all high-priority recommendations from the Development Review Assessment (“Matrix Study”) that do rely on acquisition of new software. These are recommendations 8, 17, 18, 22, and 47 in the Matrix Study.

From: Shari Wiemann-Emling [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 11:54 PM
To: City Council <City.Council@mountainview.gov>; epc@mountainview.gov
Subject: 121 El Camino Real rezoning

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

Dear City Council and Environmental Planning Commission,

I am writing to comment on the designation by the Housing Element Update for the Shopping Center at 121 El Camino and Grant Road. This very active and vital center has, unfortunately, been rezoned for housing from 65-111 living units. I cannot understand this designation, considering the multiple serious problems this intersection already has.

Please drive near 121 El Camino Real any time of day, to see the gridlock at this very dangerous corner, and imagine what additional housing would do to destroy and endanger the entire area. Already, we sit through lights at this corner several times of day - and an increase of traffic would be untenable. Freeway 237 ends at this El Camino intersection, and the multiple lanes are often pouring onto Grant Road and El Camino by drivers switching lanes at the last moment and multiple drivers ignoring the lights and proceeding through the red lights at this intersection as though they don't exist. It is already one of the most treacherous intersections in our City.

The local Elementary School causes gridlock twice a day, Then add the traffic of the very sizeable Grant Road Shopping Center, the carwash, the IN and OUT restaurant, the laundromat, the two gas stations, local businesses on the East side of Grant and the children using this route to school - and you have a negative impact that barely is tolerated now. Please do NOT add this painful increase of population, and cause this intersection to be even more deadly. Tragically, a young boy was killed in an accident at this corner less than a year ago. The planned sizable addition of housing would unfortunately expose and endanger an equally sizable number of children to this danger.

Please note the tremendous increase in noise, automobile pollution, massive traffic gridlock, and negative impact to personal safety for residents when looking for housing sites. 121 El Camino is inappropriate for this increase in population in so many devastating ways.

I thank you for your reconsideration.

Sincerely,
Shari Emling

[REDACTED]
Mountain View