

From: [Salim Damerdj](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [MV YIMBY](#)
Subject: Item 3.1 Housing Element
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 8:43:22 AM

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

Dear Mayor Kamei and Members of the City Council,

Mountain View YIMBY would like to provide comments for Item 3.1 Housing Element.

Planning the next decade of our city's growth is no small undertaking, and staff deserves a huge 'thank you' for their conscientious work. While we know the city is still early in this process, we'd like to be proactive in identifying areas of opportunity, including addressing:

1.

Our over-reliance on the North Bayshore and East Whisman plan areas, which we do not believe will be built quickly enough to satisfy our housing targets.

a.

East Whisman already had one development fail due to financial feasibility.

b.

For North Bayshore, Lendlease expects Shorebird North (1118 homes) to be permitted by 2031 and, if we're fortunate, Shorebird South (1794 homes). Other homes in that master plan will likely take longer, absent streamlining.

c.

The new Mello-Roos style tax proposed by MVWSD, if approved, will likely make any new housing infeasible.

2.

The city's duty to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requires more work:

a.

Figure 2 (pg. 13) of the staff report makes it plain that **the city is clustering development, which, as staff notes on page 5, is not permitted.**

b.

Per HCD guidance, the city needs to take a *regional* lens on AFFH, and we believe this should include an analysis of our jobs-housing imbalance that exports displacement pressures to other cities. The Google projects, while

great, do not ameliorate Mountain View's severe jobs-housing imbalance. To take a regional lens on AFFH, we need to aim **above** our RHNA and close this gap.

For these reasons, we believe the city must greatly expand housing capacity outside the two plan areas. To quantify the need for additional upzoning, the city should use a data-driven approach in calculating the likelihood of redevelopment of non-vacant inventory sites. LA and SF are using rigorous modelling for their housing elements, but even simple statistics are useful here: **Mountain View is on track to develop around 21% of its 5th RHNA cycle site inventory.** So, Mountain View YIMBY believes **we should apply great scrutiny to a housing element that claims the median inventory site has much more than a 21% of development by 2031.** As staff notes, more upzoning is required if housing development is not sufficiently likely. Thus, to hit our housing targets, further fair housing and align with our climate goals, **we believe the city should upzone high-opportunity areas within a half-mile walk of transit.**

We'd also like to suggest the following:

1.

A major constraint to affordable housing is funding. Pursuing **HCD's pro-housing designation** will give our city priority access to affordable housing grants. Mountain View is one of the most pro-housing cities in California, and we should diligently strive for this designation, which we absolutely can attain.

2.

In stakeholder meetings, affordable housing providers and market rate housing providers both agreed we should **streamline permitting, reduce parking mandates, and invest in staff capacity.** These items must be a major focus of our housing plan.

3.

The city must diligently **reach out to "all economic segments of the community,"** per AB 686. Yet we have not targeted outreach to housing-insecure residents, whether they live in mobile homes or RVs. Their needs are pressing and must not fall by the wayside.

Our city has the privilege of being a hub of opportunity and prosperity. We have the potential not only to meet our housing targets, but to turn our city into a green, walkable urban center that shares opportunity widely. We hope that our city will embrace this opportunity.

Best regards,

Salim Damerджи

On behalf of Mountain View YIMBY



From: [Olga Bright](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: R3 Development Monta Loma
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 10:33:07 AM

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

Hello,

I am very concerned about the R3 designation in two areas of Monta Loma. Monta Loma is an active community composed of single family residences. It is unclear why the city should have designated two lots for R3 development. It is particularly unpleasant to have the prospect of having the inhabitants of the high rise buildings overlooking my garden. I do not see other areas in Mountain View that have R3 designations in single home neighborhoods. The Monta Loma neighborhood is contiguous to Palo Alto single family homes and on a bike route to Stanford. I very much hope that the City of Mountain View will decide to retain the character of this charming community.

I also wanted to mention that I read that the Cities of Palo Alto and Los Altos are challenging the number of houses that they have been asked to build. Mountain View should consider doing this also.

Thank you for your consideration.

Olga Bright

From: [Toni R](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Nov 16 2021 City Council Meeting, agenda item 3.1 (Housing Element Update) comment
Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 12:25:46 PM
Attachments: [potential policy topics slide in staff presentation shown at EPC meeting on Oct 20 2021.png](#)

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

Honorable Mayor Kamei, Vice Mayor Ramirez, and Members of the City Council,

I am writing to support the approach recommended in the staff report to **not assume "R3 update densities in the site inventory"** to make the upcoming RHNA allocation. As staff points out, the R3 rezoning project could have unintended displacement effects because tenants currently enjoying rent control may not be able to return after a property has undergone redevelopment. Having to redevelop properties also means that the net gain in units will be modest in many cases and added units will be predominately market-rate units.

In addition, the **R3 rezoning project would lead to the loss of lively, green, predominantly single-family home, walkable neighborhoods with functioning communities** and replace them with tracts of anonymous apartment blocks with uniform look, token landscaping and contentious street parking. Think of it in terms of how we experience Halloween: a street which now has many decorated homes with lots of kids roaming around will become a street that everybody skips because it has predominantly bleak, massive, uninviting buildings with closed gates and few to no homes to visit.

What's more, residents in the affected areas are largely unaware this project is under consideration. Public messaging about R3 rezoning touts that it will increase the "amount and variety of housing types allowed" and to "help [new residential projects] fit better into neighborhoods", but it avoids mentioning that setbacks would be minimal and buildings 6 stories or taller would be allowed next to single-story homes. To that end, **I support the staff recommendation that robust outreach is necessary**. It must also fairly and proportionately represent feedback from all in attendance and should indicate whether the comments represent the views of a resident or non-resident. For example, the "potential policy topics" slide in the staff presentation at the EPC meeting on Oct 20 2021 (see attachment) largely glosses over concerns voiced by residents during outreach meetings, such as the detrimental impacts on affected communities mentioned above. The outreach summary report for the city council meeting on Nov 16 also shows that stakeholder interviews were conducted with developers and advocacy groups, but not with homeowners, who have the strongest interest in the long-term success of Mountain View.

Rather than this ad hoc planning approach, the **best way to make decisions** about major changes to the city's zoning and land use **remains the established precise and general plan process**.

Kind regards,

Toni Rath, Mountain View resident

POTENTIAL POLICY TOPICS

- Displacement
- Affordable Housing Production
- Funding, Capacity, & Partnerships
- Large-Unit Production
- Entry-Level Ownership Production
- Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion
- Preservation & Improvement of Naturally Affordable Stock
- Acquisition
- Sustainability
- Impacts to Infrastructure & City Facilities
- Development Review
- Development Standards & Fees
- Notice of Availability Process Review
- Targeted Populations
- Engagement and Education
- Data Efficiency

EPC Question No. 2: Does the EPC support the initial list of draft policy topics? Other policy topics that should be included?