

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Anderson, Eric B.](#); [Snelling, Aki](#)
Subject: Moffett Precise Plan Community Workshop - Comments
Date: Sunday, March 2, 2025 5:15:04 PM

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

Hello Eric and Aki,

I will be unable to attend the March 3 workshop tomorrow, but I would like to offer some input, for the record. I'm speaking as a resident living on Santa Rosa, adjacent to the Precise Plan area, and in a block that is being considered for inclusion.

First, here are some comments regarding inclusion of my block:

- 1) In a meeting on Feb. 19 to consider the R3 Update, the EPC decided to recommend upzoning the entire area north of Central Expressway and south of Central Avenue to R3-A. There is no need for the Moffett Precise Plan to second-guess this decision. I can see no reason to add my block to the Moffett Precise Plan.
- 2) With the Density Bonus, a developer could right now put up a 2.2 FAR building on my street, with 0.5 parking spaces per unit. Indeed, the City has already approved a project with exactly those numbers, at 730 Central Avenue. This is a bad situation for our neighborhood - I can only ask you not to make things any worse.
- 3) When Council voted last Nov. 19 to consider inclusion of my block in the Moffett Precise Plan, they did so with no public notice, at the last minute, on the basis of inaccurate information from Council Member Alison Hicks, who was acting on a request from MUYIMBY. This request, with no public notice, was inappropriate.

Second, here are some comments regarding the first two blocks of Moffett, a pivotal area within the original Plan boundaries:

- 1) These blocks are home to many small businesses, that give Moffett a character that would be lost if they were replaced by large residential buildings.
- 2) "Ground Floor Retail" would not provide adequate space for these businesses to relocate. Recently, Council Member Hicks pointed out that at the Prometheus development at 100 Moffett, "Ground Floor Retail" never materialized - the ground floor is a gym, serving only building residents.
- 3) Please consider that in these two blocks, there is no public parking - no surface lot, no parking structure. Parking for businesses is already tight, and spills over into adjacent residential streets (including my street, Santa Rosa). There is also no park space, except for the small Jackson Park.

I am in favor of streetscape improvements and bike lanes, if that can be done in a way that does not reduce street parking.

Thanks very much for your consideration!

Peter Spitzer
Santa Rosa Avenue

From: [Anderson, Eric B.](#)
To: [Shelling, Aki](#)
Subject: FW: Feedback on Moffett Precise Plan
Date: Monday, March 10, 2025 4:13:49 PM

Aki,
Please also attach this to the EPC report. Thanks!
-eric

From: Rick [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2025 8:35 AM
To: Anderson, Eric B. <Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov>
Subject: Feedback on Moffett Precise Plan

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

Greetings,

I attended the community meeting last week regarding the Moffett Precise Plan and had one more piece of feedback.

While the presentation didn't go into details, I hope all alternatives include having a bodega (small corner store where you can find snacks, drinks, and some basic groceries). JL Produce is a good example of this. If we, as a community, want to move away from our dependence on cars, we need more basic services within walking distance.

Thanks for letting me express my opinions.

Regards,
Rick

From: James Kuszmaul [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 9:11 AM
To: epc@mountainview.gov
Cc: Mountain View YIMBY <contact@mvyimby.com>
Subject: Item 5.1 Moffett Boulevard Precise Plan Land Use Alternatives

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

Dear Environmental Planning Commissioners,

Mountain View is in a housing crisis, and there is nowhere in the city that it makes more sense to build more housing than immediately adjacent to our downtown, where the city and region have consistently made significant investments in local amenities, public transportation, and active transportation facilities. It would be absurd to have seen the region invest so much into public transport in the area—including the recent Caltrain electrification—and **not** significantly increase the ability for more people to live in the area. For that reason, we would urge the EPC to recommend **Alternative B, with recommendations to update building standards to maximize development feasibility and density**. In particular, we would recommend:

- No setback requirements, to encourage street activation and walkability and to improve the feasibility of development on small lots.
 - This may include the option of providing architectural arcades, to create sheltered sidewalks in front of buildings while allowing for increased density.
- Clear and objective design requirements. Any architectural guidelines should be objective and form-based with the goal of minimizing significant back-and-forth during building design.
- Policies to make lot assembly easy.
- There should **not** be any required setbacks for buildings—setbacks create additional cost and complexity in building, and for buildings as short as 7 stories, carry no practical purpose.
- Ensure that all development standards are, at a minimum, compliant with the MTC TOC policies.
- Strongly encourage the removal of driveways that enter/exit onto Moffett Blvd itself, to

reduce pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.

- Rather than specifically **requiring** ground-floor retail, instead strongly encourage it (as in Alternative A). We do not want to misjudge the demand for retail as a city and end up with an excess of vacant storefronts in the future.

The city must plan for a long-term vision where this entire area becomes significantly higher density, with new housing providing relief to the market so that there is enough local housing to supply to relieve upward price pressure on existing, more affordable, housing options.

For the streetscape, Mountain View YIMBY believes that transportation needs are tightly tied with housing needs and, as such, streetscape improvements should be made to ensure that, as new housing is built, the streetscape is improved to match the needs of higher-density housing. This should include safe facilities for walking and biking, wider sidewalks, traffic calming efforts (both along Moffett and on side streets), street trees to provide additional shade (beyond that provided by the buildings themselves), and building design standards that make for a pleasant and desirable pedestrian experience. We also support a road diet south of Middlefield, with the possibility of converting a portion of the right of way into a linear park.

As a resident of a Future Study Area in this plan, I am thrilled to have the chance to advocate for more housing in my own backyard.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,
James Kuzmaul, on behalf of Mountain View YIMBY





March 19, 2025

Re: March 19, 2025, Agenda Item 5.1 (Moffett Boulevard Precise Plan)

Dear Chair Gutierrez and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission:

The League of Women Voters (LWW) supports policies that promote an increase in the housing stock, particularly affordable housing, near transit. The LWW also supports diversified housing and the involvement of community members throughout the process when land use decisions are made.

The League supports Alternative B, as potentially resulting in the building of the most housing out of the three options, including housing near the Transit Center. The requirement for first-floor nonresidential uses would help provide amenities and a sense of community for the area. The League also appreciates elements of Alternative C, such as allowing the highest density of housing closest to the Transit Center and medium-intensity mixed use in other areas.

The League appreciates that staff's outreach efforts, which resulted in a good number of community members participating in recent public workshops.

To the extent the area covered by the upcoming R3 (multi-family residential) Zoning Update borders the Moffett Boulevard Precise Plan area, a discussion of the two areas at the same time may yield a more comprehensive and cohesive result.

Please send any questions about this letter to Kevin Ma, Co-Chair of the Housing Committee, at housing@lwvlamv.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Katie Zoglin".

Katie Zoglin
President
Los Altos-Mountain View Area LWW

C: Martin Alkire
Aki Snelling
Eric Anderson
Amber Blizinski
Christian Murdock

From: [REDACTED]
To: epc@mountainview.gov; [Anderson, Eric B.](mailto:Eric.B.Anderson@mountainview.gov)
Subject: Fwd: Moffett Boulevard precise plan comments
Date: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 4:52:40 PM

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

I'll also forward this comment to EPC

Thanks,

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Adam Klett [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Mar 19, 2025 at 4:51 PM
Subject: Moffett Boulevard precise plan comments
To: Anderson, Eric B. <Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov>

Hi Eric,

I was reading over some of the notes from the community workshop , it seems like theres a lot of good direction and interest in the Moffett Boulevard precise plan and im supportive of allowing higher densities in the area and improving the streetscape. I just had couple of quick comments i wanted to pass along

1. The current moffett boulevard right-of-way is very wide and seems dangerous as a pedestrian, it seems like it was built for significantly higher traffic flows and now people speed a lot and run reds here leading to several near misses ive seen multiple cars end up on sidewalks at central expressway and central avenue. I would recommend considering lots of traffic calming, minimal lanes , maybe 1 northbound and one southbound and making the central 30ft or so of Moffett Boulevard between central expressway and central avenue a linear parklet or to be reappropriated for pedestrian centric amenities . Would also be nice to see more bollards installed on sidewalk corners at central expressway and central avenue to protect pedestrians.
2. This project is pretty intrinsically linked to the central and moffett pedestrian crossing and executing a good crossing there is going to be a big part of the success of keeping the downtown feeling continuous into moffett boulevard, id encourage to keep the crossing and moffett boulevard precise plan in some way linked through development and when presenting to council and EPC. I think the Moffett/Central expressway rail separation underpass project was running into funding concerns unfortunately. Would it save money or improve the central expressway crossing to just do a single larger central tunnel between a new central parklet on moffett boulevard and downtown? Another option might be a pedestrian flyover parklet for pedestrians that gives great "mountain views" towards castro street and would make a continuous pedestrian environment between castro and moffett boulevard.

Best of luck on the project,

Adam Klett



From: [Snelling, Aki](#)
To: [Snelling, Aki](#)
Subject: FW: Moffett Blvd precise plan
Date: Monday, March 24, 2025 1:23:24 PM

From: Ilya Gurin [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2025 4:55 PM
To: Anderson, Eric B. <Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov>
Subject: Moffett Blvd precise plan

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

Hi, Eric. I think the Moffett Blvd precise plan is a great opportunity to experiment with a novel type of allowed use: the street market. You may have seen markets like this in other parts of the world. I would define the use by the following criteria:

- * A single property with at least six individually rentable storefronts. (Ideally, I'd like to see more like 20, but that may not be possible.)
- * Each storefront is small (maybe 20 feet of frontage and 500--1000 sq ft area)
- * Circulation via a paseo or sidewalk, with optional outdoor seating. Delivery and service vehicle access via a shared loading dock or rear driveway.
- * Facade features roll-up or sliding doors, creating wide openings during business hours.
- * Allowable uses are restaurants and retail.
- * Can be the ground floor of a mixed-use building.

A street market is different than a "regular" downtown because each individual space is smaller and has a lower barrier to entry for tenants. It's different than a farmers' market because each storefront has a door that locks overnight and room to store inventory and equipment. Those types of land use are great, obviously, but there's also a niche for something else.

Thank you for your attention.

Ilya Gurin, writing as an individual

Dear Councilmembers,

At a study session scheduled for April 22, you will be considering the Moffett Precise Plan.

As a resident living on Santa Rosa Avenue, I have been closely following this plan. I have watched the video of the March 19 EPC meeting, where Staff proposed three alternatives, and I have read through all of the attachments for that meeting.

I am struck by how much the City's vision for the Moffett neighborhood has changed, and not in a positive way, since a vision was first articulated in 2012, for the "2030 General Plan."

The current vision for Moffett, from both EPC and staff, seems primarily driven by the need to meet the numbers in the Housing Element, taking precedence over the goals of beautifying Moffett and serving Mountain View residents.

The three alternatives presented by Planning staff all fall short, in my view.

All three of the staff alternatives fail to mention application of the Density Bonus in future development. For example, where Alternative B includes building heights of 5-7 stories, the real-world fact is that this specification would result in 10-14 stories, since most of the Precise Plan area is within 0.5 miles of transit. In a worst case, this would allow a developer to build 10-14 stories directly across the street from my 1- and 2- story single-family neighborhood on Santa Rosa.

There was no thought of how to mitigate the negative impact of any of the three alternatives on adjacent neighborhoods.

There was no thought given to parking issues.

There was no real effort to retain existing neighborhood-friendly small businesses.

I realize that this is a difficult situation, given the requirements of the Housing Element, and given the state Density Bonus. But I think it is reasonable to ask the City to make an effort to minimize degradation of our neighborhood. I will have some modest ideas at the end of this email.

These are the issues that concern me:

Impact of 8-14 story buildings on adjacent neighborhoods

From the 2030 General Plan:

In 2030, Moffett Boulevard is an important gateway to Downtown with a strong connection to NASA Ames. Commercial, mixed-use and residential buildings engage the landscaped, well-lighted street while **respecting the character of surrounding neighborhoods**.

LUD 23.6: Residential transitions. **Require well-designed transitions between Moffett Boulevard development and surrounding residential uses.**

Putting 8-14 stories directly across the street from the 1- and 2- story residences on Santa Rosa does not respect the character of the neighborhood, to put it mildly. No "transitions" would be possible, as the Moffett lots in this block are too shallow.

Parking

From the 2030 General Plan:

LUD 23.8: Parking supply and management. **Support strategies to improve the supply and management of parking.**

Parking is already inadequate. It is a certainty that the projected (described as 4 to 7, but in reality 8 to 14 stories) housing developments would be built with inadequate parking - if 100% "affordable," then as little as zero parking. Street parking in the adjacent neighborhoods is already tight, utilized by Moffett businesses.

Participants at community workshops have repeatedly asked for parking to be addressed, but there is not one mention of this issue in the three alternatives.

Moffett has no parking structure or surface lot, only limited street parking. Maybe the City could buy a parcel and provide at least a surface lot, and perhaps in the future a parking structure.

Please do not eliminate any street parking.

Retaining existing small businesses

From the 2030 General Plan:

LUD 23.5: Building and site improvements. **Encourage the rehabilitation and improvement of existing buildings and properties.**

Community workshop participants repeatedly prioritized **retention of existing small businesses**. This goal is mentioned in Vision Theme #2 as well.

There is no viable strategy for retaining existing businesses in any the 3 alternatives. EPC discussion at the 3/18/25 meeting assumed heavy housing development, with commissioners discussing whether "ground-floor retail" would even be possible.

My understanding is that developers cannot be forced to offer ground-floor retail. There has been some talk of offering developers even greater density beyond the Density Bonus, if they would commit to ground floor retail. This would be a very poor bargain.

Developers would have nothing to gain from such a deal, as they could already go to 10 or 14 stories using the Density Bonus. The idea of going even higher is simply bizarre. Even if they did make such a deal, ground-floor rents would be too high for existing businesses. They would be driven away, or driven out of business.

Ground-floor retail is no solution.

Existing businesses in the 100-200 block are right for the neighborhood: Audio High, two yoga studios (Yoga Belly and Crave Yoga), Opus One Music School, City of Flowers, an auto body shop (in the historic building where Disneyland rides were first created), a law office, and Young Giggles Daycare. They need to stay.

The 300 block includes a medical/dental building that is under construction, Shana Thai restaurant, and the Moffett Central Shopping Mall with JL Produce (Mexican grocery), Taqueria Tres Hermanos, Dental Zone, Ruiz Beauty Salon, Baywash (laundry, dry cleaning), and Desi Pizza (Indian pizza restaurant).

These are businesses that give this area its character.

My comments and suggestions:

Of the three alternatives presented by staff, Alternative A appears somewhat less harmful, while satisfying the Housing Element.

Please do not upzone the 100-200 block of Moffett. Keep this block at 1.85 FAR, since it is required by the Housing Element, but no higher. If you believe that you can require ground floor retail, then do so, but offering higher density in exchange for a developer's promise would be a poor idea.

Preserve the existing businesses, which are a neighborhood-friendly mix, to the extent that it is possible. I realize that because of Housing Element requirements and the Density Bonus, their days may be numbered. But please do not make this situation any worse than it already is.

Do not encourage replacement of the Moffett Central Shopping Mall with dense housing.

The lots backing onto Santa Rosa are too small for large developments. Even if an 8- to 12-story building could somehow be made to fit, no step-down or "transition" would be possible. Parking and traffic would be a disaster for the adjoining residential neighborhood. Leave the 100-200 Moffett block as it is, to the extent that is possible. Rezoning this block to commercial would be great, but I suspect that this is no longer possible.

There is already plenty of incentive for developers, both on Moffett and in the adjoining neighborhoods, given the present zoning and projected R3 update, combined with the Density Bonus.

Consider providing public parking, perhaps a surface lot at at 318 Moffett Blvd. or at 730 Central Avenue.

I am in favor of streetscape improvements and bike lanes, but we need to preserve street parking. Moffett does not need to be 4 lanes.

Thanks very much for reading this. I'm hoping for actual improvements, but I see potential for serious harm to adjacent neighborhoods, like mine. I hope you make the right decisions.

Sincerely,

Peter Spitzer
Santa Rosa Avenue