

**Anderson, Eric - Planning**

---

**From:** Serge Bonte [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 15, 2015 6:15 PM  
**To:** Cox, Robert; Ellen Kamei; Lisa Matichak; Margaret Capriles; mktrontell.mtwv.gov@gmail.com; Todd Fernandez; John Scarboro  
**Cc:** Beaudin, Gerry; Anderson, Eric - Planning; Blount, Terry  
**Subject:** re: 6/17/15 EPC Meeting Agenda Item 5.1 - 580-620 Clyde

Dear Environmental Planning Commissioners:

I will not be able to attend your meeting but wanted to share a few comments on this agenda item.

Gatekeepers come with risk:

I can not count the number of times I heard past City Councils pronounce that developers proceeding through a gatekeeper do it at their own risks, that Council can always say no at the end.... Invariably Council has approved all these projects even when not fully aligned the precise plans they were supposed to anticipate. So, whatever you do, make sure that this project will have to abide with the future precise plan and that the developer will have to pay any fees, rules and defined benefits on the books at the time of issuing a permit.

I know that the EPC has tried many times to inject language about the chronic jobs/housing imbalance in Mountain View. I hope that you will insist on such language in the Whisman Precise Plan. Should you decide to implement development linkages (no new office building until more housing is built), make sure it will apply to this project.

Transit Proximity:

I read the General Plan calling for higher density near (< .5 miles) mass transit stops. I wanted to caution the City about applying this policy to Light Rail stops. Recently VTA closed permanently the Evelyn station. Ridership is pretty light (no pun intended) at the 2 stations near this project. Should VTA decide to close one or two of these stations, the higher density would be very far from any mass transit (not good planning).

TMA and Traffic Management:

TMA Membership should be required just like it was for the Samsung building. The project is near the Ellis/101 exits, an area where congestion will be quickly growing because of the Whisman developments, the SunnyVale developments by Moffet/Mathilda and the future developments on Moffet Field (Google lease). I think that a successful TMA will need to tackle the non-Mountain View developments. I work in SunnyVale on Enterprise Way. I see many corporate buses drive on Manila into Ellis then Fairchild or Middlefield to reach our Downtown Transit Center. Light Rail has 2 at grade crossings in that area. I also see many cars go that way to avoid 237/85 or 101. Finally, that intersection is also part of a popular bike route. (I use that route when biking to work).

Community Benefits:

It's unclear the proposed path will ever be built (as both VTA and the SFPUC seem pretty reticent). Even if it did, it would primarily benefit this project (as there is currently no housing, no school, no park in that area) and as such should probably not be viewed as a community benefit but rather as a traffic mitigation measure.

As mentioned above, the Ellis 101 exit area is getting very congested. Maybe a better community benefit for this project would be to finance bike lanes enhancements in that area. Another potential benefit might a contribution to establishing a school campus or a public after school program (tech oriented) in that neighborhood.

Sincerely

A thick black horizontal bar redacting the signature of the sender.

## Anderson, Eric - Planning

---

**From:** Geoff Bradley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 30, 2015 2:28 PM  
**To:** Anderson, Eric - Planning  
**Subject:** RE: Clyde Ave office development

Hi Eric – the one thing I have noticed with the new development in the neighborhood, is that there are a lot more people out walking around, which is great.

Unfortunately, the 5-foot wide sidewalks are not wide enough. If two people are walking together and come upon one other person, there is a lot of awkward shifting around. People will often step off the curb and walk in the street. We also have large groups of people walking around together. Not sure what they are doing. Walking staff meeting or coffee break I have not figured that one out yet.

The Samsung project next door has a combination of 5-foot and 7-foot sidewalks.

The plan shows a mix of existing 5-foot sidewalks to remain and new 7-foot detached sidewalk. I would recommend that all public sidewalks be at least 7 feet wide, maybe even 8 feet. This will allow for a more walkable environment and make it more conducive to walking & taking transit to work.

The only other issue I have at this time is the orientation of the building. The plans show the front door facing Clyde. However, at Samsung the buildings were designed with

main entries facing the street. They were functionally for a couple of months but then they locked them and put up signs saying "Emergency Exit Only". So now there is no pedestrian activity at the front entry of the building. Everyone comes and goes out of the back or side doors even though there is a LOOP stop & bike racks right in front of what is now the "back door".

I think you should consider a Condition of Approval that the front doors be functional for staff and visitors to the buildings.

The architecture seems pretty stark but I'll that up to you.

Thx!  
Geoff

Geoff Bradley, AICP | *principal + president*



**M-GROUP** *a new design on urban planning*

policy planning • urban design • environmental review • historic preservation • community engagement • staffing solutions

[m-group.us](http://m-group.us)