Advocates for Affordable Housing 519 Emmons Drive Mountain View, CA 94043 (650) 967-4427

February 13, 2017

Chair Scarboro and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission City of Mountain View 500 Castro Street Mountain View, CA 94041

Re: EPC Meeting, February 15, 2017 Agenda Item 5.1 – 1001 N. Shoreline Blvd. Residential Development

Dear Chairman Scarboro and Members of the EPC:

Advocates for Affordable Housing(AAH), a volunteer group of residents of Mountain View, wishes to give input on the 1001 N. Shoreline Residential Development.

This development has our strong support of its affordable housing component. We are especially pleased to see the 10% BMRs for both the apartments as well as the condos. Those who earn incomes in the range of 80-120% of area median income are currently priced out of the market. Perhaps the much talked about "missing middle" will have an opportunity to enter the ownership sector via this development.

It's good to see that such a development which will provide much needed affordable residential units is deemed financially feasible by a developer. We look forward to more such developments.

Thank you for considering our input.

Sincerely,

Joan MacDonald
For Advocates for Affordable Housing

cc: Terry Blount
Wayne Chen
Clarissa Burke
Stephanie Williams
Dan Rich
Randy Tsuda
Lorrie Brewer



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS of the Los Altos-Mountain View Area

February 12, 2017

Chair Scarboro and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission City of Mountain View 500 Castro Street Mountain View 94041

Re: Environmental Planning Commission Meeting, February 15, Agenda Item 5.1 – 1001 N. Shoreline Blvd. Residential Development

Dear Chairman Scarboro and Members of the EPC:

The LWV supports affordable housing for all Californians. We also support below market rate units (BMRs) as we believe that dispersal of affordable housing is healthy for the community. We are pleased to see that this proposed development will include 10% of the total number of apartments and condominium units planned as BMRs. It is unclear whether this will mean 10% of the rental units will be BMRs and 10% of the condo units will be BMRs or simply 10% of the total number.

The City has been unsuccessful in negotiating with most residential developers to build even the 7.75% BMRs considered to be equivalent to the payment of the rental housing impact fees otherwise required. Perhaps this project will set a precedent, indicating that if the City is serious about seeing the BMR units actually built, it is possible to negotiate with developers to accomplish this goal.

We would like to see consideration of 10% of the condos being built as BMR condos, as these may help provide housing to the "missing middle", those who earn incomes in the 80-120% area median income (AMI) range, or perhaps slightly higher, who are being priced out of the market. We urge the EPC to consider various income targets; for example, the rental units could be targeted to those at lower than 65% AMI, and the condo units could be targeted to a range of incomes, perhaps up to 150% AMI. Tweaking these targeted income levels should be based on what staff sees as the need.

Thank you for considering our input.

Donna Yobs
Co-Chair, Housing Committee
LWV of the Los Altos/Mountain View Area

cc: Terry Blount Stephanie Williams Wayne Chen Clarissa Burke Dan Rich Randy Tsuda

Burke, Clarissa

: Subject:

FW: 2/15/17 Meeting - Agenda Item 5: 1001 North Shoreline Boulevard Study Session

----Original Message-----

From: Serge Bonte 🎚

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:37 AM

To: John Scarboro; Margaret Capriles; Ellen Kamei; Cox, Robert; preeti.hehmeyer@gmail.com; Lucas Ramirez;

Mvpamelab@gmail.com

Cc: Blount, Terry

Subject: re: 2/15/17 Meeting - Agenda Item 5: 1001 North Shoreline Boulevard Study Session

Dear Mountain View Environmental Planning Commission:

I will not be able to attend your 2/15/17 meeting but wanted to share a few comments on that proposed development:

1. Office Parking, TDM, TMA...

Since the Office component is near completion, it would be most useful for the EPC and the public to know what parking and TDM requirements were put in place for the Office building. That information would be needed to determine if staff is recommending changes to these previously adopted requirements.

I also believe the City should require the residential component to join a TMA (taking a page from the El Camino Real Precise Plan). For starter, there is literately an MV GO shuttle stop at the corner of Shoreline and Terra Bella. Further, the TMA is uniquely equipped to optimize the use of the parking structure(s): shared parking between office and residential, parking overflow for Shoreline events or more generally commuters (great location for park and ride).

2. Omission of Retail....

While it's not a huge amount of retail, I believe the City should insist in requesting it for the following reasons:

- 2.1 There will not be other retail nearby in the short term.
- 2.2. I think it's time the City stops developers from not delivering on the promises made to secure a green light in the gatekeeper process.

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte Lloyd Way, Mountain View