

## Gutierrez, Jeannette

---

**Subject:** RE: 6/14/22 3.1 Study Session - Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element

**From:** Serge Bonte [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2022 3:57 PM

**To:** Kamei, Ellen <[Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov](mailto:Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov)>; Ramirez, Lucas <[Lucas.Ramirez@mountainview.gov](mailto:Lucas.Ramirez@mountainview.gov)>; Abe-Koga, Margaret <[Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov](mailto:Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov)>; Lieber, Sally <[Sally.Lieber@mountainview.gov](mailto:Sally.Lieber@mountainview.gov)>; Showalter, Pat <[Pat.Showalter@mountainview.gov](mailto:Pat.Showalter@mountainview.gov)>; Matichak, Lisa <[Lisa.Matichak@mountainview.gov](mailto:Lisa.Matichak@mountainview.gov)>; Hicks, Alison <[Alison.Hicks@mountainview.gov](mailto:Alison.Hicks@mountainview.gov)>

**Cc:** Shrivastava, Aarti <[Aarti.Shrivastava@mountainview.gov](mailto:Aarti.Shrivastava@mountainview.gov)>; Anderson, Eric B. <[Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov](mailto:Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov)>; Yau, Ellen <[Ellen.Yau@mountainview.gov](mailto:Ellen.Yau@mountainview.gov)>

**Subject:** re: 6/14/22 3.1 Study Session - Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

How the State will perceive Mountain View's Housing Element is anyone's guess, but I find it very comprehensive in methodically addressing the gazillion requirements spelled out by the State.

I had sent the following comment to the EPC but the draft still shows a significant data issue on education opportunities in Mountain View. I understand that Staff stated it will be corrected in the final housing element but it seems backwards to me (fixing the data after doing your analysis)

"The data in the "Access to Education" rubrique seems to ignore all Mountain View elementary school students attending schools in the Los Altos School District (some located in Mountain View like Springer Elementary and an upcoming school in the San Antonio Precise Plan).

The draft states that: " Most of Mountain View is served by the Mountain View Whisman School District which has approximately 4,400 students enrolled up through eighth grade". There are also over 1,000 Mountain View students enrolled through eight grade in the Los Altos School District (more if you include Mountain View students attending Bullis Charter School).

As a result of that omission some of the maps like (Figure 69: TCAC Education Domain Score, Mountain View) seem erroneous. For example, it's unlikely a Mountain View neighborhood (like mine) in the Springer Elementary (or Almond or Santa Rita or Covington) attendance area would get the lowest Education Domain Scores -as shown in figure 69-. I feel you should revise this rubrique to get a better picture of Education opportunities in Mountain View.

For reference, here are the Los Altos School District boundaries:

[https://www.lasdschools.org/files/user/1/file/Adopted\\_attendance\\_boundaries\\_6\\_18\\_07.pdf](https://www.lasdschools.org/files/user/1/file/Adopted_attendance_boundaries_6_18_07.pdf) "

I concur with the many suggestions you have received to protect our currently affordable housing stock (in particular have a local -and more permanent- version of SB330 and a COPA type program)

You also have received many suggestions for reducing fees in order to facilitate housing production. I am not sure how far the City can go without jeopardizing its finances (including hiring more city planners) or other goals (like greenspace) but I wanted to share a modest suggestion that could also help the city meets its carbon reduction goals:

Wave any city fees and expedite any permits for installing Solar Panel and/or performing Electric Upgrades -needed to move away from fossil fuels-. Fund inspections through our tax dollars (General Fund for instance...). Any home with solar panel and an electric upgrade moves the City closer to its carbon neutral goals.. While the fees are modest , the City should use any tool under its control to accelerate the City's electrification. You could phase the fees back in when the City reaches its emission targets.

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte

 Mountain View

**From:** [Toni R](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Housing Element (item 3.1 of agenda)  
**Date:** Monday, June 13, 2022 6:26:42 PM

---

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

Dear council member,

I would like to provide public comment on agenda item 3.1 of tomorrow's city council meeting, i.e. the draft housing element. I am generally supportive of the direction of the housing element and the identified sites. There are however 3 items in the staff report that I would like to comment on:

**1. Redevelopment of village shopping centers should preserve the same amount of retail space:** I support allowing housing at Mountain View's shopping centers, but it should not come at the cost of losing space for retail, restaurants and other services that are currently offered. These are essential to Mountain View's goal to have walkable neighborhoods with opportunities for shopping, social gatherings and employment. Losing this retail would result in an increased need for transportation. Any redevelopment of shopping centers should therefore require the preservation of at least the same amount of existing retail space.

**2. There should be no reduction in fees or park land dedication requirements:** Mountain View's population is expected to grow substantially in the coming years. The amount of park space needs to be commensurate with housing growth to provide recreational space nearby, especially since SB9 will increase growth in the number of single family homes. Reducing the park fees will stifle the necessary growth of park space and increase overcrowding at existing parks. The timing of this proposal is also rather strange: Large-scale housing construction is widespread in Mountain View. It is obviously very desirable to build in Mountain View. Reducing fees is a measure to take when it is not desirable to build, so why do it now?

**3. There should be no further reduction in minimum parking requirements:** The need for individual transportation is apparent in all neighborhoods of Mountain View. It is also clear that areas with higher density and more affordable units are already experiencing spill-over parking issues. Take Easy Street near Whisman Park: With the park on one side of the street and apartments on the other, the street is full of parked cars in the morning. Where would the existing cars go if the apartments would be redeveloped with fewer on-site parking spots, let alone the cars belonging to new residents living in additional units?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Toni Rath, Cuesta Park

**From:** [mary hodder](#)  
**To:** [Lieber, Sally](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Margaret Abe-Koga](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Hicks, Alison](#)  
**Cc:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** The Community Benefit of Small Bay Retail spread through new housing: Housing Element  
**Date:** Monday, June 13, 2022 6:51:37 PM

---

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

Dear Mountain View Council,  
Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Housing Element.

I signed the letter from Livable Mountain View about the Housing Element that you have already received.

I wanted to add one more detail about what I personally think we need to focus on regarding the Housing Element and the Community Benefits of Small Bay Retail. This goes beyond our group's message and as such I haven't shared this with the group. I will pass this letter along to them as well but for now, this is my thought:

Small Bay Retail is critical when we think about housing, density and upzoning. It is a Community Benefit that can lessen driving, and bring community to renters as they go out to meet shop owners, workers and patrons as they get the services and products they need to live.

Developers, when actually proposing a development, tend to gloss over the details such as how the retail is configured. We often find ourselves with buildings that actually aren't helping our housing issues all that much, and worsen livability, because as they say: "the devil is in the details."

One key element is retail. Why build density if everyone living in them has to drive far away to reach their dentist, their hair cutter, their shoe repair, a yoga studio or workout gym, grocery or tailor, their favorite cafe, bakery or flower shop? Their wine shop or small drug store, and credit union or bank?

If we don't mandate Small Bay Retail, developers will limit new retail in the base of their buildings to Large Format Retail. But there are only so many Apple Computer stores and Whole Foods that can come into an area. And people need much more than that.

They need a tailor, a shoe repair, a cafe and a hair salon, as well as a bakery and a small grocery to pick up a few items between larger grocery trips. Or they need a small grocery when they are living in apartments. They need personal grooming and workout spots.

Density housed people also needs a few small bay retail places for heritage foods for dining in and taking out, like Korean bbq or Indian or Swiss or Moroccan or bubble tea, or Thai or Italian or Dim Sum dumpling shops, or a Noodle House or German schnitzel and burgers.

One problem with all these kinds of places people \*want\* to frequent? They are \*low margin\* businesses. They can't afford the high rents developers want, nor do they want half a city block worth of space, which is the preferred format a developer would like to rent out, nor are

they giant corporations with big legal teams to agree to huge, long multi-year leases.

Developers, if they are to get upzoned properties, must be required to do Small Bay Retail, at lower rents.

I know the Housing element work is focused on housing, but I think the Council must require developers put in Small Bay Retail. And you should offer trades for additional development potential in exchange for lowered rents in order that the retail underneath or near dense housing be able to sustain itself, as a Community Benefit, with walkability and livability.

Elan did a version of this, to ameliorate community concerns at 801 El Camino (at Castro) by holding rents low for 5 years, for Rose Market, Le's Alterations, the hair shop etc. But after 5years, which we are fast approaching the end point for Elan, what will happen? Will those businesses be sent away due to high rents? What does that do for walkability for the Elan development? How do we make sure that people there and nearby have walkable amenities?

Rent controls in exchange for developer benefits would be one way to do this.

But at minimum, mandating Small Bay Retail for \*all new developments with commercial frontage\* must be done to preserve walkability and livability. To really get this right, lowered rents should be a part of the equation.

Please consider this issue seriously, or we'll find people driving miles to get what they need, and all the arguments about why we need density here in what was a farm community will have been for not.

Thank you,  
Mary Hodder

Also signed by:  
Edward Falk

**From:** [jose saldivar](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Housing element  
**Date:** Monday, June 13, 2022 9:10:30 PM

---

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

Queridos concejales, espero estén muy bien cuando resinan mi carta!

Soy María O y soy miembro de la coalición de inquilinos.

Y mi mayor preocupación es que las rentas cada día son más altas, y creo que estamos empezando a estresarnos mucho en pensar que algún día, no vamos a poder pagar la renta por los precios tal altos.

Por eso en nombre de mis vecinos, familiares y toda la comunidad de M V les pedimos una moratoria para poder pagar nuestra renta, para que en agosto o septiembre, no nos aumenten el 5 o hasta el 8%.

Si no que nos sigan cobrando el 1 o el 2% como estaban cobrando durante la pandemia, porque a vemos muchas familias que a un que ya estamos trabajando, pero no al 100 por ciento y o debemos renta o dinero, entonces por favor consideren y ojalá hagan algo por nosotros los que queremos seguir viviendo en Mountain View, y Que para nosotros es muy difícil irnos a otra ciudad donde ni siquiera sabemos cómo vamos a empezar. Muchas gracias por su atención!!