



## Mountain View General Plan Update

# MIRAMONTE/SPRINGER ROAD AREA WORKSHOP SUMMARY

August 31, 2009  
City Hall

# INTRODUCTION

---

The City of Mountain View is leading a multi-year planning process to update its General Plan, which will guide long-term growth and change in the City. A series of community outreach activities is informing development of the Mountain View General Plan Update. Over the last two years, community outreach related to the General Plan Update has included: the 2008 Community Visioning Process; targeted outreach meetings with a variety of stakeholder groups including youth, seniors, business owners, and non-English speaking groups; and two rounds of community workshops. The first round of outreach, held in spring 2009, focused on general land use and policy direction, while the second round, held in fall 2009, solicited more specific feedback to both citywide and local planning areas throughout the City of Mountain View.

During both spring and fall rounds of outreach, community workshops were held in the following areas: Miramonte/Springer; North Bayshore; San Antonio/Rengstorff; Moffett/Whisman; Central Neighborhoods; Grant Road/Sylvan Park; and Monta Loma/Farley/Rock Street. Summaries are available for each of these community workshops and are posted on the City's website at [www.mountainview2030.com](http://www.mountainview2030.com).

This document describes the purpose and format of the second round of community workshops, summarizes feedback from the **Miramonte/Springer Road Area Workshop** held on **August 31, 2009** at **City Hall**, and synthesizes community input to citywide focus areas.

## Purpose of Round 2 General Plan Update Community Workshops

During late August and throughout the month of September, staff and consultants facilitated the second round of General Plan Update community outreach meetings. The purpose of these meetings was to confirm broad planning direction and gather specific feedback to both citywide and local planning area issues and opportunities. Community members provided feedback related to land use, building form and character, specifically in relation to areas with the greatest potential for significant land use change—El Camino Real, North Bayshore and the San Antonio area. These areas were identified by community members during the first round of workshops. Participants also discussed issues and potential enhancements for local planning areas and sub-neighborhoods. Ideas and preferences from these public forums will help shape General Plan policies and land use alternatives.

## Workshop Format

The workshop began with a brief presentation to review the General Plan Update purpose and process and introduce workshop discussion topics. Next, community members participated in small group facilitated discussions of community values, vision and planning principles; local planning area themes, issues and potential

enhancements; and preferences for different village center prototypes. Graphic recorders captured changes, suggestions, and other feedback. A comment card encouraged additional input on these topics. Finally, as part of a citywide planning exercise, participants reviewed a gallery of graphic materials related to El Camino Real, North Bayshore and the San Antonio area. Using a second comment card designed to track with the gallery posters and prompts, participants indicated preferences related to land use, building form and character. The citywide comment card and corresponding graphics were also available online.

## Document Organization

This document is composed of two main parts: Part I—Summary of Local Planning Area Comments; and Part II—Summary of Citywide Planning Area Comments. A copy of the citywide comment card is provided in the Appendix at the end of the workshop summary.

***Part I: Summary of Local Planning Area Comments*** summarizes comments recorded during the Miramonte/Springer Road Planning Area Workshop discussions, as well as feedback submitted on local planning area comment cards. **This first part of the summary captures feedback specific to the Miramonte/Springer Road “host” planning area.** This section of the document is organized into headings that reflect the following workshop discussion topics.

- A. Citywide Values, Vision and Planning Principles
- B. Key Themes and Directions for the Local Planning Area
- C. Potential Community Enhancements
- D. Village Centers

***Part II: Summary of Citywide Planning Area Comments*** synthesizes input submitted on citywide comment cards, both at community workshops and online via the City of Mountain View website. **This second part of the summary provides an overview of community-wide feedback on key areas with larger implications for the entire City.** The comments in this section are organized into the following three geographic areas, with subheadings for land use, form and additional feedback.

- A. El Camino Real
- B. North Bayshore Area
- C. San Antonio Area

# I. SUMMARY OF LOCAL PLANNING AREA COMMENTS

---

## A. Citywide Values, Vision and Planning Principles

During the fall 2009 workshops, participants reviewed and commented on the following community values, vision statement and planning principles for the City of Mountain View. These were developed based on outcomes from the 2008 Community Visioning Process and feedback from the first round of targeted outreach meetings and community workshops.

### ***Community Values***

- Economic vitality
- Sustainability
- Small-town character
- Connectivity
- Diversity
- Education

### ***Vision for Mountain View***

*In 2030, the City of Mountain View embraces sustainable living and provides for the needs of all residents. It is a place that values its diversity, balances preservation with innovation, and provides quality education. The community supports a lively downtown, vibrant neighborhoods and a healthy economy.*

### ***Planning Principles***

- Accessibility and connectivity
- Affordability
- Collaboration and transparent decision-making
- Community engagement
- Community health and well-being
- Diversity and inclusivity
- Economic strength
- Education and improvement
- Neighborhood cohesiveness
- Preservation of character
- Safety and security
- Sustainability and stewardship

In general, participants supported these citywide values, vision and planning principles, and added the following point.

- Add a goal related to the environment.

## **B. Key Themes and Directions for the Local Planning Area**

During the earlier stages of the General Plan Update planning process, the following key themes and directions for the area emerged.

- Preserve the Cuesta Annex as natural space.
- Consider high density mixed-use along El Camino Real.
- Use shopping centers as opportunities for higher densities and mixed-use.
- Preserve existing single family character of neighborhood.
- Improve bike and pedestrian connections, design, and safety.
- Increase traffic calming measures such as roundabouts, bulb-outs and narrower streets.

Workshop participants reviewed and confirmed these ideas.

### *Additional Input*

- Add traffic light synchronization (from Miramonte Avenue to Highway 237).

## **C. Potential Community Enhancements**

A Local Planning Area Strategy Diagram was presented to workshop participants, outlining existing conditions, proposed improvements, and changes that emerged from conversations and studies in earlier stages of the planning process. Participants were invited to review the diagram, ask questions, and discuss ideas or concerns. During the discussion facilitator(s) drew from a number of questions that were developed in response to feedback from the initial round of workshops (May 2009) and from consultant expertise regarding specific challenges and opportunities. These prompts not only assisted participants by providing additional information and context, but also helped reaffirm or refine prior feedback on issues identified by the community. Comments below are organized into broad discussion topic areas.

### ***Land Use and New Developments***

Participants voiced concerns around resident participation in development discussions, particularly at the Cuesta Annex.

- Discuss the Cuesta Annex more extensively.
- Design buildings to reduce sound (including landscaping, etc.).
- There is a concern over the bulk and mass of development at Cuesta—

- preserve this area as open space.
- Design permeable surfaces in parking lots and other paved areas.
  - Consider high-density (three to five stories) mixed-use along El Camino Real.
  - Use shopping centers as opportunities for higher densities and mixed-use.
  - Define “moderate density.”
  - Consider water supply and infrastructure needs in planning.
  - There are views of mountains from the Cuesta Annex.
  - Develop higher density at Blossom Hill Center.
  - Developments need a good landscape buffer—Hyatt Rickey in Palo Alto is too close to the street.
  - Blossom Valley Center is a very good size. Max growth of 10 percent. No need for senior housing as Villa Siena grew to over allowed size.
  - Proposed museum in Cuesta Annex is too big.
  - Cuesta Annex community park needs discussion on the two multimillion dollar projects (drainage pit and 35’ high historic museum).
  - Preserve existing single-family character of neighborhood.
  - Maintain single-family home character; limit development and traffic during rush hour. School drop-off/pick-up are issues along corridors.
  - The El Camino Real/Grand Boulevard concept will be developed (see “C” below). To avoid future slum projects along this Grand Boulevard, development of updated noise/acoustic standards for 21st Century living is required. The present condition of 1950s acoustical standards for multi-family dwellings is subpar. One is constantly aware of neighbors’ moods, arguments, telephone calls, passing wind and amatory activities. These updated acoustic standards do not seem to be addressed! Please reference what hotels are doing in this area (acoustic control) to keep business.
  - Major strategy item for this neighborhood is to save ground-level open space in Cuesta Annex. No large buildings/no building over 17 feet. No drainage pond (ditch).
  - Allow up-zoning at corners on Springer Road and on Miramonte Avenue for small neighborhood shopping to improve walkability.
  - Mixed use should be moderate-density; not high-density.
  - Not sure I agree with high-density housing until transportation infrastructure is there first. Do not think we need a village center. We are already close to downtown and other amenities.
  - Grocery store in downtown area for the people who commute by Caltrain, neighbors.
  - Miramonte pump station landscaping no longer in character of neighborhood. Has become a serious blight.
  - Put reservoir under lowered McKelvey Field due to population growth.
  - The historic museum in Cuesta Annex would have a kitchen for meetings of the

- private club with 300 members and would require more parking than the Annex has. Also would increase neighborhood traffic on Sunday meeting days.
- More development okay at Grant Park Plaza and adjacent area across Grant Road. Senior housing okay at Grant Park Plaza “village” area.
  - El Camino Real redevelopment okay. Grand Boulevard concept—another opportunity to utilize Example 2 to maximize use, services with minimal impact.
  - Nearly one-half of Mountain View is multi-family dwellings. A program requiring no more soft-story buildings and a 21st Century solution to those buildings already built to a new stringent building code requirement. This will be key to avoiding a human/economic during our next inevitable “big one.” These new building standards are required; not merely desired.

### ***Transportation and Traffic***

Workshop participants were particularly concerned about the safety of roads in the area, with many highlighting dangers to drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians. They also noted the many challenges with getting to and through Downtown for all modes of travel, and suggested many ways this access might be improved.

- Address concerns about roundabouts.
- Address fire truck access over speed humps.
- Look at increasing transit ridership to increase bus frequency and demand.
- Address concerns about bus scheduling.
- Address traffic concerns on Miramonte Avenue.
- Traffic calming is needed on Fordham and Barbara Avenues.
- Improve transit on Miramonte Avenue.
- Create better links to Caltrain.
- Increase frequency for the 51 route.
- Put a traffic signal at the intersection of Cuesta Avenue and Springer Road.
- Crossing El Camino Real is difficult.
- Access to Grant Plaza from Phyllis is difficult.
- Create a better downtown route.
- Address utility poles on Miramonte Avenue.
- Proposed traffic calming measures are excessive.
- Add a secondary transit route on Miramonte Avenue and El Camino Real, Miramonte Avenue, or Grant Road and El Camino Real as connection to Cupertino or Los Altos.
- Maintain El Camino Real and Miramonte Avenue for pedestrians.
- Consider adding a stop sign on Rose Avenue.
- Convert Cuesta back to one lane in each direction between Miramonte Avenue and Grant Road.

- The primary transportation goal is to get from the neighborhood to the train station.
- Add City shuttle service with various stops throughout the City (similar to Palo Alto's Margarete shuttle) with links to VTA and Caltrain.
- Retain and maintain light synchronicity to improve traffic flow.
- Create bus routes from the neighborhood to Mountain View transit center as an alternative to the El Camino Real buses to Palo Alto transit center.
- Pedestrian improvements are needed on Cuesta Avenue (in addition to El Camino Real and Miramonte Avenue), including landscaping (street trees, etc.).
- El Camino Real is not safe.
- At the intersection of Miramonte and Castro, the right turn is taken too fast by vehicles traveling northbound; this is an opportunity for traffic calming.
- Grant Road is over capacity (e.g., getting through the Grant/Martens intersection can take forever).
- Better bike route from Miramonte Avenue to Mountain View High School (via Cuesta Avenue or Covington Road) on Grant Road.
- Traffic calming seems to just move problems elsewhere.
- Need more traffic control along Miramonte Avenue, especially near St. Francis High School.
- Would be nice to make it safer to cross El Camino Real.
- Traffic-calming measures tend to be excessive. Bike access to Castro Street can be improved, better safety for shopping and transit to train station.

### ***Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transit Access***

Workshop participants highlighted a number of pedestrian needs in the area, both on streets and along trails. Participants felt that bicycle safety needed to be addressed in many parts of the neighborhood, and that there was a need for bicycle lanes on many streets.

- Improve pedestrian and bicycle connections to schools and parks.
- Enhance the pedestrian and biking experience with more protected routes, shade and other comfort-enhancing strategies.
- Provide ADA access for pedestrians and wheelchairs.
- Ask students where they prefer to bike and walk.
- There is very heavy traffic near St. Francis High School, which makes it difficult to cross for pedestrians; there may be a need to add an additional stoplight.
- Improve crosswalks and connections across El Camino Real and Grant Road.
- Crossing at crosswalks along El Camino Real is very unsafe; provide more police presence.
- The intersection of Cuesta Avenue and Springer Road is unsafe for pedestrians, and may need a controlled light during school hours.

- Parts of Miramonte Avenue lack sidewalks.
- The lighted crosswalk does allow safe crossing at the intersection of Cuesta Drive and Springer Road.
- Schoolchildren can use routes to school other than Springer Road.
- Better connections to trails are needed.
- Improve the pedestrian/bicycle crossing at El Camino Real and Grant Road.
- It is a challenge to get from Northwest to Cuesta (Blossom Valley area)—the creek and school block the direct connection.
- The intersection of Grant Road and El Camino Real is very unsafe for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- There is no direct pedestrian access from Graham Middle School to Bubb Elementary School.
- Provide different paving material for crosswalks that will cause motorists to slow down.
- Provide additional striping for crosswalks or lighted crosswalks similar to Los Altos or Palo Alto.
- Improve overall bicycle/pedestrian safety around schools.
- Traffic calming seems to just move problems elsewhere.
- Need more traffic control along Miramonte Avenue, especially near St. Francis High School.
- Would be nice to make it safer to cross El Camino Real.
- Traffic-calming measures tend to be excessive.
- Slow down traffic - too many cars run through crosswalks while pedestrians crossing; especially people turning right on red lights.
- Ensure that methods of traffic calming measures are appropriate and context-specific.
- City shuttle service would be great.
- Need better public transportation and access to Caltrain and light rail.
- Traffic light at Cuesta Drive/Springer Road.
- Caution on Miramonte Avenue—cars back up at Covington Road stop sign to St. Francis High School at 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. during school year. Should add a South Drive drop-off to St. Francis High School.
- Improve bicycle connections and routes to school.
- Add bike lanes on Grand Road.
- Improve bike access on Castro Street.
- Biking along Castro Street, especially during school pick-up/drop-off, is unsafe—parents are not paying attention.
- A loop detector is needed at the intersections of Miramonte, Cuesta, and Barbara Avenues.

- Miramonte Avenue near McKelvey needs bike lanes.
- Bike improvements are needed on Calderon Avenue north of El Camino Real.
- Martens to Stevens Creek would work as a bicycle connection.
- Crossing El Camino Real is unsafe on bikes.
- Provide bike access from Phyllis to Calderon Avenues.
- It is difficult for bicyclists to get to the shops on Castro Street.
- Better bike route from Miramonte Avenue to Mountain View High School (via Cuesta Avenue or Covington Road) on Grant Road.
- Bike access to Castro Street can be improved, better safety for shopping and transit to train station.
- Like the pedestrian/bike improvements on Miramonte Avenue. Wider bike lane. Maybe shrink cars to one lane.
- Improved bike connection between Miramonte Avenue to Mountain View High School.

### ***Housing***

Workshop participants felt there was a need for low-income housing to be distributed across the entire City, and were concerned about how best to meet military housing needs.

- Allow granny units.
- New housing sites could help create connections.
- Housing could go into the underutilized area around El Camino Real and Rich Place.
- Move senior housing closer to Grant Road.
- High-density housing at Blossom Valley may be more politically tractable if designated senior only.

### ***Parks, Open Space and Schools***

Participants also had ideas about what types of new open spaces were needed in the community.

- More parks with water features such as Mitchell Park (Palo Alto) and Ortega Park (Sunnyvale).
- Develop a community garden at Cuesta.
- Community garden at Cuesta Park Annex. Continue trails. Connect neighborhoods and schools for biking.

## **Other**

- Allow gray water use.
- Consider the reservoir under McKelvey.
- Consider ABAG's influence on Mountain View.

## **D. Village Centers**

During this part of the discussion, participants learned about three village center prototypes that could potentially be used in the neighborhood: a one-story commercial model, a two-story mixed-use model, and three- to four-story mixed-use model. Each prototype was presented graphically to illustrate form, massing, and other aspects of design so that the group could see how such a center might fit into the neighborhood fabric. Facilitators explained that a village center provides local retail, community services, small public gathering areas, and other community amenities to support the daily needs of residents. The group then discussed each type of village center, reflecting on the advantages and disadvantages of each and identifying which type or types of village center might be appropriate in different parts of the local planning area. The graphics depicted three examples of potential village center development, described as follows.

*Example #1* depicted a single-story commercial center similar to many that exist in Mountain View today. Key elements of *Example #1* included:

- One-story building
- Conventional low-rise shopping center
- Commercial uses only
- High proportion of lot is dedicated to parking
- Large surface parking area located adjacent to the sidewalk and street
- Typical of existing commercial developments in the area

*Example #2* featured two-story mixed-use development for the village center. Key elements of *Example #2* included:

- Two-story building
- Mixed-use development
- Balanced distribution of building footprint and parking areas
- Surface parking located behind building
- Building located adjacent to sidewalk
- Potential for more activity along sidewalk and street

*Example #3* offered a more intense development pattern for the village center. Key elements of *Example #3* included:

- Three- to four-story building
- Mixed-use development
- Intensive land use
- Surface, podium and structured parking
- Parking minimally visible from street
- Building footprint with minimal or no setback
- Increased potential for more activity along sidewalk and street

Participants supported the concept of village center nodes, but felt that the neighborhood had many walkable amenities already. Opinions were split on what type of buildings might be appropriate for the Blossom Valley Center. Participants also suggested several other potential sites for expanded local services.

- Example #2 seems appropriate for Blossom Valley Center.
- The neighborhood has a lot of amenities within walking distance already. Mixed-use/higher density is not a necessity in this area.
- Example #2 seems appropriate at the intersection of Castro Street and El Camino Real. Provide pedestrian amenities; it is currently a dead corner. Transit is already there, and the intersection can handle the traffic.
- Add a farmer's market at Blossom Valley Center—the current market is crowded.
- Examples #2 or #3 could be acceptable if they were stepped back with articulation.
- Example #3 does not seem to fit in with the village center concept.
- At Blossom Valley, protect the privacy of adjacent single-family homes. Example #1 seems appropriate here, provided it is sensitive to the surroundings.
- At Grant Park Plaza, Example #2 or #3 could be appropriate.
- Example #1 could be good at Grant Park Plaza if it were better to walk through.
  - Nice low-profile buildings
  - Lower profile parking areas
- The structured parking behind buildings in Example #3 is good, but generally this is not a good fit at Blossom Valley.
- Mixed use seems appropriate in village centers.
- Examples #2 or #3 would help support business, but generally Examples #1 or #2 seem most appropriate for Blossom Valley, not Example #3.
- There is a concern about additional traffic around Blossom Valley Center which could come with mixed-use.
- Examples #2 or #3 would be appropriate on El Camino Real with good design.
- Clarify village concept.

- Not many homes are within walking distance of Blossom Valley.
- Consider leaving Blossom Valley as it is.
- Parking is problem at Blossom Valley; expanding uses here would require a parking structure.
- Example #2 seems appropriate at the intersection of El Camino Real and El Monte Road.
- Blossom Valley Center should be no more than two stories.
- Example #1 seems appropriate for Blossom Valley.
- Example #2 seems appropriate along El Camino Real.
- Nob Hill can be a village center (and also to a larger area).
- It doesn't matter what I like. ABAG requirements and real estate development and population pressures will necessitate three- to four-story mixed-use "village centers."
- Will be nice to have a farmers market similar to the Thursday evening one in Los Altos, but runs all year round.
- Existing retail sufficient in residential neighborhood.
- Entire center should be single-story but high attic okay.
- Blossom Valley Shopping Center is a virtual two-story design that only utilizes one story. Example #2 would optimize the space, increase diverse services with minimal visual change.

## II. SUMMARY OF CITYWIDE PLANNING AREA COMMENTS

---

During the first round of neighborhood workshops in May 2009, participants identified three key areas of potential change that had larger implications for the entire City of Mountain View: El Camino Real, North Bayshore, and the San Antonio area. The fall 2009 workshops provided community members with an opportunity to weigh in on future planning directions for these key areas.

At each workshop, facilitators encouraged participants to review a gallery of images illustrating potential future development in El Camino Real, North Bayshore, and the San Antonio area. The gallery presented key information on potential land use and development form and character, depicting a range of options for community members to review. The boards also posed a number of questions to participants to gauge support for the different types of development. For those who could not attend a workshop, the same gallery of images was provided online with an interactive comment card that could be submitted electronically. In total, 149 participants completed comment cards (electronically and at workshops) targeting the citywide areas.

**This second part of the document provides an overview of community-wide feedback on key areas with larger implications for the entire City.** The responses summarized below are derived from input submitted on citywide comment cards, both at community workshops and online via the City of Mountain View website. The comments in this section are organized into three geographic areas: El Camino Real; North Bayshore Area; and the San Antonio Area. Within each of these geographic areas, additional subheadings reflect topics included in the citywide comment card and gallery: land use; form; and additional feedback.

Where multiple respondents gave the same comment, it is listed only once. However, the overall percentages of respondents who favored specific uses and forms in each citywide planning area is presented with each question in order to provide a snapshot of overall community opinion on future change in these areas.

## A. El Camino Real

### *Land Use – El Camino Real*

*Where should high intensity mixed-use be located along El Camino Real?*

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 38.5 percent felt that high intensity mixed-use should be located only at key locations.
- 57.7 percent felt that high intensity mixed-use should be located along the entire corridor.
- 3.8 percent felt that this growth was not appropriate anywhere on the corridor.

### *Form – El Camino Real*

*Is there a place for three-story, four-story, or more than five-story building heights along El Camino Real? If so, where?*

Generally, there was strong support for buildings of three stories and relatively strong support for building heights of four stories. Respondents were divided on building heights of five stories or more, and many of those who did support these buildings were very specific about where they should be permitted.

#### Three-Story Building Heights

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 85.0 percent were comfortable with three-story buildings.
- 15.0 percent were not comfortable with three-story buildings.

Respondents felt three-story buildings would be appropriate:

- Anywhere/along the entire corridor.
- Almost anywhere.
- Where possible.
- Along the entire street that is not four- or five-story zones.
- In-between density corridors.
- Anywhere but it should be mixed with two-story.
- Everywhere in-between major intersections.
- Everywhere except at critical zones.
- At key locations.
- In commercial areas, if the aesthetic is pleasing.
- At hubs of activity (Castro, San Antonio, Grant Road).

- From Castro to El Monte.
- At Miramonte or Showers.
- At El Camino Real and Castro.
- Near transit stops.
- Clustered together, or next to four-story buildings.
- From Escuela to Oak and View to Calderon (where adjacent lots are historic single family home neighborhoods).
- South of Rengstorff, all along ECR to Sunnyvale—but more setback needed.
- From San Antonio to Castro, set back from street.
- Primarily at distances from transit hubs.
- Between Rengstorff and San Antonio.
- From Shoreline to San Antonio.
- At Shoreline.
- At San Antonio Center.
- Away from Castro.
- Between Grant and Shoreline.
- East El Camino.
- Towards Sunnyvale.
- Along less intense areas with transit service.

#### Four-Story Building Heights

- 67.7 percent were comfortable with four-story buildings.
- 32.3 percent were not comfortable with four-story buildings.

Respondents felt four-story buildings would be appropriate:

- Anywhere.
- Around the five-story zones.
- Anywhere, but set back behind the lower buildings.
- At or near major intersections.
- At hubs of activity (Castro, San Antonio, Grant Road).
- At key locations.
- At main intersections and along corridor.
- All major intersections and from Highway 85 to Sunnyvale border.
- Only at select high intensity intersections.
- Near transit stops.
- Near transit hubs, except height transitions are needed to one- to two-story residential.
- At Sylvan.

- At Grant/Castro.
- Where no single-family homes are within 250 feet of El Camino Real.
- In commercial areas, if the aesthetic is pleasing.
- Back away from the street.
- In the high intensity areas identified in the previous page.
- Clustered together, or next to three-story buildings.
- At critical zones only.
- From San Antonio to Castro, set back from street.
- Between Rengstorff and San Antonio.
- Between El Monte and San Antonio.
- At busy intersections—Castro and Shoreline.

#### Five-Story or Higher Building Heights

- 45.1 percent were comfortable with five-story or higher buildings.
- 54.9 percent were not comfortable with five-story or higher buildings.

Respondents felt five-story buildings would be appropriate:

- Anywhere.
- Along the entire corridor, except when close to one- to two-story residential where a transition should be applied.
- At key locations.
- Near transit stops or hubs.
- Near transit hubs, except where height transitions are needed to one to two-story residential.
- At major intersections.
- Where no single-family homes are within 350 feet of El Camino Real.
- In industrialized areas with limited housing.
- Mid-block behind lower buildings, but not on corners.
- San Antonio Center.
- In the high intensity areas.
- From San Antonio to Ortega and at the Castro Street and Grant/237 intersections.
- At critical zones only, considered to be gateways to Mountain View.
- In all commercial zones; transitions can be applied to areas adjacent to one to two-story residential neighborhoods.
- At Grant/Castro.
- Near density corridors.
- No more than one every four blocks.

*How close should buildings be placed to El Camino Real?*

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 7.6 percent were comfortable with buildings directly adjacent to the street.
- 70.3 percent were comfortable with buildings close to the street.
- 25.4 percent were comfortable with buildings further from the street.

*Percentages total more than 100 percent because some respondents favored more than one type of setback.*

### **Additional Feedback – El Camino Real**

*New Developments: Form*

- Prefer to see higher-density in this area versus existing residential areas.
- Fill in open spaces.
- Development at Castro/El Camino Real and Grant/El Camino Real is an opportunity that should be encouraged.
- Three-story development along the entire corridor, with five-story or higher development for key locations.
- Yes to three- or four-story development; no to five stories or more.
- Three-story development along the entire corridor, with four-story development for key locations only.
- Yes to three- or four-story development; no to five stories or more.
- Three-story development was identified for the Miramonte & Showers areas, with four-story okay at Castro Street and near Grant Road.
- Yes to three-, four-, or five-story or more development.
- Yes to three-story development if use calls for tall ceiling. Four-story is appropriate for mixed-use, and five or more stories is appropriate for the corner in Grant and Castro.
- Three stories alright at Miramonte and El Camino; four stories alright at Grant Road and El Camino.
- Three-story development is alright next to any two-story development, while four-story development is appropriate on Evelyn only or next to an existing three-story development.
- Yes to three-story development; no to four stories or more.
- Maybe for three-story development.
- Three-story development is alright all along the corridor; four-story development is alright at key intersections. Five or more stories is too tall.
- Yes to three- or four-story development; no to five stories or more.
- Three- or four-story development is alright everywhere.
- Development should be further from the street; we need parking visibility to avoid traffic delays on El Camino.

- Development should be close to the sidewalk, except at corners.
- Development should not be directly adjacent to sidewalk.
- Development should be close to the street, with space for pedestrians.
- Construct high density, mixed-used developments with ample greenery and sustainable construction.
- Allow development opportunities to proceed as they arise. The fragmented land-use patterns and small-lots will make it difficult for redevelopment.
- Build diverse, randomly-mixed buildings along corridor.
- Evaluate the placement of buildings on a site-by-site basis.
- Provide more imaginative architecture, green plazas and public use spaces.
- All of El Camino Real should be zoned for five or more stories and property owners should develop the size they feel.
- Buildings should be further from the street, with plazas.
- Three-story buildings seem appropriate in high intensity areas (El Camino Real and Castro Street).
- Two to three stories.
- Three-story buildings should be away from Castro Street.
- The Avalon Apartment towers on El Camino (and the neighboring office towers) are too tall and too close to the street. The issue is not the design (the buildings are attractively-designed). The issue is their imposing size—too overwhelming. I do not support buildings taller than four stories along El Camino Real.
- Establish some minimum set of architectural guidelines for a more uniform street view.
- Building setbacks should be enough to provide a comfortable barrier to the traffic on El Camino. Utilizing multi-story designs to increase density and variety of shops, services, and housing is recommended.
- Incentivize developers with an interest in El Camino property development and hold them to a high standard in advance of the implementation of Grand Boulevard initiatives.

#### *New Developments: Land Uses*

- Allow for diverse businesses including child care, medical, residential, etc.
- El Camino Real is a good spot for mixed-use building rather than in the neighborhood itself.
- Encourage the existing Development Dept. to do something about vacant commercial properties. Several have been vacant for over a year, and vacant properties in such a prominent area attract transients and other trouble-makers.
- Encourage new business, where appropriate. Mountain View residents should ask themselves why businesses (Whole Foods, Elephant Pharmacy) choose to

- get situated in Los Altos rather than Mountain View and what can Mountain View can do to appeal to new business.
- All inclusive integrated development.
  - Need to see more specialized retail.
  - The vacancy rate on El Camino Real keeps increasing.
  - The businesses scheduled to be eliminated at San Antonio Center are the ones that I need: Sears, Rite Aid, and Sports Authority. Please keep these, bring back Penney's, and add some (e.g., Macy's) and make the stores, including Target, more comparable to their sister stores (e.g., in Cupertino). These stores serve the neighborhood and people who shop on foot. Boutique shops will bring traffic to an impacted area. Also, one-story stores and parking are more accessible and elder/handicapped friendly.
  - I sincerely doubt many people would want to live on El Camino Real.

#### *New Developments: Character*

- Parts of El Camino Real are an eyesore. I would like more uniformity along the entire corridor.
- Bring more historic spirit to El Camino Real (Mission style of buildings, etc.).
- Good ideas: Grand Boulevard.
- El Camino is ugly—used car lots, strip malls, vacant lots. We have the opportunity to turn it into a grand boulevard with commercial and residential. Frankly, El Camino feels very shoddy, especially between Grant Road and Shoreline. Lots of run down businesses, etc.
- Updating or rebuilding the old dilapidated buildings will greatly improve the look of the community. Many need face lifts!
- A general clean up and face lift for a clean and consistent look.
- Needs major improvement/updating. Buildings, sidewalks are falling apart.
- The part in Mountain View is an eyesore. We need trees and landscaping by the sidewalk and median, using native drought-tolerant plants. Why can't it look like Castro Street? The shape of the commercial buildings along El Camino is so boring and utilitarian.

#### *Parks, Open Space, and Climate Change Impact*

- Preserve Mountain View open spaces and add additional parks.
- Provide a lot of landscaping near sidewalks.
- Place trees and landscaping adjacent to El Camino Real.
- Reduce noise and air pollution.
- Increase the number of street trees and improve landscaping. Landscaping shall be drought tolerant and when applicable, incorporate stormwater management best management practices

### *Traffic and Parking*

- Add red light cameras—way too many people run the red lights and roll through right hand turns.
- While I like the Grand Boulevard Initiative (in theory) as well as the “maximizing development opportunities,” we must first remember that the purpose of El Camino Real is to move traffic. Too much density can turn this major east-west thoroughfare into a parking lot. From the standpoint of aesthetics, Two Worlds seems to me to provide a nice prototype. The heights and density is manageable; and the landscaping and trees make it an oasis.
- Timed lights.
- You must consider the traffic flow into El Camino especially those main thoroughfares that feed from Highway 101. Right now more development is being considered near San Antonio when San Antonio is itself at or near capacity several hours of every day including weekends.

### *Pedestrian and Bicycle Access*

- Better pedestrian crossings.
- More pedestrian-friendly development.
- Enhance walkability from Stevens Creek Trail head at El Camino along El Camino real to Grant Road.
- Sidewalks along El Camino real need full repair (tree roots are getting out).
- How long will it be before the horribly buckled sidewalks along El Camino Real are fixed? These are a hazard. I’d like to see the City fix them and bill the State, rather than waiting for the State to take action.
- Pedestrian crossings over El Camino Real (e.g., bridges).
- You absolutely need to provide pedestrian access to the El Camino—the Grant Road shopping area, in particular—from the Whisman neighborhood. We are completely shut off from the El Camino except by auto.
- Improve safety and comfort of pedestrian crossings. El Camino is a big psychological barrier to a walkable City.
- The area should be more bike-friendly.
- Walkability and bikeability are key.
- El Camino Real is not bike friendly, any improvements to that would be welcome.
- I completely agree that bicycle and pedestrian improvements are extremely important. This should continue to be a high priority as a very important issue for improving El Camino Real.
- Add bike lanes.
- The biggest hurdle is safe crossing for bicyclists and pedestrians across San Antonio *and* across Central Expressway.
- Future streetscapes should take into consideration making it more walkable

and bikeable. That includes providing shade for walkers and bikers, who often have to wait quite long before they are allowed to cross roads, all the while standing in burning sun and traffic noise.

- Finding a safe way to incorporate bike access.
- Make it pedestrian and bike friendly: e.g., separate car, pedestrian, and bike lanes.
- Whisman neighborhood needs bicycle/pedestrian access to Grant/El Camino corridor. Currently, this can only be reached by car.
- Consider sharrows for outside lanes for car/bike sharing.
- Only that lane usage protocols should be redone to allow for safe bicycle use with no conflicts with parked cars, bus stops, etc. (This should be done on all major thoroughfares in Mountain View, not just El Camino Real.)

### *Transit*

- Improve frequency of transit and connections.
- Extend the light rail from Shoreline Boulevard along El Camino Real to Palo Alto.
- If there are more intense uses, transit must be given priority over increased auto use. Consider a bus only lane, better pedestrian facilities, and mid-block crosswalks.
- Use of Palo Alto type shuttle service to connect to Caltrain, tram and bus services.
- Personal Rapid Transit (e.g., <http://www.unimodal.com/>) should be contemplated in a long term plan. There's a PRT prototype to be built between Castro Street, Google, and NASA Ames, and depending on the success of that deployment, further extensions should be contemplated.
- I agree with the idea of maximizing development opportunities, but based on comments I've heard in meetings a significant number of residents want to plan for zero or negative population growth in Mountain View by minimizing development. Only one Rapid Bus serves Mountain View, the 522 bus, stopping at El Camino Real and Showers Dr (San Antonio Shopping Center) and El Camino Real and Castro a few blocks from Downtown. Plan instead for high-frequency bus transit, like 22.
- The concept of "future bus stops" seems a little vague. How do we know for sure those stops will be there when we start the developments?
- Seems like bus rapid transit stops might be subject to change. Might be good to concentrate higher intensity along the whole of El Camino.

### *Parking*

- Aside from street parking, the remaining parking should be at the rear of structures and/or underground.

- Put parking behind buildings and buildings on El Camino Real.
- Lack of parking and unfriendly pedestrian access prevents El Camino from becoming a place that is desirable to frequent. Parking needs to be located off street.

#### *Gateways*

- The corner at Castro Street should be more of a gateway. Fix the sidewalks near Grant Road.
- Put a welcome to downtown Mountain View sign/archway at the entry of Castro Street.

#### *Other*

- Discourage or eliminate loitering on El Camino. I do not feel safe having my daughter walk/ride to school with unemployed men hanging around the street.
- I'm concerned that it reads like a wish list. In reality there are powerful trade-offs that we need to make. While the public meetings did a good job of surfacing "what people want," you didn't confront us with the cost or implications of our desires. We can have low density housing, for example, but only by distorting the range of housing prices and pushing out the bottom half of the job hierarchy. I wish you had shown us the trade-offs and asked how we would manage the tensions.

## B. North Bayshore Area

### *Land Use – North Bayshore Area*

*Should high intensity office uses and mixed-use residential be allowed in North Bayshore? If so, where?*

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 71.6 percent felt that high intensity office uses and mixed-use residential should be allowed.
- 28.4 percent felt that high intensity office uses and mixed-use residential should not be allowed.

Respondents who supported these uses felt that they would be most appropriate:

- Everywhere.
- Everywhere, but keep parks.
- At key locations.
- Adjacent to 101.
- In areas with freeway access.
- In areas further from Shoreline Park.
- Along Shoreline, at the end of Amphitheater Parkway.
- In existing areas.
- Near transit nodes.
- Along Shoreline, Space Park, and Shorebird.
- Along Shoreline Boulevard, Charleston Road, and Amphitheatre Parkway.
- Offices anywhere; residential near Shoreline and Rengstorff.
- Wherever possible; it eliminates “dark zones” at night.
- Western portion so that access to San Antonio and Rengstorff is emphasized; Shoreline is already crowded.
- In “leftover” areas around major employers like Google and only if it’s not in flood plain.
- Where it is already developed only.
- Shoreline and Amphitheatre Parkway.
- More medium-density residential in North Bayshore please to cut down on commute traffic.
- Wherever Google wants!
- Grow and intensify the existing center around the Century Theaters, and maybe one other near Costco; rebuild the 101 interchange there.
- Primarily in the Shoreline corridor and between San Antonio and Rengstorff.

- Along Shoreline Boulevard to Charleston—but only if increased transit service/light rail extension occurs.
- Every where in the North Bayshore but not in addition to building on El Camino Real—one or the other (I would prefer housing in North Bayshore).
- Maybe along the Bayshore Freeway corridor.
- Proximate to services and transit connections and away from heavy industrial uses.
- Along and east of North Shoreline, for example in Space Park Walk area.
- In all areas except open space, in particular on East Shoreline.
- Yes, but only if developments are designed to accommodate sea-level rise
- On L'Avenida, near Google.
- Along Amphitheater Parkway and Charleston.
- On Shoreline Boulevard and east.
- Where many office building are currently vacant.
- On edges.
- Near big employers.
- Alongside child care.
- Along Shoreline Boulevard.

### **Form – North Bayshore Area**

*Is there a place for three-story, four-story, or more than five-story building heights in the North Bayshore area? If so, where?*

The majority of comment card respondents were comfortable with three-story, four-story, five-story, or higher buildings in the North Bayshore area, although many expressed concerns about transitions back to lower density residential areas. As in other areas, lower building heights had the strongest support, with over three quarters of respondents endorsing three-story buildings in North Bayshore. A number of participants also suggested specific areas where they felt a given building height might be most appropriate.

#### Three-Story Building Heights

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 77.9 percent were comfortable with three-story buildings.
- 22.1 percent were not comfortable with three-story buildings.

Respondents felt three-story buildings would be appropriate:

- Everywhere.
- Along Shoreline Boulevard.

- Everywhere, as it is non-residential.
- For sight lines.
- Far from Shoreline Boulevard.
- Close to Shoreline Lake.
- Next to Shoreline Park.
- Around major employers.
- Dependent on structural engineering.
- Both main streets.
- Around edges.
- At key locations.
- Not too close to street/sidewalk.
- By the other tall buildings.
- Near housing.
- In areas not served well by transit.
- Along main streets.
- Along Charleston and Amphitheater Parkway.
- Along inner blocks.

#### Four-Story Building Heights

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 68.6 percent were comfortable with four-story buildings.
- 31.4 percent were not comfortable with four-story buildings.

Respondents felt four-story buildings would be appropriate:

- Anywhere.
- Anywhere above sea level.
- Far from parks and trails.
- Along Shoreline Boulevard.
- Close to Highway 101.
- Near Highway 101, midway to Shoreline Park.
- Along key corridors in North Bayshore.
- At key locations.
- In core areas.
- Areas along major transit corridors.
- Near main streets.
- Set back from streets.
- Around major employers and at major intersections.

- Where it is already developed.
- Dependent on structural engineering.
- Between five or more and three-story buildings.
- Not too close to street/sidewalk.
- By the other tall buildings.
- Between housing and taller buildings.
- Near Rengstorff and Highway 101.
- Near existing high buildings.
- Near big employers.
- Along Shoreline.
- Open.

#### Five-Story or Higher Building Heights

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 54.0 percent were comfortable with five-story buildings or higher.
- 46.0 percent were not comfortable with five-story or higher buildings.

Respondents felt five-story or higher buildings would be appropriate:

- Anywhere.
- In all areas except when close to one to two-story residential where a transition is appropriate.
- On North Shoreline, with transition when close to one to two-story residential.
- Along main streets.
- Along Shoreline Boulevard.
- Adjacent to Shoreline Boulevard.
- East of Shoreline Boulevard.
- Along or near Highway 101.
- In the southern sections.
- Set back from streets.
- Where it is already developed.
- Dependent on structural engineering.
- In the center, so height tapers toward edges.
- At key locations.
- Not too close to street/sidewalk.
- In the high intensity area(s).
- By the other tall buildings.
- High is good.

- Furthest from housing.
- In areas at intersections with major transit stops.
- Close to transit nodes and services.
- Near the freeway to lessen traffic concerns and visual impact on the park.
- Along interior streets.
- For a hotel or conference services.

*How close should buildings be placed to the street in North Bayshore?*

- 26.7 percent were comfortable with buildings positioned directly adjacent to the street.
- 47.5 percent were comfortable with buildings positioned far from the street with landscaping.
- 25.8 percent were comfortable with buildings positioned far from the street with parking.

*Percentages total more than 100 percent because some respondents favored more than one type of setback.*

### ***Additional Feedback – North Bayshore Area***

*New Developments: Form*

- Two to three stories.
- Buildings should be far from street, landscaped, with plazas.
- The setback should depend on whether it's a pedestrian/commercial use or an industrial campus.
- No more than two to three stories.
- Three-story buildings should be away from Castro Street.
- Light industrial should be setback and offices should be close to the street for connectivity with other businesses and transit.
- Three-story buildings should be directly adjacent to the street; four-story buildings should be far from the street with landscaping; and five-story buildings should be far from the street with parking.
- Building heights: we do favor increasing the FARs and building heights to six stories and six stories plus parking structures' height if needed to develop parking.
- Consider four-story buildings further from Shoreline Boulevard, Shoreline Recreational Area and Steven Creek Trail (walking public should be avoided from hanging high buildings above).
- Consider three-story buildings everywhere.
- Consider four- and five-story buildings along Shoreline.
- No for four- and five-story buildings; yes for three.

- Three stories for office spaces. Match local heights.
- Three, four, or five stories.
- Three stories if use for tall ceiling, four stories for mixed-use office and light industrial, and five stories for a hotel on Shoreline.
- No for four- and five-story buildings; maybe for three.
- Buildings should be far from the street and landscaped, but this could vary by building use with Planning Committee and plan approval.
- Plan for multi-story development greater than four stories. Plan for one or two, not more, high intensity residential-retail-office centers with high-frequency public transit between them and to other high-frequency public transit.
- Buildings should be directly adjacent to sidewalk. Use recycled water for plantings. Office parks often have green space in front of them that no one really uses.
- Do not increase development intensities.
- Large (four or more floors) buildings should have green space in front, and single-family homes need front yards.
- Retail or residential can be adjacent to the sidewalk or close to the sidewalk. Large office buildings should continue to be far from the sidewalk with parking.
- Height shouldn't be as much of a concern as the visual angle from the street. If there's a two-story building 100 feet from the street, it's pretty much the same as a four-story building 200 feet from the street visually. Higher buildings further from the street allow more of a chance for landscaping to hide the building, provide a visually greener environment, provide potential recreational uses, absorb carbon dioxide, etc. Parking would preferably be underground to be more visually appealing, allow better/more landscaping, provide covered spaces, etc.
- This close proximity to the street would give it the feel of a vibrant metropolis, but I would want to see the close-to-street design reserved for purposes that have wide shared use, such as public buildings, shopping, etc. Business applications with specified users would be best set up at a further distance from the street to designate those spaces as primarily limited to pre-determined users.
- Building setback depends on availability of parking at the rear of building.
- In the high intensity center(s), buildings should be closer to the sidewalk.

#### *New Developments: Land Use*

- Would be nice to see a second commercial hub similar to downtown with restaurants, retail, etc.
- Keep Walmart, Targets, Costco, etc. away from residential areas.
- Build the correct mix of retail/commercial in order to ease traffic on El Camino Real and Castro Street.

- Build mixed-use, residential and commercial, but take into consideration sea level rise and Permanente Creek flooding issues.
- Provide more services.
- North Bayshore Area is too far from center to be used for residential.
- High intensity office uses and mixed-use residential should be spread out.
- Only mixed-use residential along Shoreline and Charleston Road.
- Not enough services or schools to support residential.
- Construct a village center for employees to live, eat, and shop.
- Leave large square foot corporate industrial and office in this area.
- This might be a good location for some below-market rate housing.
- Family housing shouldn't have place among company's buildings. It's very uncomfortable to residents and public.
- Only large office and commercial.
- The North Bayshore needs a gas station and fast food service.
- Consider high intensity office and mixed-use along Shoreline Boulevard and west side.
- Residential housing, at reasonable prices, is over largest issue in Silicon Valley.
- Consider high intensity office and mixed-use on Shoreline Boulevard, Charleston Road, and Amphitheatre Parkway.
- Open to high intensity office uses and mixed-use residential.
- Target areas where existing mixed-use and high intensity office spaces are located—along Shoreline and surrounding streets.
- Mixed use along Shoreline and at the end of Amphitheatre Parkway. You will need a school if you put more people on that side of Highway 101. This Amphitheater makes it undesirable to live in North Bayshore.
- This area is crying for high-density residential opportunities for those who work nearby.
- I'm not sure about high intensity office and mixed-use residential.
- Dense housing should also be built here, along with some retail, in a "dense urban village" style.
- Consider some commercial uses, such as retail stores. Those office workers gotta eat!
- Population growth should be in North Bayshore and not in existing neighborhoods.
- The lack of housing in the North Bayshore area requires heavy traffic and commuting for anybody working there. More medium-density housing in North Bayshore please.
- They should plan for overnight stays of businesspeople to the existing businesses. Visitors should not have to spend the night miles away from the business that they are visiting.

- Residential development is appropriate in mixed-use situations, not where it is residential only—but leave the existing residential uses alone.
- This is where Mountain View should plan for high density/mixed-use housing.
- More schools in proportion to increased housing.

#### *New Developments: Character*

- Make it nice. There's lots of room.
- The less intense development in Mountain View the better for quality of life, less pollution, less traffic, more open space, more safety, more aesthetic, more preservation of Mountain View's unique character, etc. But better to have intense development in North Bayshore, as long as open space is preserved, than in existing residential neighborhoods.
- I would like to mention that this area should have more trees and new development should preserve existing trees. Residential development should be a priority supported with plans for a school or two in the area.

#### *Parks, Open Space, and Climate Change Impact*

- Analyze sea level rise and mitigation measures.
- Water issues: What about water desalination? Make use of Bay water—cutting edge.
- Incentives for solar and wind generated power. Solar requires federal and state subsidies and wind may break even or a little better but I believe wind is also subsidized. Therefore:
  - Neither wind nor solar stand on their own and are already getting subsidies.
  - Solar doesn't generate at night and is reduced on cloudy days and in the winter.
  - Wind does not blow consistently, therefore is sporadic.
  - The City should not give incentives for power systems that have to be paid for or subsidized by the public coffers.
  - The City should come up with guidelines to allow solar and wind generators to install the system if someone wants to install them but say no to "incentives" that someone else has to pay for.
- We need reliable base load power and we need nuclear power plants and the cities should be doing intensive lobbying to overturn the restrictions that California has placed on nuclear power that makes it impossible in California. Cities and politicians are going to make this country a third world nation by continuing to kowtow to the Sierra Club and other environmentalist that are really just employment agencies for attorneys that get fat off of lawsuits that cost this country's citizens, taxpayers and consumers nothing but money and reduces our standard of living.

- Allow new business to support the growth in this area, more open space.
- Impacts on open space and traffic should be considered.
- BMX park.
- Key Theme: Preserve open space and buffer zones, natural character and trails. Key Planning considerations: Preserve park area, minimum retail for employees to promote dining/retail in down town area.
- Climate change is going to flood this area. Please plan ahead—levee, barrier, etc. so we don't have a disaster in the future and crash the real estate price in the rest of Mountain View because this becomes a huge news item!
- Keep as much open space as possible.
- Concerns about tide changes and water level changes.
- This is one of the few areas where there is space to add additional athletic fields. It should be utilized.
- I am very concerned about the impacts of sea level rise over time, meaning the probability of increasingly frequent, or constant, flooding. All development proposals of any sort should be evaluated first, before any other reviews, on established criteria (need to set up!) specifically concerning this issue. I am also concerned about the lack of practical transit options, roads or public transit, between this area and the rest of Mountain View.
- Use recycled water for plantings.
- Recycled water should be used to support planting. Buildings should be directly adjacent as well as far away from the sidewalk and landscaped (for pedestrians and bicycles) in areas that have residences.
- Use recycled water for all landscaping.
- Preserve shoreline trail and its benefits of scenery and healthy outdoor activity.
- Strongly consider impacts of sea level rise over time.
- All buildings should use recycled water for landscaping, and xeriscaping should be encouraged, probably required.
- Strongly consider impacts of sea level rise over time. It will flood; it's just a matter of time...and will the impact be catastrophic for Mountain View when it does?
- Buildings' entry level should be raised five to six feet from ground level for flexibility in reconstruction in case of sea level rise and/or flooding. Conceptually similar to the residential area of the new San Antonio Avenue community center near 101.

#### *Traffic and Parking*

- Automobiles as transportation: Automobiles are necessary and will continue to be the primary transportation and appropriate infrastructure should be provided.
- Grid streets: we are opposed to gridding the area with small grid streets.

- In four-story buildings, consider ground floor parking.
- Provide parking. Developers should be allowed to provide the parking they feel needs to be available. Parking should meet the current City parking requirements but should not be limited on the amount of parking that they want to provide.
- Improve Shoreline traffic flow. Currently it is too sluggish at times.
- Difficult to get in/out during a concert.
- More ways to enter this area would be nice. The access across 101 to this area is too limited causing bottlenecks.
- Parking lots are really ugly eyesore and makes Mountain View look like an unattractive office park. Trees provide shade, reduce greenhouse effect, and soften the look of the parking lot. Consider covered lot, and solar panels over parking area.
- Parking would be best hidden away. Parking lots are hot and ugly.

#### *Pedestrian and Bicycle Access*

- Walkability and bikeability are key.
- We need another pedestrian bridge, between Shoreline and Rengstorff.
- Improving the design for pedestrian and bicycle transportation and access is extremely important.
- Bike access via Shoreline and Rengstorff is not entirely safe. Recommend building bicycle bridge or bicycle underpass across 101 between these two exits along the creek there. (Permanente Creek?)

#### *Transit*

- North Bayshore feels very disconnected from the rest of Mountain View in terms of land use and transportation. A streetcar could help spur pedestrian friendly development and connect to the Downtown.
- Along Shoreline Boulevard, provide solid transit and biking facilities to serve the new growth.
- Residential & Retail! Some kind of rapid transit. Private rail transit? Gondola?
- Need regular transit from train station to North Bayshore area (including movie theaters and Shoreline concert park).
- Consider the use of free shuttle buses (with key pick-up and drop-off sites) to transport people back and forth to high-use areas.
- Could use some public transportation options to downtown area.
- It would be really nice to extend the tram from downtown mountain view Caltrain station along Shoreline to Shoreline Amphitheater (with intermediate stops, probably at the movie theater/computer museum and Safeway/Jack-in-the-Box).

## C. San Antonio Area

For the purposes of the workshop planning exercise and comments, the San Antonio Area was divided into four general planning areas:

- San Antonio Center, the central shopping district
- Surrounding Area #1, the area immediately to the west of San Antonio Center along San Antonio Road below California Street
- Surrounding Area #2, the area immediately to the north of San Antonio Center along San Antonio Road above California Street
- Surrounding Area #3, the area to the southeast of San Antonio Center along Showers Drive between California and Latham Streets

### ***Land Use – San Antonio Area***

*What uses would you like to see in San Antonio Center?*

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 58.1 percent were comfortable with regional commercial uses.
- 48.6 percent were comfortable with high intensity mixed-use.

*What uses do you prefer for the surrounding areas?*

Overall, roughly a third of participants were comfortable with existing uses in the three defined areas surrounding San Antonio Center. In Area 1, nearly 60 percent favored adding medium intensity mixed-use development, while just over half were comfortable with this type of development in Areas 2 and 3. Approximately 20 percent were comfortable with high intensity mixed-use in Areas 1 and 2, although some respondents expressed concerns about adding this type of use in Area 3.

#### Surrounding Area #1

- 31.3 percent were comfortable with existing uses.
- 58.6 percent were comfortable with medium intensity mixed-use.
- 22.2 percent were comfortable with high intensity mixed-use.

*Percentages total more than 100 percent because some respondents favored more than one type of setback.*

#### Surrounding Area #2

- 33.3 percent were comfortable with existing uses.
- 54.2 percent were comfortable with medium intensity mixed-use.
- 19.8 percent were comfortable with high intensity mixed-use.

*Percentages total more than 100 percent because some respondents favored more than one type of setback.*

### Surrounding Area #3

- 35.1 percent were comfortable with existing uses.
- 52.1 percent were comfortable with medium intensity mixed-use.
- 16.0 percent were comfortable with high intensity mixed-use.

*Percentages total more than 100 percent because some respondents favored more than one type of setback.*

### **Form – San Antonio Area**

*Is there a place for two-story, three-story, or four-story building heights in the San Antonio Area? If so, where?*

Generally, respondents were very comfortable with two- or three-story buildings in the San Antonio Area, with nearly 80 percent comfortable with these building heights. However, only 60 percent of respondents felt comfortable with four-story building heights in the area. Of those who did, many specified that buildings of this height should be located in San Antonio Center itself or along major corridors such as El Camino Real. Some of the respondents who supported higher buildings also stressed the importance of adding housing to the shopping area itself.

### Two-Story Building Heights

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 79.8 percent were comfortable with two-story buildings.
- 20.2 percent were not comfortable with two-story buildings.

Respondents felt two-story buildings would be appropriate:

- Anywhere.
- In Area 1.
- In Area 2.
- In Area 3.
- Along Calderon Road.
- Along El Camino Real.
- Along California Street.

### Three-Story Building Heights

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 78.4 percent were comfortable with three-story buildings.
- 21.6 percent were not comfortable with three-story buildings.

Respondents felt three-story buildings would be appropriate:

- In Area 1.
- In Area 2.
- In Area 3.
- At Showers and San Antonio Road.
- At the perimeter of the development.
- Near El Camino Real.
- In San Antonio Center.
- At the center of the area.

#### Four-Story Building Heights

Of those participants who responded to this question:

- 60.0 percent were comfortable with four-story buildings.
- 40.0 percent were not comfortable with four-story buildings.

Respondents felt four-story buildings would be appropriate:

- Everywhere.
- At San Antonio Center and El Camino Real.
- At the center of the development.
- In Area 1.
- In Area 2.
- In Area 3.
- In San Antonio Center.
- Near major arteries and transit stops.
- At key locations.
- In back lots, if lower building heights can be street-front.
- Along the west side of San Antonio, behind lower buildings.
- North of San Antonio, San Antonio Center.
- At El Camino Real and San Antonio.
- At El Camino Real and Showers.
- Four stories is appropriate only along major corridors facing the San Antonio shopping center.
- Limited and only if designed in a beautiful way.
- Big stores; also housing above.

- In the central corridors and the main commercial center.
- Closest to the commercial district.
- Heights should be varied throughout the area to create an interesting and diverse urban form: taller buildings along major corridors (both existing ones and future ones that may be routed through the center's mega-block), medium-sized buildings adjacent to major public spaces, shorter buildings in areas further removed from major transit corridors.
- In the central zone (San Antonio Mall).
- In the more interior part of complex.
- Where appropriate given neighboring development.
- Higher buildings at north end (lower ground).
- Have the two-story buildings closest to San Antonio and El Camino Real, and then have three- and four-story buildings behind the two-story ones, (i.e., further from the street)—the result would be an upward slope in buildings as you get further from the streets.
- In the shopping center itself (mixed-use).
- Parking areas.
- Let's make this area dense, like Santana Row, but more affordable.

*How close should buildings be placed to the street in the San Antonio Area?*

- 6.8 percent were comfortable with buildings positioned directly adjacent to the street.
- 75.7 percent were comfortable with buildings positioned close to the street.
- 25.2 percent were comfortable with buildings positioned further from the street.

*Percentages total more than 100 percent because some respondents favored more than one type of setback.*

### **Additional Feedback – San Antonio Area**

*New Developments: Form*

- Yes for two-story buildings, maybe for three.
- A mix of building heights.
- High intensity building heights.
- Due to high apartment density, one-story development and small "Town & Country" atmosphere would be best.
- Two-story buildings could be anywhere in Mountain View.
- The design of centers should be in small blocks with buildings pulled to the street rather than parking between the street and buildings.
- Buildings should be set back with landscaping where other parking is available.

- Buildings should be set back with landscaping, if adequate parking is otherwise available.
- Plenty of ground-level parking and single-level stores that serve the surrounding neighborhoods. Everything possible should be done to protect Monta Loma neighborhood from even more impact—already impacted by Caltrain, possible high speed rail, The Crossings, and future Mayfield high-density, high-rise residential, etc.
- Could be closer for one- and two-story buildings.
- Far from sidewalk can be nice, e.g. Castro restaurants, but if so, parking should be provided behind, e.g., Castro and in Los Altos for Main Street, State Street, etc.
- Require berms between street and parking for visual shielding.
- Some buildings have their own parking lots, with buildings set far back from the “street.” Some have parking lots adjacent to the street. Some have landscaped strips between the street and the building. A mix is fine.
- Industrial/commercial should have parking in front. Entertainment (along Shoreline) should be adjacent to sidewalk.
- The taller the building, the further the set back.

#### *New Developments: Land Use*

- Keep primarily as commercial with some mixed-use in surrounding areas.
- Create a village center.
- Build mixed-use close to San Antonio Road/El Camino Real intersection.
- Develop master plan for a commercial area.
- Only increase the intensity of shopping by 50 percent.
- Provide similar uses to Santana Row such as shopping with high intensity housing above and provide a variety of housing types such as condominiums, townhouse and apartments.
- More affordable housing including below-market rate housing.
- Target opportunities to attract a Whole Foods store to the area.
- Create a local community: multi-use shops/residential theme in San Antonio Center with Walmart the only exception.
- Neighborhood needs its own elementary school.
- I already sent input on the shopping center. It should become a center of activity with good shopping availability similar to what Mayfield Mall, the Old Mill and Menu tree provided. Having good public transportation is vital. Stores such as Old Navy, Organized Living, Gap, Gymboree, Talbots, Pottery Barn, etc.—stores you only find in Stanford and San Jose.
- Develop the vacant lot at California and Ortega—it’s an eyesore in its current condition.
- Mixed use buildings along major corridors should be sited close to the

sidewalk. Locations closer to Shoreline Park should have a more open and campus like environment with pedestrian accessible landscaping along the sidewalk (not berms). Far from sidewalk with parking should not be an option anywhere.

- No Home Depot!
- San Antonio Center isn't the place for a Home Depot-type place, where there would be lots of big delivery trucks. It desperately needs more good restaurants.
- Encourage renovation of the Sears. All other stores in the area are high quality spaces.
- Regarding the next question—San Antonio Center can be both a “regional commercial area” and a “high intensity mixed-use area.” I do not understand why these things are presented in a way that makes them appear mutually exclusive. A mix of regional commercial draws and local serving businesses on the ground floor with mixed-use above and you have both of these qualities.
- This site has the potential to become another signature example of blended retail and housing, like Santana Row. But it needs a thorough reconsolidation of the site so that buildings and uses are coordinated. Right now, it's a hodgepodge of stores and is confusing and frustrating to navigate.
- Make it a vibrant shopping center with desirable big-box anchors! Big-box is not evil and big-box can be attractive and well-designed with proper guidelines. This under-used and unappealing shopping center is a victim of schizophrenic city planning policies. Bring in the stores that people want, and the problems of blight will take care of themselves.
- Keep the rents down and don't drive out the meat and potatoes business like Walmart, Target, and Sears. We need a place for those stores in Mountain View. Squelching Home Depot felt elitist. Now I purchase all of my hardware in Sunnyvale Lowes, Home Depot, and OSH.

#### *New Developments: Character*

- Redevelop area.
- View and shading. Expand plazas.
- Improve the blight and add large retail, but not a Home Depot.
- Coordinate with Los Altos to ensure the Mountain View and Los Altos sides of El Camino Real appear unified.
- Make it look good.
- I would love to see some effort to buffer noise and soften the edges of pure commercialism.
- The current center is a hodge-podge that lacks cohesiveness. Can San Antonio Road support increased traffic if this center became more popular? If mixed-use residential goes in there, can the Los Altos School District support it? (I think that this shopping center is in their district) Is it even possible to plan this

in a better way given the multiple owners and the Hetch-Hetchy right-of-way? (I hope it is, but it's a concern.)

- Find ways to prevent San Antonio from becoming an eyesore when businesses don't do well (e.g., how it is right now with Sears). Integrate community gathering space so it is not just commercial—there are other reasons to visit it (e.g., transit center, skating rink, outdoor food court, space for community groups to exhibit/gather, art exhibition from local schools/artists). San Antonio Mall is really unpleasant to visit.
- Sorely needs to be revitalized. The homeless/day laborers need to be removed from the shopping center (e.g., Burger King) and the surrounding streets. The Day Labor Center has no place in Mountain View. The City should not sanctify hiring of illegal immigrants, especially not in this economy.
- They should have a more cohesive theme than the mishmash that is as a result of the multiple landowners now have. Improvements in one area should be agreed on by most of the landowners and be implemented in a similar fashion.

#### *Parks, Open Space, and Climate Change Impact*

- Plan for future use of the Hetch-Hetchy trail.
- Have shade areas with trees.
- Connect San Antonio to the Whisman Area via Hetch-Hetchy ROW.
- Open spaces and child care needed in this area.
- This area has the potential of evolving into a local neighborhood e.g. like California Ave. in Palo Alto, but with higher density. Make sure to include some green, park area that could also be playing fields for recreational use.

#### *Traffic and Parking*

- Improved parking—attendants?
- On Showers Drive, reduce the number of lanes and add traffic calming features.
- For more housing and more stores, there must be better driving routes—people constantly speed through Monta Loma to get around San Antonio/Central/Rengstorff already.
- Get rid of some of the vast parking lot for San Antonio Center.
- Make sure there are enough parking spaces, especially if mixed-residential will be allowed since often many more cars per unit end up in projects.
- Hide parking and make the shopping areas walkable. Currently, the parking lots are unsafe and there are no good pedestrian paths from one shop area to another.
- Business can have parking visible and residential unit can have parking behind the buildings.

### *Pedestrian and Bicycle Access*

- Would be nice to have safer pedestrian crossings in this area; currently it's so difficult to cross California and Showers that it forces people to drive between the Target/Walmart/Safeway blocks.
- City Council should implement many useful suggestions. Ask bicycle riders who share pedestrian walk to use warning bells. Traffic improvement, etc.
- Accessibility for pedestrians and bikes.
- The commercial centers should have improved bike/pedestrian circulation.
- This is still the most pedestrian-unfriendly shopping center I've ever been in. There are very few safe places to walk to get from Point A to Point B. I go there frequently (by bus) and make the same observation every time. It isn't particularly safe to drive in, either. Whatever happens, there must be a better way of configuring it! We need vastly improved access for bicycles and pedestrians, sufficient bike parking, and no more big box stores.
- In the shopping center, emphasize access for pedestrians and bicyclists, ample bike parking, and provisions for open civic space.
- I would like to see walkways and gardens similar to the Stanford Shopping Center along with public amenities, such as interactive fountains and public art.
- Would like to see more inviting foot traffic and shopping areas.
- Having safe bike access would be good.
- Improvements for improved pedestrian and bicycling in the area is extremely important.

### *Transit*

- People will drive to the retail venues in the San Antonio efforts. All efforts should be made to encourage public transit, cycling and walking in this region.
- Yes, we should consider the shape of buildings and support all transit.

### *Gateways*

- This is a gateway to Mountain View. It needs some serious renovation.
- San Antonio has needed some architectural and landscaping unity. I understand the challenges posed by multiple owners, yet all current and future businesses would benefit from upgrading the landscaping, providing some unifying architectural/aesthetic standards, and bringing some organization to the nutty internal traffic wackiness that exists there. It's an embarrassing gateway to our community.