

City Council Questions

October 15, 2019 Council Meeting

ITEM 7.1 DOWNTOWN PARKING STRATEGY

1. Is the shift from retail to more restaurant/experiential uses a good thing? What experiential uses are there downtown?

The shift from retail to more restaurant/experiential uses is primarily the market's response to counteract the increasing shift towards online sales. "Experiential uses" typically includes restaurants and fitness, but the term also includes retailers that use various strategies such as virtual reality and to draw patrons into the store and to shift the purchasing experience from a purely transactional one into a more personal, immersive experience. In terms of experiential uses in Downtown Mountain View, there are over 80 restaurants and two fitness uses. Note that the ULI TAP report (attached to this Council report) included potential strategies to bring in more experiential/alternative retail stores to Downtown.

2. If all of the businesses downtown parking district provided their own required number of parking spaces, how many parking spaces would that be?

Based on the current Downtown Precise Plan parking requirements for different land uses, it is estimated 4,984 parking spaces are required for all the businesses located within the Parking District, if they were to provide their own spaces.

3. Has the City ever considered a continuation of the timed parking restrictions past 5 pm M-F, and on the weekends? If so, what was the rationale for not extending them?

Timed parking restrictions began in 1960. Updates have been made periodically and have typically been focused on specific items but there has not been a comprehensive update. Staff has identified a comprehensive review of timed parking restrictions as part of the proposed Downtown Parking Strategy to increase the efficient use of the existing parking supply under Phase 2.

4. Have any of the downtown parking studies looked at the capacity and utilization of on street parking? If so, what have been the results and conclusions?

Yes, the 2010 Downtown Parking Study conducted a comprehensive parking data collection of on and off-street public parking spaces looked at the capacity and utilization of on-street parking. The 2010 study concluded the on-street parking was equally as or more impacted than off-street parking, primarily because there are fewer on-street spaces than off-street and there is greater demand for on-street parking because Downtown patrons look for convenient parking closest to their destination. The 2010 study included considerations such as options to increase the efficient use of on-street parking and more limited options to marginally increase on-street parking supply.

5. Hasn't the City been looking to increase shared parking in private parking structures for years? Why has none of it come to fruition?

The City has been working on opportunities to facilitate shared parking in both existing structures and in new developments. Regarding existing structures, the City is currently working with Kaiser Permanente to share the use of its existing parking structure in the evenings when the medical office is closed. The agreement is currently in the process of being developed, with a goal to finalize the agreement by the end of the calendar year. The City has explored shared parking opportunities with 444 Castro, 801 Castro (Fenwick and West) and 250 Bryant. However, those property owners are unable

to share due to lease agreements with current tenants having access to the parking 24 hours a day and security needs for the tenants' clients. Regarding new developments, the Hope Street Development Project has a shared parking agreement where the office building underground parking structure (160 parking spaces) will be available to the public during evenings and weekends, in addition to the net increase of 75 public spaces 24/7.

6. If Council decides to advance certain programs (i.e. shift from Phase 2 to Phase 1), would we also need to determine which programs to delay? Or will staff be able to return with recommendations based on the relative impacts of each program on staff capacity?

Staff will incorporate Council input on prioritization of programs and modify the strategy and timing of programs as appropriate based on resources and capacity. Additionally, it may be important for certain programs to be designed and implemented together, so that is an additional factor to be considered in terms of modifying the phasing and sequencing of programs.

7. How much funding is currently available for new parking supply, and how much additional funding is the City anticipating given development proposals in the pipeline?

The Parking In-Lieu Fee currently has \$6.7 million, but the funding is designated for the Hope Street Development Project (Parking Lots 4 and 8). An estimated \$7.8 million is anticipated from three proposed office development projects: 756 California Street, 714 Villa Street, and 701 W. Evelyn Avenue.

8. Any thoughts of parking validation for a specific amount of time?

A parking validation program is typically part of a paid parking program. Currently, the City does not have paid parking. If and when the City does implement paid parking, a parking validation program could be part of the program, perhaps during an initial startup phase. Consideration of paid parking is part of parking technology under phase 2 of the Downtown parking strategy.

9. Any data on how much time needs to go by before someone gives up on parking and goes elsewhere?

There is no industry-accepted standard for how much time someone is willing to search for parking before giving up. The willingness is dependent based upon a number of factors including commute time, length of trip/stay, expectations, purpose of their visit, and individual preferences. The 85% desired capacity is the typical proxy for balancing efficient parking supply and the search for parking spaces block.

10. Why are apps / technology in Phase 2 and not Phase 1?

"Parking technology" includes apps, wayfinding, parking management software, and paid parking. Certain components under parking technology, such as paid parking, etc. is recommended to be in a later phase (Phase 2), but apps is recommended to be part of Phase 1.

11. Why isn't the City charging for the true cost of a parking space?

The Parking In-Lieu Fee for Fiscal Year 2019-20 is \$52,140 for new construction. The fee was last changed during the Fiscal Year 2016-17 budget process. At the time, staff analyzed the cost of constructing parking structures from two different cost perspectives:

1. The cost of constructing the 850 California Street Parking Structure adjusted by the then current rate of inflation for construction costs. This cost did not include the costs of constructing the retail space and solar panels;

2. The evaluation of several comparable parking structures (a mix of above and below grade parking structures) in the Bay Area and Mountain View. The average cost per net new space also assumed the existing land was used as parking.

Staff is proposing to review and update the Parking In-Lieu Fee as part of the proposed Downtown Parking Strategy under Phase 1.

12. Why isn't the parking in-lieu fee adjusted for inflation?

Parking in-lieu fee is adjusted annually by the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index. The index measures the average cost of construction over time.

13. Chart 1, where are the underutilized lots?

In general, there is available parking for most of the time in most of the parking facilities. There are three parking facilities that are typically more underutilized than the other facilities: Parking Lots 11 (Franklin and Villa Streets) and 12 (California at Bryant Streets); and Parking Structure 3 (California at Bryant Streets). These three facilities are also typically more underutilized and have available parking during peak periods.

14. There is data for cost of technology, what about potential revenue for charging for parking?

Potential parking revenue through a paid parking program depends on demand for visitors/patrons for a particular location. If demand is high, paid parking is more feasible and more can be charged because it won't turn visitors away. Additionally, over time, as expectations change regarding free parking versus paid parking, there could be more willingness for visitors to pay for parking. Evaluation would need to be conducted to assess if and when paid parking could be feasible in Downtown without decreasing visitors/patrons. This work item is recommended to be part of Phase 2.

ITEM 7.2 CITYWIDE SCHOOL STRATEGY

CORRECTIONS TO STAFF REPORT:

- Footnote 4 on page 6 inaccurately stated that there are no one bedroom units in the subsidized housing projects studied by the demographers. Eleven percent of these units are one bedroom.
- Table 4 inaccurately shows the School/State share for the Residential Feasibility option. The table should read:

Table 4 – Summary of School Strategy Options and Scenarios

	School/ State Share	Park Land Share	TDR Share	Developer Contribution Share
<i>Residential Feasibility Option - \$6.30</i>				
SchoolHouse Scenario	39%	11%	32%	18%
School Districts Scenario	45.5%	11%	32%	11.5%
<i>Split-Share Option - \$13.16</i>				
SchoolHouse Scenario	20%	11%	32%	37%
School Districts Scenario	33%	11%	32%	24%

1. Could the El Camino Real or the San Antonio Precise Plans, or any other Precise Plan, be amended to include a school strategy? What are the issues in doing this?

Yes, the Precise Plans could be amended. Doing so might affect development feasibility in those areas, and some developments may not occur. It is not clear how the School Strategy may affect the City's compliance with RHNA/Housing Element law, and required limits to housing constraints. If more areas include a school strategy expectation, it may limit where RHNA sites can be. Other Precise Plans would be more difficult to amend, if they don't already have a "Bonus FAR" structure.

2. On page 10 of the staff report in the TDR Value section, it says The City would not be able to use both land dedication and off-site TDR to facilitate school district acquisition of land because both programs effectively do the same thing. If land is dedicated, does this assume that the development rights are transferred to another location owned by the property owner that dedicated the land?

Yes.

3. Which development applications will be affected by the citywide school strategy?

The applications currently under review include:

<u>Residential Projects</u>	555 West Middlefield Road
	1001 North Shoreline Boulevard
	360 South Shoreline Boulevard
	2645 Fayette Drive
	355 - 415 East Middlefield Road
	400 Logue Avenue
<u>Office Projects</u>	465 Fairchild Drive
	189 North Bernardo Avenue
	303 Ravendale Avenue
<u>Mixed Projects</u>	Gateway Master Plan (North Bayshore)

4. "Residential Feasibility Option" and "Split-Share Option:" are the per-square-foot contributions for the net square feet above Base FAR, or do they apply to the *entire* project?

They apply to the net new residential or net new office, regardless of whether the square footage is part of the Base FAR or Bonus FAR. The only component where "FAR" matters is that only projects requesting Bonus FAR would provide the contribution. For example, if a Bonus FAR residential project is replacing office, they would provide the contribution based on the whole project because the net new residential in this example is the entire project.

5. Will the school districts be restricted in how they can use the funding acquired from the School Strategy? Will the school districts be required to use the funding within a certain time period? How will any restrictions in the use of the School Strategy funding be enforced?

The City does not have jurisdiction over the specific use or timing of funds. The City could, however, request reports of how the funding is used, to help inform any future iterations of the School Strategy.

6. If increased school contributions are making housing less feasible can we apply them more to office development than to housing? After all offices cause housing need which causes school need.

Yes, the City can increase the office contribution and reduce the residential contribution. However, there are three issues to consider:

- Residential projects have a more direct relationship to the number of students generated.
- If fewer office projects are built than expected, the School Districts could have fewer contributions than they expected, relative to the number of students.
- The growth in the report projects 20,000 units (a little over 19 million square feet) consistent with growth anticipated in the City’s change areas. It also projects about 3 million square feet of net new office using Bonus FAR. Therefore, it is projected that there will be six times the amount of residential square footage than office. As a result, office contributions would need to be significantly higher than residential on a per square foot basis to offset the residential contribution needed. For example, the following contributions add up to the same amount:

	<u>Residential Contribution</u>	<u>Office Contribution</u>
Office = Residential	\$13.16	\$13.16
Office = 3 x Residential	\$10.33	\$31.00
Office = 5 x Residential	\$8.52	\$42.62

7. Why did Mountain View take responsibility for an LASD school site at San Antonio when LASD has declining enrollment and unused space in its schools? I understand that Mountain View is generating students in the San Antonio area, but we are also addressing regional housing need, whereas Los Altos may not be. As we continue to add housing do we foresee any additional obligations to LASD?

As adopted in the San Antonio Precise Plan, the City had an objective to develop a neighborhood-serving school in the area, given existing student population and expected growth north of El Camino Real. This would achieve parity for students in Mountain View and transportation benefits (students would not need to travel across ECR). The LASD Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program helped LASD acquire this land within their funding resources. It also provided an opportunity for significant new public open space serving a park-deficient neighborhood.

Staff did not analyze LASD’s likely student generation or school needs, since the key areas affected by the school strategy are North Bayshore, East Whisman and Terra Bella, which are in the MVWSD and MVLA school districts. However, if the Council chooses to do so, the framework established by the Citywide School Strategy can be applied to LASD. The TDR does not eliminate their capital needs, which would also include new classroom space.

8. Staff is recommending that school district responsibility for school development be at least 33 percent, based on development feasibility and the opportunities available to them. What are the opportunities available to them now?
- The school districts are able to bond.
 - Standard school mitigation fees are paid by conforming residential and office development, which can also be used for improvements.
 - Under certain circumstances, the State will reimburse schools for construction and land acquisition costs.

9. If district responsibility for school development is set at 33%, does that mean that current Mountain View residents would pay taxes to build schools in new areas like N Bayshore and East Whisman, rather than office developers there paying?

One source of school district funding is bonds. While bonds are repaid through taxes, they would not increase the tax rate. Residents' taxes would not change based on the district responsibility for school development. Repayment of bonds may change how taxes are spent, and may reduce spending on other services. The school districts have other sources that may not affect local taxes, such as State resources.

10. Does staff think it would be worth it to open up the N Bayshore Precise Plan to apply the school strategy to Google Landings?

Adding Google Landings would reduce other projects' per-square-foot contributions by about \$0.30. In the past, Council has given deference to grandfathered projects in considering new fees and requirements.

11. What is the status of Shoreline Community Funds use for funding the schools? Can that funding be used to fund school sites or general school expenses in the future and to what extent?

The Shoreline Community, MVWSD and MVLAUHSD are currently party to the Education Enhancement Reserve Joint Powers Agreement (EER JPA), which provides an annual payment from the Shoreline Community to each school district. The EER JPA was established in 2006 and later replaced in 2013. Over this timeframe, Community payments to the districts have totaled \$51.2 million. Since 2013, total payments to both districts have ranged from \$4.7 million to over \$6.5 million per year. In order to implement a North Bayshore Precise Plan policy related to funding for local schools, in June 2019, the Council approved an amendment to the EER JPA to provide an additional payment to the districts for the property tax revenue associated with new residential development in the Community. All three governing bodies have approved this amendment.

The purpose of the EER JPA is to "enhance the educational and technological capacity of students in the districts' schools who, in turn, will contribute to the availability of a local technology workforce necessary to further Community objectives." The agreement indicates a range of expenditures on which the districts can use these payments, including "costs reasonably associated with the impact of Shoreline Community on the districts' students, schools and facilities. . ." Staff believes this could include school site costs for any schools developed in the Shoreline Community.

12. Do TDRs as a part of a school strategy tend to get us more office, or can they be used just as easily/often to transfer development rights to develop housing? What have been the difficulties, if any, in using this method? Has it been difficult to find appropriate target sites?

The City Council authorizes specific TDR projects and sites, and can use that authority to limit projects to housing. The school districts may be able to get more money by selling the floor area to office projects in this development cycle, but future economic conditions may be different.

One challenge has been aligning the projects with the evolving East Whisman Precise Plan, which added uncertainty to the development projects and complicated implementation of the draft Plan direction. For example, some projects' initial proposals were inconsistent with the Precise Plan's character, connectivity and open space direction. In addition, it has been difficult to coordinate the several office and residential projects to maintain consistency with the Jobs-Housing Linkage Strategy. Another challenge has been finding sites where the additional floor area would be appropriate to the context of the area.

13. School district has two schools in North Mountain View, Whisman and Slater, how much land do those two schools have?

The Slater site is nine acres, but shares the campus with the new Vargas Elementary School. The Whisman site about 12 acres (not including land the City owns along Easy Street).

14. How many new students could those two schools accommodate?

Elementary schools in Mountain View Whisman School District are generally between 400 and 600 students, but Slater may need to be smaller than that given its limited campus space.

15. Has the school district discuss not renewing the leases and bring the school back for use by the district?

Based on discussions with school district staff, the lease with the German School at Whisman is longer-term and may be more difficult to end than the other campuses. Additionally, the school district has noted that the leases bring in money for operational uses.

16. Please explain how you came to the conclusion that the school district would at minimum play 33% of cost, given that the school district can bond for the money?

There is no right split. Thirty-three percent is based on a split share between the City actions, developer contributions (which total to two-thirds) and school district responsibility. It acknowledges that they do have other tools at their disposal and that neither the City nor developers should be 100% responsible. Council could determine another split but should keep in mind project viability.

17. What steps has the school district done to set aside a reserve for the purchase of new school sites and how long have they been doing this?

City staff has not analyzed the school districts' current financing and is not aware of any specific reserve. The purpose of the Citywide School Strategy is to identify how future development can be accommodated, not to determine the current need.

18. Why should the City, other than go into a partnership on open space, be so concern about what the school does?

Mountain View has high-quality schools, and residents care about maintaining that level of quality. In addition, the North Bayshore area is planned for significant residential growth and doesn't have any local schools to serve that population. Therefore, transporting students to school could add to vehicle congestion if they need to travel across the City.

19. Why should the City subsidize the cost of schools, thought the redirection of community benefits, when the school district has the power to bond and has done very little in advocating for the increase in development fees from the state?

This is a policy decision for Council. The NBS PP includes language for a school strategy and Council has directed staff to develop a Citywide strategy.

20. How can there be a “voluntary agreement” if is approved by the City? Quid pro quo. The City gives up something, what do we get in return?

Gatekeeper projects are receiving approval of their rezoning or General Plan amendment requests and Bonus FAR projects are receiving additional floor area. In exchange, the community is getting assurance that the schools will be able to accommodate student population growth.

21. On page 9 of staff report, why should the City determine if there is available funding? Shouldn't that be the responsibility of the school district to determine if there are alternative or other options for funding?

Yes, it would be the responsibility of the school districts. The City would apply that information to any determination of project-specific school strategies or updates to the Citywide school strategy.

ITEM 7.3 PARK LAND DEDICATION ORDINANCE REVIEW

1. I was under the impression we were also going to look at other aspects of the park land dedication ordinance beyond those covered in the staff report. Will those be covered at a later date? The one topic I can recall is whether or not the City is willing to accept park land that will not be owned by the City but will be deed restricted. I think there were other topics as well.

Staff is using this study session to review the current ordinance and better understand all elements, such as the one referenced in this question, that Council would like staff to analyze. This question appears to refer to “publicly accessible private open space credit” that is privately built and owned, but accessible to the public. This is discussed as part of the Credit section of Chapter 41 (Pg. 12 of Staff Report – North Bayshore Credit) and will be in staff’s presentation.

2. If a project involves dedication of land, can the development capacity of that dedicated land be transferred to the developed portion of the site? Or would FAR limitations (and other development standards) be based on the *remaining* portion of the site?

The idea of transferring development capacity is already captured in Chapter 41, as it allows a new project to add the development capacity of the portion of land dedicated for park land toward the overall project density and development proposed on the project site. In other words, all density calculations are based on the entire project site land area (pre-park land dedication). This naturally results in shifting greater development to the buildable areas of the project site to accommodate a new park.

In recent years, most residential projects approved by Council with new dedicated park land are Gatekeepers or in Precise Plan areas. These projects were able to accommodate development on site with a new park or Publicly Accessible Private Open Space by either aligning the development standards to the project (in the case of 1720 Villa Street with a Precise Plan Amendment) or the project continued to meet the development standards.

3. Can the City require commercial development to dedicate land for parks and/or pay in-lieu fees? Would this require a nexus study?

At this time, the City cannot require park land dedication or in-lieu fees from commercial development. A nexus study would be required first.

4. Has the City been able to successfully commit all in-lieu fees? Or has the City lost any in-lieu fees due to the requirement to commit within 5 years?

The City has been able to commit all in-lieu fees within the required five year period.

5. What is the aggregate cost of all fees (parkland, affordable housing, community benefit, school strategy, other impact fees, etc.) imposed on residential development?

Each of the development fees is dependent on the type of residential development (affordable units, number of net-new units, density), location within the City, and amenities provided. The aggregate cost of fees varies by each development.

To provide some reference point, staff has estimated the total cost of construction for two of the sample projects in Attachment 3: 2296 Mora Drive (75 rowhomes) and 400 San Antonio Rd (582 apartments). The table below is based on: (1) estimated construction costs based on an analysis completed for the BMR discussions early this year and (2) City permit and inspection fees, public benefit fees, parkland fees (had no park been dedicated), and school impact fees. Staff did not include any school strategy fee estimates as those are being discussed tonight: each project paid the school impact fee in place during permit issuance.

Development/Project Costs Per Unit			
Costs	2296 Mora Dr.	400 San Antonio Rd.	Notes
Units Provided	75	582	
Project Size (Acres)	5.13	5.7	
Public Works Fees and Inspections	\$6,905	\$4,856	
Park Land Fees	\$24,900	\$49,800	Assumes total park in-lieu fee (for reference only). Both projects dedicated all or a portion of park land.
Planning Fees	\$866	\$106	
Building and Fire Fees	\$11,881	\$5,397	
BMR Fees	\$36,000	0	This is an estimate since Mora Dr. units haven't been sold.
Public Benefit Fee	0	\$7,830	
School Impact Fees	\$6,393	\$3,511	
Construction Costs (incl. land cost, direct and indirect costs)	\$819,640	\$635,998	
Total Cost Per Unit	\$906,585	\$707,498	

The cost of land at Mora Drive was half that of San Antonio Road even though the project size was similar. It demonstrates how land cost plays into the total park land fee cost. The construction cost per unit of rowhomes is greater than higher density projects due to economy of scales (attached vs detached dwelling units).

6. What percentage are fees of the *total* cost of development?

A huge portion of the total cost is based on outside market factors like construction cost, labor cost, administrative costs, and other costs not directly associated with City permit, development, or impact fees. See response to question 5 for examples.

7. The staff report says that the City has seen an increase in the number of companion units built. How many have been built?

Since the amendment in June 2016, the City has collected Park Land Dedication In-Lieu fees from 31 companion units (6 in FY16-17, 6 in FY17-18, 11 in FY18-19, 8 so far in FY19-20).

8. Section 41.5 of the City Code establishes the requirement that at least 3 acres of property for each one thousand (1,000) persons residing within the City be devoted to public park and recreational facilities. Isn't this City Code based on CA law? My understanding is that our code merely conforms to the minimum amount of parkland required by state law. Is this true?

Correct. Three acres per 1,000 residents is the minimum park land ratio required by California Government Code Section 66477, known as the Quimby Act.

9. The staff report says, "In accordance with the Open Space Section of the Environmental Management Chapter of the Mountain View 2030 General Plan and the City's Parks and Open Space Plan, it has been determined the City currently meets and is in excess of this requirement with 13.4 acres per 1,000 residents; however, this determination is made only when Shoreline at Mountain View is included in the total inventory of parks and open space." Does the 13.4 acres per 1000 residents include shared school space acres at 100%, at 50% (which is how much the public has access to it) at 0%? Does it include Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Parks (POPAs)?

The 13.4 acres per 1,000 residents ratio includes Shoreline Regional Park, shared school space, and all public parks within the City. Shared school space is included at 100%. This ratio does not include privately owned publicly accessible parks (POPAs) because the City does not currently have any constructed at this time. (The Sobrato project at 1255 Pear Ave was approved with up to 75% park land credit; 777 W. Middlefield Rd was approved with up to 50% park land credit). As part of the Parks and Open Space Plan update, staff will seek direction from Council on whether to include Private Open Space or Publicly Accessible Private Open Space for some level of credit to count toward the City's ratio.

10. The staff report says that, "According to State law, the City cannot lower the ratio below 3 acres per 1,000 residents because we are currently achieving this goal with the inclusion of Shoreline at Mountain View." What does this sentence mean?

State Law includes regional parks in the calculation of the ratio so the City has 13.4 acres per 1,000 residents according to the Quimby Act, which has a minimum ratio of 3 acres per 1,000 residents.

11. If we took out Shoreline, how much parkland would we have per 1000 residents?

2.6 acres per 1,000 residents (See Attachment 2 to the report)

12. If we took out shared school space, how much parkland would we have per 1000 residents?

1.43 acres per 1,000 residents

13. How much are park in-lieu fees being used to create urban trails, greenways and pocket parks?

The City does not have a “pocket park” categorization in Chapter 41. The smallest park size is a Mini-Park which is up to 1 acre in size. There is currently \$10,387,000 committed towards the design and construction of five mini-parks: Wyandotte, Evandale, Mora, 400 San Antonio, and Fayette. There is currently \$850,000 in park land funding committed towards trails.

14. As we create more affordable housing, how does this affect our ability to create adequate parkland acreage per 1000 residents?

Council amended Chapter 41 in 2015 to exclude affordable units, except those units provided pursuant to density bonus law, from the total amount of dwelling units used to calculate the park land dedication and in-lieu fee. Therefore, affordable units increase the City’s population but in many cases the City is unable to require dedicated land or in-lieu fees for park land to offset that increase.

15. The staff report says, “When the Park Land Dedication Ordinance was first adopted in 1971, these density categories reflected the types of residential developments occurring at that time. However, many of the recent residential developments proposed are at higher densities with 50 to 100 units per acre and include on-site amenities.” Do these on-site amenities produce much green space available to the public or the residents or are they mostly gyms and pools surrounded by concrete patios?

The on-site amenities proposed in new residential development currently under construction or recently completed primarily serve the on-site residents and include indoor amenities (gyms, conference centers, etc.) and outdoor amenities (pools, roof decks, patios, pet areas) that have restricted access. However, some of these projects include connections that are publically accessible, such as through-block paseo connecting El Camino Real to Latham Street as part of the Novo development (2270 W El Camino Real) or a bike connection into Palo Alto as part of the project at 2700 W El Camino Real (at Del Medio). However, the most recent residential development projects approved by Council – the two Publicly Accessible Private Open Space projects (1255 Pear Ave and 777 W. Middlefield Rd) – will include open green space that will be publicly accessible.

16. What’s the definition of game court area? What kinds of games qualify to be in a game court?

A game court area is intended to provide space designed for activities such as basketball, volleyball, badminton, or pickleball. This is similar to an athletic field which is intended for organized sports. Chapter 41 does not prescribe the activities that must be played so that Council can approve credits on a case by case basis, providing opportunity for creative alternatives that Council might consider for a “game court area”.

17. Has the City done any analysis of what types of parks and what types of park amenities are most used?

Staff has not performed a formal study of park usage since the adoption of the Parks and Open Space Plan in 2014. However, City staff are routinely in the parks and able to determine equipment and amenities which are more highly-utilized than others. The types of amenities used vary depending on the location of the park, the surrounding residents and/or businesses, and the size of the park. Through the design process for each new park, the City hosts community meetings to best determine the amenities that residents expect to utilize and would like to see.

18. For determining density, would net new bedrooms show more people since they could accommodate more?

It depends on the type of development and the density level used for the persons per bedroom. As an example, the column "Residents/Bedroom" in Attachment 3 provides the hypothetical calculation using number of net-new, market-rate bedrooms and assumes a density of one person per bedroom. Using this hypothetical density and calculation, 277 Fairchild and 2296 Mora Drive would have a higher park land requirement or total in-lieu fee compared to the actual calculation under the current ordinance. This is because these developments have a higher percentage of 3 and 4 bedroom units and one person per bedroom means it is 3 to 4 new residents instead of the 2 persons per dwelling unit assumed in the current ordinance. For the other three developments, the park land requirement or total in-lieu fee is lower than the actual calculation under the current ordinance. This is because these developments have a higher percentage of studio and 1 bedroom units which assume 1 person per bedroom instead of 2 persons per dwelling unit under the current ordinance.

If Council is interested in changing the methodology for calculating the density ratio, staff will need to analyze whether this is in accordance with the Quimby Act and any other applicable laws. Staff would also analyze the appropriate density of person(s) per bedroom based on US Census data and confirm any adverse effects for types of residential developments other than the five examples in Attachment 3.

19. What would the calculation look like if you added a line item that was great than the current dwelling units per acre of 26+ to 26-50, 41-100, 101 to 200, 201 to 400, 400 to 600?

It would depend on the density level of persons per dwelling unit associated with these higher densities. For instance, the column "Lower Density Ratio" in Attachment 3 assumes 1.5 persons per dwelling unit for the five example developments. When assuming a lower density of persons per dwelling unit, it assumes less new residents and therefore lowers the park land requirement or in-lieu fee for each net-new, market-rate unit.

20. What direction is the park to population ratio going over the last 5 years (excluding Shoreline Park)?

In the last five years, the City has increased park acreage by 1.2 acres with the addition of Heritage Park. According to the [US Census' Quick Facts](#), the population of Mountain View has increased from 74,391 in the Parks and Open Space Plan to 83,377. This would equate to a park ratio of 2.29 acres per 1,000 residents when excluding North Bayshore. However, in the last five years, Park Land Funds have been used in a number of projects to increase amenities to the public while not increasing parks and open space acreage, i.e. Community Center Renovation, Shoreline Athletic Field, Park Restrooms. Attachment 2 shows 12 parks that are expected in the next five years that will increase acreage by approximately 15.5 acres.

21. If park in-lieu fees must be committed with 5 years from the date the City receives the money, has the City ever not committed the money with that 5 year time frame?

The City has been able to commit all in-lieu fees within the required five year period.

22. When a residential development comes in for approve, is a park area considered to spend the park in-lieu on? If no area can be ready define to us park in-lieu fees, does the City require the developer to build park land on site?

Staff works with developers to provide a public park when feasible and in accordance with the Parks and Open Space Plan, with particular attention paid to proposed projects in underserved park areas. The Parks and Open Space Plan provides the roadmap for where we would like to have parks and open

space throughout the City. Precise Plans such as North Bayshore, East Whisman, and San Antonio, can also provide guidance on locations of new parks and open spaces. The conversations around requesting park land starts early during the informal review of a proposed project between City staff, the applicant, and decision makers (PRC, EPC, and Council) at Study Sessions.

If providing park land is not feasible or does not completely fulfill the park land requirement, then an in-lieu fee is collected. Staff has a list of future projects that will require park land funds. If there is not a project within 1-mile of a development, then fees can be committed to open space acquisition. The Real Property Program Administrator will then pursue land in the areas where we have money dedicated for open space acquisition.

23. If a developer uses the state density bonus to build more units, are the affordable units including in the park in-lieu fee?

Affordable units provided pursuant to density bonus law are included in the park land dedication and/or in-lieu fee calculation. State Density Bonus Law states that an applicant for a density bonus project is not exempt from paying the required City development fees associated with that type of development (e.g. permit fees, impact fees, school fees, etc.); though the applicant may request consideration of a fee waiver as part of their project.

24. On page 12 of staff report, does a publicly accessible private open space that is one acre of contiguous land require a restroom? Is Sobrato Pear Ave. development require to provide a restroom?

The City requires a restroom for parks over 3 acres in size; parks under 3 acres do not require a restroom. The Sobrato project at 1255 Pear Ave was approved as a Publicly Accessible Private Open Space and will not have a restroom.