

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 1	Lockheed	3	3.4	46	Connecting Open Space and Urban Ecology	Parks and public spaces greater than a half acre should not be maintained by property owners. The City or a non-profit organization should be responsible for maintenance	The Specific Plan does not define the long-term ownership and maintenance of each open space. Decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis. No change recommended.
# 2	R+A	3	3.8	55	Prioritizing Active Mobility	Update maps for consistency with comments and responses in later chapters.	Update <b>Figure 17 Complete Conceptual Street Framework</b> and <b>Figure 18 Complete Bicycle Network</b> with comments and responses in <b>Section 7.2 Complete Streets Typology and Network</b> .
# 3	Google	3	3.9	58	Reducing Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips	<b>Recommendation:</b> Include new language (derived from the Peery Park Specific Plan) regarding TMA requirements: <b>"Property owners will be required to participate in a TMA which is privately funded. Responsibilities of the TMA are flexible and will be defined by a governing board and can be adjusted over time. The timing, structure, funding, and responsibility for creating a TMA will be determined by the Community Development Director/Designee following adoption of the Moffett Park Specific Plan."</b> Additionally, the MPSP should recognize existing employer-operated transportation programs and establish a mechanism of review that allows existing employer-operated programs to fulfill programmatic requirements of the TMA for that employer.	Add text: "To accommodate future growth and establish Moffett Park as a model community of climate protection, a substantial mode shift away from single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips is needed to reduce congestion, ensure multimodal access at the district gateways, and meet local and regional ambitions for improved climate and environmental outcomes. Transportation demand management (TDM) and parking management strategies aim to reduce single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel, minimize daily vehicle trips, and shift trips to transit, biking, walking, scooting, or rideshare. TDM manages transportation resources through pricing, incentives, services, communication, marketing, and other techniques. The Specific Plan builds off the City's existing requirements enhancing TDM requirements for both non-residential and multi-family residential developments. TDM programs within Moffett Park will be managed by a Transportation Management Association (TMA). <b>Property owners will be required to participate in a TMA. The timing, structure, funding, and responsibility will be defined through an immediate term implementation action following adoption of the Specific Plan."</b>
# 4	Google	4	4.1	61	Land Use Policy	<b>Comment:</b> City should allow for a range of temporary to permanent solutions enabling quick and nimble deployment and a streamlined permitting process for both temporary uses and special events. (Doing so would allow for faster deployment, the ability to test new ideas and partnerships, and the reuse/repurposing of existing spaces to create a more dynamic sense of place.)	The zoning code allows for the consideration of temporary uses and special events through a staff level review. No change recommended. <b>Add Policy: Policy LU-1.7: Enable temporary uses and special uses throughout the plan area to reserve space for future neighborhood-serving uses.</b>
# 5	Staff	4	4.1	61	Land Use Policy	Add a new policy to clarify the goal of creating complete neighborhoods by increasing amount of land area dedicated as publicly accessible.	Add policy: <b>"Policy LU-1.8: Increase the amount of land in the plan area used as publicly accessible open space, urban ecology, and complete street networks."</b>  Modify text on page 64: "Each neighborhood is distinct with a unique mix of land uses that blends the historic development of the area with future needs to create an ecological innovation district. Each neighborhood is planned around an active transportation network, parks and open space, and community-supporting services. <b>To provide for these new spaces and services, each parcel's developable area will be approximately 60-70% depending on specific circumstances."</b>
# 6	Silicon Valley @ Home	4	4.1	62	Land Use Policy	Mandate a minimum of 15% units to be affordable housing (3,000 units) with a goal of 20% of all residential units be deed-restricted affordable units	Modify Policy: <b>"Policy LU-2.1: Require a minimum of 15% of all residential units in Moffett Park as deed restricted affordable consistent with SMC 19.67 and 19.77. Provide incentives for property owners to provide more affordable housing than is required by citywide policy. The goal of the Specific Plan is to reach 20% of all residential units to be deed-restricted affordable units."</b>
# 7	Silicon Valley @ Home	4	4.1	62	Land Use Policy	Recommend an adaptive policy to allow the City to change its strategies for affordable housing production	The City continues to monitor implementation of its housing programs, including the Below Market Rate Ordinances for rental and ownership housing. The City will continue to adapt these city-wide ordinances, which are subject to changes and revisions over the lifetime of the Specific Plan. In addition, the Citywide Below Market Rate inclusionary housing program offers opportunities for Alternative Compliance, subject to City Council approval. No change recommended.
# 8	Community Non-profit Organizations	4	4.1	62	Land Use Policy	Include an explicit language expanding access to people of all incomes will require integrating deed-restricted units into both market-rate and stand-alone 100% affordable housing developments. This will require additional public and private resources to achieve deeper level of affordability	The City continues to monitor implementation of its housing programs, including the Below Market Rate Ordinances for rental and ownership housing. The City will continue to adapt these city-wide ordinances, which are subject to changes and revisions over the lifetime of the Specific Plan.  <b>"Policy LU-2.2: Fairly distribute the affordable housing units throughout Moffett Park's residential neighborhoods. Promote the mixing of affordable housing units into market-rate and 100% affordable housing developments."</b>
# 9	Community Non-profit Organizations	4	4.1	62	Land Use Policy	Consider tools that would generate additional resources, reduce costs, and incentivize affordable housing development, like allowing all or some of housing mitigation fees collected from MPSP nonresidential projects be dedicated to affordable housing projects within the plan area. Another option is to reduce development fees for affordable housing projects in the plan area.	The City is undertaking several studies to address affordable housing Citywide. Results from those studies could inform additional policies or programs that could be implemented in the MPSP. No change at this time.
# 10	Community Non-profit Organizations	4	4.1	62	Land Use Policy	Incorporate concrete language in the community benefits program to prioritize affordable housing development to expand opportunities for VLI and ELI households	City Council provided feedback to staff on the Community Benefit priorities and identified affordable housing as a high priority. Specifically the number of affordable units provided. The level of affordability was also recognized but just below in priority the total number of units provided.
# 11	Community Non-profit Organizations	4	4.1	62	Land Use Policy	Prioritize affordable housing in the community benefits, compared to other benefits	See response to comment #9.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 12	Silicon Valley @ Home	4	4.1	63	Land Use Policy	Prioritize the community benefits program to support development of additional affordable units at deeper levels of affordability at VLI an ELI households	See response to comment #9.
# 13	Google	4	4.1	63	Land Use Policy	<u>Comment:</u> Policy LU-5.2 Requires new publicly accessible parks and open spaces for residential development and non-residential development that seeks bonus floor area. However, the current City ordinance only requires the provision of parks / open space for residential development. Therefore, if non-residential developments in Moffett Park are required or contribute to publicly accessible parks and open spaces for bonus FAR it should be considered a Community Benefit.	Provision of open space and improvements onsite and in designated locations by non-residential development counts towards a development's community benefit contribution as defined in the Standards for Bonus FAR Developments. No change recommended.
# 14	Commissioner Mike Serrone	4	4.1	63	Land Use Policy	Inclusionary requirement: Is 20% affordable a maximum? Concern that we will get all of our affordable housing there. Likes the incentives and other pathways	The Specific Plan does not define a maximum amount of affordable housing in a development. No change recommended.
# 15	Kelly	4	4.2	64	Moffett Park Neighborhoods	Revise creation and innovation space reference	Revise footnote: "*** The 32 million sf Office/R+D/Industrial Range includes innovation and creation and innovation space."
# 16	Google	4	4.2	66-67	Moffett Park Neighborhoods	<u>Recommendation:</u> Remove any implication that the landscape area in front of Google's Caribbean projects will be classified as a 'Biodiversity-Hub.' These areas are private open spaces that have already been provided as part of the approved Caribbean project's conditions of approval. Therefore, those open spaces should not also be subject to the MPSP's expansion of public accessibility or "Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub" requirements. The current configuration of the new Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub area in the MPSP should be altered to not include the previously approved private open space on the Caribbean Project's property. Also, we are requesting the addition of a clarifying statement in the MPSP to the effect of: "While existing private open spaces are not the same as a public park, POPA, or Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub, they may in some instances be counted towards the District's overall open space target."	Additional OS Type has been added to Pg 138: "Contributing Open Space" Page 140, Figure 32 revised to include Contributing OS at the Caribbean Project (referenced in this comment) and at other applicable locations. Page 142, Figure 33 revised to show revisions to Urban Ecology Framework. Page 143, Figure 34 revised based on the above. Page 144-145, Table 9 revised to reflect changes outlined above. Biodiversity hubs have been redefined as follows Page 148 - Added Text at end of paragraph: Biodiversity Hubs and Habitat Patches may be a combination of public open spaces, private open spaces with public access, and private open spaces that are not accessible to the public, provided they meet the standards defined in Table 11. New Pages following Pg. 155, Add Definition of Contributing Open Space Add Contributing Open Space: Contributing Open Spaces may include public open spaces, natural areas, and private open spaces that include limited public access via a publicly accessible pathway through the space. Contributing Open Spaces shall be visible from and directly adjacent to a public or publicly accessible right-of-way. Contributing Open Spaces not designated in the Specific Plan shall not be permitted to offset designated Public or Publicly Accessible Open Spaces. Add Page Contributing Open Space Design Standards, Scale: 1 - 8 acres, Service Area: Neighborhood-Community, Minimum Resources: Accessible Pathway(s), Seating Areas, Potential Program: Similar to Neighborhood Park, Landscape and Lighting Design: Landscape design shall be per Section 6.6.6 Landscape Design. Landscape lighting shall be per Section 6.6.9 Exterior Lighting
# 17	Google	4	4.2	66-69	Moffett Park Neighborhoods	<u>Recommendation:</u> Modify text to remove references to a specific 'new pedestrian main street' connecting activity centers in the North and South Java Neighborhoods and discuss locations for retail and activation areas more generally via a 'bubble diagram.' (Diagrams and text currently contained in the document indicate a specific location for retail activation through Borregas Alley which is overly prescriptive.)	On all diagrams *location and size is subject to change during the site master plan process.
# 18	Google	4	4.2	70-71	Moffett Park Neighborhoods	<u>Recommendation:</u> Modify text, diagram, and annotation to remove implications for a specific 'Crossman Square' location; preferably replace with a 'bubble diagram' and clear intent statement that allows for flexibility in terms of design and placement. (Diagrams and text currently contained in the Draft MPSP indicate a specific location for plaza / retail activation through blocks in Crossman that have yet to be designed.)	On all diagrams *location and size is subject to change during the site master plan process.
# 19	Lockheed	4	4.2	74	Moffett Park Neighborhoods	"the expansion and restoration of the Lockheed Martin stormwater detention area" should be removed. No change the stormwater ponds is planned or needed.	Revise: "Parks and open space in the West Mathilda Neighborhood include a new neighborhood park on the US Navy site, the expansion and restoration of the Lockheed Martin stormwater detention area, and a bicycle and pedestrian connection along Discovery Way, and The West Mathilda Neighborhood includes the Ecological Combining District (ECD). The ECD that includes emergent and potential wetlands and habitat areas that will be enhanced through the development of a Biodiversity Hub and park lands."
# 20	Lockheed	4	4.2	75	Moffett Park Neighborhoods	The critical work LM performs in Sunnyside requires a security setback of 100 meters from classified areas. This is a non-negotiable requirement and must be met	All maps will be updated accordingly for the buffer areas identified, map of extents received 3/20
# 21	Lockheed	4	4.2	75	Moffett Park Neighborhoods	The map does not seem to reflect accurately the core campus boundary - specifically the buffer/setback north of Bldg. 076	All maps will be updated accordingly for the buffer areas identified, map of extents received 3/20
# 22	Jay Paul Company	4	4.2	77	Moffett Park Neighborhoods	There is an unidentified green area shown on the southwest corner of 11th Avenue and Discovery Way which should be deleted. This area is currently a parking lot and it is not on the Plan's list of planned open space.	Figure 25 will be updated to remove the open space.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 23	Commissioner Mike Serrone	4	4.3	78	Land Use Districts	How does the Moffett Park Specific Plan interact with the Housing Element?	The Specific Plan aims to provide housing opportunities for a range of incomes and households types (LU-2). The Specific Plan includes three new land use districts, MP-AC, MP-R, and MP-MU, that allow for the production of housing as a by-right use (Section 4.3). The Specific Plan sets minimum residential densities for the MP-AC and MP-R to ensure a threshold amount of housing is developed (Section 4.4). The Specific Plans to lessen constraints to housing by removing maximum densities and by incentivizing housing through the community benefits and transfer of development rights program (Sections 4.4 and 4.5). The Draft Environmental Impact Report studied up to 20,000 new housing units.  The City's 6th Cycle Housing Element identifies specific sites within Moffett Park to include in the Sites Inventory. These sites accommodate a significant proportion of the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation. No change recommended.
# 24	Divcowest	4	4.3	78	Land Use Districts	Once adopted, the MPSP update will re-designate the Property from MP-I to Moffett Park Mixed-Use (MP-MU), which appears to offer future flexibility for the Property; however, given that we have no current intentions of redeveloping the Property, we are concerned that: 1) the updated MPSP contemplates the elimination of Caspian Drive in favor of future open space, such as the proposed Caspian Community Park, and 2) the new MP-MU designation does not expressly allow data storage providers as a permitted use. Divco, thus, respectfully requests that the clarifications specified below be included in the MPSP, per our discussions during the conference call on Wednesday, February 1, 2023.	A Permitted, Conditionally Permitted, and Prohibited Uses in MPSP Districts table will be published with the proposed Zoning Code amendments. This will be released during the adoption hearings process. A response related to the Caspian Community Park and street access is provided in Section 6.5. No change recommended.
# 25	Lockheed	4	4.3	79	Land Use Districts	Language should be added to the MP-E1 district clarifying that R&D, industrial and warehouse uses are permitted	Revise: "The MP-E3 district allows for a mix of office, R&D, <del>and</del> light industrial, <b>and warehouse uses.</b> "
# 26	US Navy	4	4.3	79	Land Use Districts	The Navy requests for the "Navy parcel," that the FAR with community benefits (Bonus Maximum FAR) be increased to 100% from 75% to align with the density allowed to properties across 5th Avenue zoned MP-O1, and better complement the 135% Bonus FAR Maximum allowed on the properties immediately east across Mathilda Avenue zoned MP-O2.	The MP-E1 land use district establishes a Bonus FAR Maximum up to 75% FAR with the provision of community benefits, with a Total FAR Maximum up to 150% FAR through participation in the Transfer of Development Rights Program. No change recommended.
# 27	Harvest Properties	4	4.3	81	Land Use Districts	Split designations with MP-AC and MP-O2. Requesting MP-O2 portion to be redesignated as MP-MU to allow flexibility on the property and increase housing opportunity.	Change <b>Figure 26 Land Use Districts</b> MP-O2 portion of APN 11037002 to MP-MU.  Change <b>Figure 28 Fine Grain Core Area</b> to include all MP-MU, MP-AC, and MP-R parcels.
# 28	CommonWealth Partners	4	4.3	81	Land Use Districts	Request for redesignating their surface lots at 1184, 1194, 1224 N Mathilda Ave from R, MU, and O2 to MU	Change <b>Figure 26 Land Use Districts</b> the MP-O2 portions of Commonwealth's parcels to MP-MU.  No change recommended to MP-R to MP-MU.
# 29	CommonWealth Partners	4	4.3	81	Land Use Districts	Request for redesignating their surface lots at 1184, 1194, 1224 N Mathilda Ave from R, MU, and O2 to MU	Change <b>Figure 26 Land Use Districts</b> the MP-O2 portions of Commonwealth's parcels to MP-MU.  No change to MP-R to MP-MU.
# 30	CommonWealth Partners	4	4.3	81	Land Use Districts	Confirmation on their right to allocate their existing entitlements and any additional as-of-right zoned density across any portion of the site	All new office/R+D floor area above the base 0.35 FAR is considered Bonus FAR and subject to City Council approval. The total land area of the MP-MU zoned areas will determine the maximum Bonus FAR allowed. MP-R area will only be allowed for Residential uses
# 31	Jay Paul Company	4	4.3	81	Land Use Districts	With respect to Moffett Place (Moffett Park Drive between Borregas & Mathilda) a portion of the site is zoned MP-O2 and a portion zoned MP-MU. Both parcels should be zoned MP-O2 in order to achieve the additional density we have planned for the site without the need to acquire TDRs; the split seems rather arbitrary as it is not along any existing property lines	The MP-MU district is consistent with the Specific Plan goal of allowing for residential uses within easy walking distance of activity centers. The City will recommend changing areas of MP-MU parcels between Mathilda Avenue and Borregas Ave not adjacent to Bordeaux Ave to MP-O2.  Change Figure 26 Land Use Districts areas of MP-MU parcels between Mathilda Avenue and Borregas Ave not adjacent to Bordeaux Ave to MP-O2
# 32	Miramar Capital	4	4.3	81	General Land Use	Type I high-rise residential project is not feasible due to the construction cost and interest rate as well as the site condition. The proposal currently for the site is considering Type III building (5 story wood over 2 story concrete)	Noted. No change recommended.
# 33	Commissioner Nathan Iglesias	4	4.3	81	General Land Use	Need to be more proactive about zoning to meet the needs of the community.	Noted. No change recommended.
# 34	ALUC	4	4.4	82	General Land Use	ALUC Condition fo Approval. Add the following language for Table 2: "No residential development is allowed within the Turing Safety Zone (TSZ) of Moffett Federal Airfield (NUQ), and the population density of any nonresidential development within the TSZ shall be limited to a maximum of 200 people per acre including open areas and parking areas required for the building's occupants and one-half of the adjacent street area."	Add standard: " <b>3. Turing Safety Zone. No residential development is allowed within the Turing Safety Zone (TSZ) of Moffett Federal Airfield (NUQ), and the population density of any nonresidential development within the TSZ shall be limited to a maximum of 200 people per acre including open areas and parking areas required for the building's occupants and one-half of the adjacent street area.</b> "

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 35	Divcowest	4	4.4	82	General Land Use	<p>Given that the Property has been tenanted for years with Equinix, a data center use, Divco also requests that the MPSP clearly reflect a policy that expressly allows existing uses to continue indefinitely as the plan unfolds and evolves. To amplify this point, we ask that the data center-type use be called out in the MP-MU designation (below), as well as the subsequent Zoning Ordinance update that will be undertaken to bring the Zoning Ordinance into compliance with the adopted MPSP. <i>See Mixed-Use (MP-MU) Description in plan.</i></p> <p>Specifically, we ask that data centers be added to the Zoning Ordinance's MP-MU land use table as a permitted use and not be characterized as a conditional use or not permitted at all.</p>	A Permitted, Conditionally Permitted, and Prohibited Uses in MPSP Districts table will be published with the proposed Zoning Code amendments. This will be released during the adoption hearings process. No change recommended.
# 36	RJR	4	4.4	82	General Land Use	<p>Land Use Controls for MP-R District. The Draft Plan states that allowable land uses in the future MP-R District are listed in the Sunnyvale Zoning Code. However, there is no existing MP-R District to draw from in the Sunnyvale Zoning Code.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> Please provide proposed allowable land uses the future MP-R district within or as an attachment to the Draft MPSP.</p>	A Permitted, Conditionally Permitted, and Prohibited Uses in MPSP Districts table will be published with the proposed Zoning Code amendments. This will be released during the adoption hearings process. No change recommended.
# 37	RJR	4	4.4	82	General Land Use	<p>The Draft Plan states that all development will be required to submit a Site Master Plan for review, and that neighborhood-serving commercial uses will be subject to permitting requirements in the City's Zoning Code. However, the current zoning code does not identify commercial permitting requirements for the future MP-R District</p> <p><b>Request:</b> Please provide commercial use permitting requirements for the future MP-R district within or as an attachment to the Draft MPSP.</p>	A Permitted, Conditionally Permitted, and Prohibited Uses in MPSP Districts table will be published with the proposed Zoning Code amendments. This will be released during the adoption hearings process. No change recommended.
# 38	Google	4	4.4	82	General Land Use	<b>Recommendation:</b> Add private utilities (e.g., Central Utility Plants (CUPs) and District Infrastructure Systems) as a permitted use in all eight of the listed land use categories.	A Permitted, Conditionally Permitted, and Prohibited Uses in MPSP Districts table will be published with the proposed Zoning Code amendments. This will be released during the adoption hearings process. No change recommended.
# 39	Google	4	4.4	82	General Land Use	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Allow the transfer of development rights (TDR) between property owners for net new Bonus FAR across neighborhoods without requiring Community Benefits. (If two properties each develop to the allowable Base FAR, they would not be subject to Community Benefits. If one of these sites transfers its Base FAR to the other site, which will use that FAR as Bonus, the net development between the two sites has not changed and should therefore not necessitate Community Benefits.)</p>	<p>Revise description: "Developments requesting TDR <del>may request TDR before requesting</del> <b>must first meet the requirements for Bonus FAR through the provision of community benefits.</b>"</p> <p>See pages 84 and 86 for related clarifications.</p>
# 40	US Navy	4	4.4	83	Intensity and Density Standards	The Navy requests for the "Navy parcel," that the FAR with community benefits (Bonus Maximum FAR) be increased to 100% from 75% to align with the density allowed to properties across 5th Avenue zoned MP-O1, and better complement the 135% Bonus FAR Maximum allowed on the properties immediately east across Mathilda Avenue zoned MP-O2.	The MP-E1 land use district establishes a Bonus FAR Maximum up to 75% FAR with the provision of community benefits, with a Total FAR Maximum up to 150% FAR through participation in the Transfer of Development Rights Program. No change recommended.
# 41	R+A	4	4.4	83	Intensity and Density Standards	Remove residential floor area from Total Maximum FAR definition.	Modify Definition: " <b>Total FAR Maximum.</b> Maximum density for a parcel inclusive of office and R+D floor area, commercial and retail areas, <del>residential floor area,</del> and TDR floor area from sending parcels."
# 42	R+A	4	4.4	83	Intensity and Density Standards	Remove residential floor area from table on page 83	<p>Change <b>Table 2 Office and Residential Intensity and Density Standards by Land Use District.</b></p> <p>Modify Total FAR Maximum* Column                      MP-AC: (450%**,150%-Office)                      MP-R (350%**)                      MP-MU (400%,200%-Office)</p> <p>Footnotes:                      **Total FAR Maximum is the total of Office and R+D Bonus FAR Maximum, <del>residential floor area,</del> commercial and retail floor area, <b>innovation and creation and innovation</b> space, and additional Transfer of Development Rights Program incentives (Section 4.6)."                      ** MP-AC and MP-R developments in the Chesapeake neighborhood may exceed the Total FAR Maximum by up to 100% FAR due to additional height allowances."</p>

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 43	RJR	4	4.4	83	Intensity and Density Standards	<p>Residential FAR in the MP-R District.</p> <p>The Draft Plan states that residential development in the MP-R District will be subject to a Total Maximum FAR of 350%, but indicates that no Base or Bonus FAR applies to residential development in this area. The Draft Plan also states that residential development is not subject to maximum density controls, and that instead maximum density is limited through detailed form-based design standards.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> Application of a Total Maximum FAR functions as a de-facto residential density control by capping total allowable residential floor area within a given property. As the Plan aims to encourage high density residential development and already incorporates detailed form based density design controls (height/bulk/setback/open space), we suggest potentially eliminating the additional Total Maximum FAR limit in this district. Alternately, we suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For purposes of calculating Total Maximum FAR, please clarify that Total Maximum FAR is to be based upon total, current gross parcel areas.</li> <li>• Allowing development that proposes a high-rise development of 85' in height or greater to achieve an additional FAR bonus (potentially 0.5:1) for areas above the 8th floor of buildings, with no associated requirement to obtain transfer of development rights from the Development Reserve; increased entitlement process (i.e. Development Agreement) associated with this bonus; or requirement for additional community benefits. This would incentivize development of the high-rise typology encouraged by form based design controls within the district by allowing for additional residential area to offset increased development costs.</li> </ul>	See Table 2 revisions on page 83 for clarification, line #45 above
# 44	Google	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide clear criteria for when a Site Master Plan (SMP) will be required and when one will not. Related, provide clarity that smaller / simpler projects (e.g. office below 400k SF and residential below 400 units) can move via an expedited path within the SMP framework. (Clearly-defined processes are needed to ensure both adequate review and efficient approvals for projects of all scales; the MPSP should recognize that smaller / simpler projects should move towards approvals more quickly than larger / more complicated ones.)</p>	Due to the high level of required public improvements, including open space, bike and pedestrian improvements, roads, landscaping and stormwater improvements, City staff recommends that all projects that are not an addition to or a remodel of an existing building submit a Site Master Plan application. No change recommended.
# 45	City	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	Add clarifying language about potential adverse impacts on the environment	<p>Revise text: STANDARDS FOR ALL DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>"2. <b>Allowed floor area and density.</b> Allowed floor area and density are defined by Land Use District in Table 2. Allowed floor area and density is based on the gross parcel area.</p> <p>a. <b>Non-residential FAR.</b> "Base" and "Bonus" FAR intensity are established for each Land Use District.</p> <p>b. <b>Residential density.</b> Minimum residential densities are set for the MP-AC and MP-R districts. There are no residential maximum densities.</p> <p>c. <b>Transportation, park, and open space dedications and easements.</b> Any new dedication or easement for a street, path, or other transportation connection or open space shall not be deducted from a site's gross lot area for the purposes of calculating FAR.</p> <p>3. <b>Height.</b> All districts have maximum height. See Section 5.3.1 (Figure 30) for maximum height per district.</p> <p>4. <b>Landscaping.</b> All development shall comply with the Sunnyvale Municipal Code Title 19 Section SMC 19.37.</p> <p>5. <b>Required Complete Street, Bicycle, and Open Space Frameworks.</b> The Complete Streets Framework, Complete Bicycle Network, Parks and Open Space Framework, and site design development standards in the Specific Plan are critical to meeting the mobility, transportation, urban ecology, and open space goals of the district. Each development shall implement the required standards to ensure no adverse impact on the environment."</p>
# 46	Google	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b> In bullet point 2 replace 'Allowed floor area and density are defined by Land Use District in Table 2' with '<b>Allowed floor area and density is based on the gross parcel area within the SMP</b>'. (For multi-parcel developments as part of an SMP, floor area and density may be based on gross parcel area within the application. We believe the intent here is to help provide more opportunities for an SMP.)</p>	<p>Modify standard: "2. <b>Allowed floor area and density.</b> Allowed floor area and density are defined by Land Use District in Table 2. Allowed floor area and density is based on the gross parcel area.</p> <p>a. <b>Non-residential FAR.</b> "Base" and "Bonus" FAR intensity are established for each Land Use District. <b>Within a multi-parcel Site Master Plan, allowable floor area may be aggregated or consolidated within a neighborhood. Floor area may be moved to another Moffett Park neighborhood if it generally meets the intent of Table 1 (Section 4.2).</b></p> <p>b. <b>Residential density.</b> Minimum residential densities are set for the MP-AC and MP-R districts <b>and shall be met on identified parcels.</b> There are no residential maximum densities."</p>

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 47	RJR	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	<p>Potential Usable Open Space Conflict Language.</p> <p>The Draft Plan states that "all development must comply with the SMC Title 19 with regard to usable open space and landscaping." However, the Draft Plan provides usable open space and landscaping requirements under Section 5.3.4, and the existing zoning code does not have usable open space requirements specific to MP-R Districts.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> Please clarify the specific usable open space and landscaping requirements applicable to development in the MP-R District under both the Draft Plan and Sunnyvale Municipal Code.</p>	<p>Per Section 10.1, for all development criteria and regulations that are not amended or superseded by this Specific Plan, the provisions of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code shall prevail.</p> <p>Remove standard for clarity: "<del>4. Landscaping. All development shall comply with the Sunnyvale Municipal Code Title 19 Section SMC 19.37."</del></p>
# 48	Jay Paul Company	4	4.4	84	Land Use Policy	<p>Moffett Gateway Site at Crossman &amp; Moffett Park Drive - there is an artificial zoning split that should be resolved - a portion of the site is zoned residential and the balance MP-O2. In order to justify redevelopment of the site, we need the ability count FAR over the entire site at 135% FAR without the need to acquire TDRs. (Based on current split, we would only have 195k sf of additional density in the area of the site zoned MP-O2. Our planned commercial development at this site is 372k - meaning we would need to acquire 177k sf of TDRs which would make the redevelopment, including the residential unfeasible)</p>	<p>Modify Standard on page 84:</p> <p><b>"7. Split parcels.</b> If a parcel includes more than one Land Use District, the site development shall be based on the land area within each Land Use District. At the City's discretion, a weighted average may be distributed without regard to the Land Use District boundary, provided the Total FAR Maximum is not exceeded. <b>Where a parcel is split between MP-R and MP-O2, the gross area for the full parcel may be used to determine the allowed floor area.</b></p>
# 49	Jay Paul Company	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	<p>Consolidated density (paragraph 6). Please confirm if this is meant to provide a path for Bonus FAR transfer between parcels with common ownership?</p>	<p>Within neighborhood boundaries, FAR may be transferred and consolidated within a multi-parcel Site Master Plan. See Standard 2 revision for clarification.</p> <p>Remove standard: "<del>Standard 6. Consolidated density. As part of a Site Master Plan, Bonus FAR and residential density may be consolidated across parcels within the neighborhood boundaries in Figure 19."</del></p>
# 51	RJR	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	<p>Please confirm that above grade parking levels would not count towards Total Maximum FAR.</p> <p>Please also confirm that community service Retail/Commercial space (not required on the Property would not count towards Total Maximum FAR.</p>	<p>Above grade parking levels and neighborhood-serving uses do not count towards the <b>total</b> non-residential FAR. Modify standard for clarity.</p> <p><b>"8.Exemptions.</b> The following building area may be exempt from a project's development's gross floor area, including allowed FAR, community benefit, or development reserve calculations. <del>subject to approval from the decision-making body.</del> <b>Exemptions include neighborhood-serving uses (Section 4.6), parking, and district utilities.</b></p> <p><del><b>a. Neighborhood serving uses.</b> As defined in Section 4.6, neighborhood-serving uses may be excluded from gross floor area for Bonus FAR non-residential development, mixed-use projects development with a residential component, and residential development. The maximum floor area exemption shall not exceed 10% of the project's development's gross floor area (up to 20,000 SF).</del></p> <p><del><b>b. District parking facilities or infrastructure.</b> Building spaces devoted to district parking or district infrastructure shall be excluded from allowable gross floor area calculations if these uses facilities are provided."</del></p>
# 52	Google	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u> In bullet point 8.a add: <b>"Building spaces, whether above or below grade, that are devoted to either parking (for office, residential, or district use) or district infrastructure shall be excluded from gross floor area calculations. 'Above-grade' is understood as the 'story' and not 'basement' as defined by the IBC".</b></p> <p>(Structured parking has significant public realm benefits over surface parking, but is significantly more expensive to provide. District infrastructure similarly can have significant capital costs. In both cases, the cost is to be borne primarily by office and residential development, which should not have to lose development square footage in order to provide beneficial district-serving infrastructure or parking.)</p>	<p>Above grade parking levels and district utilities do not count towards the non-residential FAR. See Standard 8 revision for clarification.</p>
# 53	Google	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Neighborhood serving uses should be exempt from a project's FAR with the approval of an SMP. (Neighborhood-serving uses should be incentivized through an FAR exemption. This would also support project feasibility)</p>	<p>Neighborhood-serving uses are exempt from FAR calculations. Neighborhood-serving uses defined in the draft revised zoning code. No change recommended.</p>
# 54	Silicon Valley @ Home	4	4.4	84	Standards for All Development	<p>The Affordable Housing Mitigation Fees (Commercial Linkage Fees) collected from nonresidential development within MPSP should be available exclusively for MPSP residential projects</p>	<p>The City's existing commercial linkage fee program does not establish a geographic limit to the expenditure of funds within the city. It allows City staff to opportunistically support affordable housing throughout all neighborhoods. The Moffett Park Specific Plan does not amend the City's existing commercial linkage fee program implementation. No change recommended.</p>
# 55	ALUC	4	4.4	84	Standards for All development	<p>ALUC Condition of Approval. "Prior to the issuance of building permits, pursuant to NUQ CLUP policy G-5, an Avigation Easement shall be dedicated to the United States Government on behalf of Moffett Federal Airfield."</p>	<p>Add standard: <b>"10. Avigation easements. Prior to the issuance of building permits, pursuant to NUQ CLUP policy G-5, an Avigation Easement shall be dedicated to the United States Government on behalf of Moffett Federal Airfield."</b></p>

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 56	RJR	4	4.4	85	Standards for Residential Development	<p>Potential Usable Open Space Conflict Language.</p> <p>The Draft Plan states that "all development must comply with the SMC Title 19 with regard to usable open space and landscaping." However, the Draft Plan provides usable open space and landscaping requirements under Section 5.3.4, and the existing zoning code does not have usable open space requirements specific to MP-R Districts.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> Please clarify the specific usable open space and landscaping requirements applicable to development in the MP-R District under both the Draft Plan and Sunnyvale Municipal Code.</p>	<p>Per Section 10.1, for all development criteria and regulations that are not amended or superseded by this Specific Plan, the provisions of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code shall prevail.</p> <p>Remove standard for clarity: "<del>2. Usable open space and landscaping.</del> All development shall comply with the Sunnyvale Municipal Code Title 19 (Zoning)."</p>
# 57	Google	4	4.4	85	Standards for Residential Development	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u></p> <p>Modify bullet point 2.a to say, "Proposed open space types and design standards including size, width, and other standards, are identified in Chapter 6. Where required, property owners shall dedicate land or provide an easement consistent with these standards. Improvements shall be constructed by the development and shall be eligible for equivalent dollar value credit to offset Parkland Dedication obligations and land value credit." (Developers providing a public benefit should have the ability to earn actual dollar value improvement credits via dedication of land or easement for public parks or improvements thereon.)</p>	<p>Revise standard: "<b>3. Provision of open space versus payment of park dedication in-lieu fees.</b> Where open space types are identified in the Parks and Open Space Framework (see Chapter 6), developments are required to provide open space for public use and improvements which will credit toward the park dedication requirements. Residential densities are based on gross lot area."</p>
# 58	Berlinger Cohen LLP	4	4.4	85	Standards for Residential Development	<p>All developments are required to comply SMC Title 19 (Zoning) and park dedication fees for rental housing projects (Chapter 19.74) is part of Title 19. Chapter 19.74 provides for the requirement of residential projects to dedicate land, pay a fee, or both, at the option of the City. Unclear why it was explained that the developers would not be able to pay the in-lieu fee and have to dedicate parkland. Allowing in-lieu fee only with CC approval adds uncertainty into the process.</p>	<p>Where open space types are identified in the Parks and Open Space Framework, the provision of open space and improvement of parkland is the preferred option for implementing the City's parkland dedication requirement as stated on page 85. No change recommended.</p>
# 59	Silicon Valley @ Home	4	4.4	85	Standards for Residential Development	<p>Mandate feasible affordability requirements that will ensure deed restricted units are integrated with future residential projects in MPSP</p>	<p>The MPSP is consistent with the citywide policy on affordable housing requirements. Staff did not receive direction from Council to create a separate set of policies. No change recommended.</p>
# 60	Community Non-profit Organizations	4	4.4	85	Standards for Residential Development	<p>Include an explicit requirement that a minimum 15% of housing units be income-restricted affordable housing units for moderate income, LI, VLI, ELI households with a goal of achieving 20%</p>	<p>The City continues to monitor implementation of it's housing programs, including the Below Market Rate Ordinances for rental and ownership housing. The City will continue to adapt these city-wide ordinances, which are subject to changes and revisions over the lifetime of the Specific Plan.</p> <p>Remove standard from page 85. New developments are expected to adhere to the City's affordable housing requirements: "<del>5. Alternative pathway to meet affordable housing requirement. Developers may request to meet inclusionary housing requirements through a variety of alternatives, as outlined in Sunnyvale Municipal Code Title 19 (Zoning).</del>"</p>
# 61	Berlinger Cohen LLP	4	4.4	85	Standards for Residential Development	<p>Clarify requirements for residential development or component to exceed the minimum density up to Total FAR Maximum. All projects are required to meet the minimum density of the applicable district and the language sounds either incorrect or confusing.</p>	<p>Modify text: "Residential development or the residential component of a mixed-use development may exceed the minimum density up to the Total FAR Maximum if they shall meet all of the following requirements, in addition to the Standards for All Development requirements above."</p>
# 62	Ellis Partners	4	4.4	86	Standards for Bonus FAR Development	<p>Request the community benefits to be defined similar to Peery Park Specific Plan and Lawrence Station Area Plan instead of requiring negotiation on a project-by-project basis.</p>	<p>Due to the mixed-use nature of the MPSP plan area coupled with the need for a large number of infrastructure and other public improvements, a point system was not feasible. Additionally, as economic and community factors influence the type and intensity of development in the plan area, the improvements needed will evolve, again making a point system less adaptable and less desirable. No change recommended.</p>
# 63	Ellis Partners	4	4.4	86	Standards for Bonus FAR Development	<p>Decrease LEED requirement from Platinum to Gold, and have the platinum level as part of the community benefits. Achieving LEED Platinum certification is costly.</p>	<p>Moffett Park is envisioned as an ecological innovation district that combines the tenants of sustainability, ecology, and resilience. To help achieve that vision, Moffett Park requires Bonus FAR projects to achieve LEED-Platinum. Like other areas of the City, development projects are required to meet the intent of the LEED standards but not required to be certified by the US Green Building Council, an additional and costly step. No change recommended.</p>
# 64	Google	4	4.4	85	Standards for Bonus FAR Development	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Add language stating that "All POPAs are eligible for 100% parkland dedication credit and equivalent credit for value of improvements to the POPA. Likewise, reasonable capitalized operating expenses for POPAs should be considered additional public benefit and count towards park credit." (Adding this language will encourage the development of more publicly accessible open spaces within Moffett Park that that will be privately maintained at minimal to no cost to the public)</p>	<p>Revise text to include: "The City will review and consider any proposed "Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Parks" (POPA) for eligibility for parkland dedication credit (up to 100%) and equivalent credit for value of improvements to the POPA. All POPA's require a public easement dedication and are to be maintained by the property owner. The consideration of each POPA's eligibility for parkland dedication is to be an element of the Site Master Plan review process."</p>
# 65	Google	4	4.4	86	Standards for Bonus FAR Development	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Development applications for smaller and/or single-parcel developments that access Bonus FAR should not be required to establish a Development Agreement (DA) - but could still be subject to Community Benefits.</p>	<p>The current MPSP includes a "Bonus FAR" program, requiring a Development Agreement consistent with the history of development within the plan area. As noted above, due to the public improvement needs in the plan area, a point system is not feasible. No change recommended.</p>



**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 66	Google	4	4.4	86	Standards for Bonus FAR Development	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Modify bullet point 2.a to say, "Proposed open space types and design standards including size, width, and other standards, are identified in Chapter 6. Where required, property owners shall dedicate land or provide an easement consistent with these standards. Improvements shall be constructed by the development and shall be eligible for equivalent dollar value credit to offset Parkland Dedication obligations and land value credit." (Developers providing a public benefit should have the ability to earn actual dollar value improvement credits via dedication of land or easement for public parks or improvements thereon.)	Revise standard: "4. <b>Park and open space dedications or easements.</b> Where open space types are identified in the Parks and Open Space Framework, the development shall contribute the open space onsite and in designated locations and improvements as part of its community benefits contribution."
# 67	Community Non-profit Organizations	4	4.4	87	District Community Benefits	The establishment of a small business advocate office that serves as a single point of contact for existing Sunnyvale small business owners and non-profits, or through a small business alliance, to support the proposed retention/expansion policy currently included in the Community Benefits Program list.	The City has an Economic Development Division as part of the City Manager's Office. Economic Development staff works directly with businesses as the first link to City government. No change recommended.
# 68	Google	4	4.4	87	District Community Benefits	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> In Table 3, under Public Uses, modify "Dedication of land or built facilities for public uses, including community centers, schools, and other government facilities, such as police substation, in excess of the amount required under existing City and	Modify Table 3: Public uses description: "Dedication of land or built facilities for public uses, including community centers, schools, and other government facilities, such as police substation, in excess of the amount required under existing City and Specific Plan regulations."
# 69	Kelly	4	4.4	87	District Community Benefits	Revise creation and innovation space reference	Revise text: "Retention and/or expansion of existing small business or non-profits, including below market rate innovation and creation and innovation spaces"
# 70	Google	4	4.4	87	District Community Benefits	<u>Recommendation:</u> Add language stating that "The undergrounding of PG&E's high voltage power lines along the eastern edge of the East Channel would enable additional high quality open space benefits within the Moffett Park Specific Plan. It would further contribute to the City's vision for an East Channel open space corridor and is eligible as a park and open space dedication credit equivalent for its improvement value. Reduced open space setbacks along the East Channel Greenbelt, may also be considered, if the HV lines are undergrounded." (Encouraging developers to coordinate with PG&E will allow for improved outcomes and greater ability to deliver on the Specific Plan's guiding principles, standards, and overarching vision to create an ecological innovation district.)	Modify Table 3: District transportation and utility improvements description: "Off-site transportation, infrastructure, and utility improvements in excess of required contributions that address the fair share of impacts needed to serve the development. May include undergrounding of PG&E's high voltage power lines along the eastern edge of the East Channel in concert with open space and ecological improvements."
# 71	Google	4	4.4	87	District Community Benefits	<u>Recommendation:</u> Under the "Accommodation" subhead, include a sentence regarding stormwater incentivizing (through fee offset, community benefits, or other methods) effective and even beyond-code performance of stormwater management as a critical flood mitigation strategy. (With new large areas of open space and green infrastructure being proposed, Moffett Park has the potential to increase its ability to absorb, slow, and treat water from increased precipitation events. But this won't happen without incentives and being open to alternative approaches to compliance that look to unlock strategies limited by business as usual (BAU) parcel-by-parcel development.)	Modify Table 3: Ecological and Environmental Enhancements "On-site or off-site improvements related to ecological enhancement or environmental stewardship, including stormwater enhancements above requirements and interpretive center."
# 72	Commissioner Mike Serrone	6	4.4	87	District Community Benefits	Can their be an interpretative center in the Ecological Combining District?	Modify Table 3: Ecological and Environmental Enhancements "On-site or off-site improvements related to ecological enhancement or environmental stewardship, including stormwater enhancements above requirements and interpretive center."
# 73	Commissioner Carol Weiss	4	4.5	88	Transfer of Development Rights	Schools: Major concern with all of the land use and parcels that are set aside but there are not school districts. If you are going to have 20,000 housing units, there are going to be a lot of students. I don't see any parcels of land for schools to lease. You will have a lot more VMT because have to take their kids to school.	The Specific Plan includes a transfer of development rights program to incentivize the location of a neighborhood school in Moffett Park. School uses will be an allowed use in all zoning districts except in MP-E2.
# 74	Google	4	4.5	88	Transfer of Development Rights	<u>Recommendation:</u> Clarify that Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) may be used at a receiving site on top of the initial Base FAR without accessing Bonus FAR (to bring up the site to Max).	Revise standard: "2b. <b>Allowable transfers.</b> All the nonresidential floor area on a sending parcel may be transferred in its entirety, to a single receiving parcel, or in separate increments to several receiving parcels. Receiving parcels may receive floor area from multiple sending parcels. Individual receiving parcels may not exceed the Total FAR Maximum. Receiving parcels are not required to access Bonus FAR before accepting TDR floor area."
# 75	Google	4	4.5	88	Transfer of Development Rights	<u>Recommendation:</u> Expressly state that Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) sending sites may later replenish their Base FAR rights either by transferring in rights from qualifying sending sites or by accessing the Development Reserve.	The purpose of the Transfer of Development Rights program is to incentivize Specific Plan priorities for open space, urban ecology, public schools, housing, and community facilities. Sites may not "replenish" their Base FAR rights as those sites would accommodate those priority uses and improvements. No change recommended.
# 76	Jay Paul Company	4	4.5	89	Transfer of Development Rights	Requiring purchase of TDR from another property owner and making FAR achieved through TDR also subject to community benefits make redevelopment of Discovery neighborhood very expensive compared to other neighborhoods in the plan area	Modify standard: "2.d. <b>Fees for transferred square footage.</b> The receiving non-residential development shall not be required to pay City's commercial linkage fees or community benefits fees on the transferred non-residential square feet."
# 77	Google	4	4.5	89	Transfer of Development Rights	<u>Recommendation:</u> Under Standard 3.a, allow sites zoned for office to transfer their Base FAR rights when dedicating those sites for the use of public schools, open space, district infrastructure, district parking, or community facilities.	The Transfer of Development Rights program allows the transfer of existing demolished square feet for the provision public schools, open spaces, and community facilities, not the parcel's base FAR. District parking is not included on the list of priorities. No change recommended.



**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 78	Lockheed	4	4.5	89	Transfer of Development Rights	Should clarify that Property owner shall submit a Habitat Enhancement and Management Plan, but City or Non-profit shall be responsible for implementing the plan and maintaining the Ecological Combining District.	Decisions related to the plan will be made during the Site Master Plan and Development Agreement processes. The following changes are recommended to clarify requirements for TDR. None of these requirements prohibit the property owner from partnering with another company, agency, or non-profit to prepare and implement the maintenance and management plan.  "Ecological Combining District (ECD). To facilitate the expansion and enhancement of the unique habitat, property owners north of 1st Avenue in the ECD may transfer non-residential building area and developable square footage up to the Base FAR to other sites within Moffett Park if the following conditions are met: 01. Prepare a maintenance and management plan for the ECD. 02. A plan to implement the habitat enhancements that shall be completed within the ECD. Examples of habitat enhancements include, but are not limited to, the removal of existing buildings, removal of impervious surface, improvements of stormwater management facilities, and landscape design and planting to enhance the ecological value of the area. 03. Adherence to additional standards in the Open Space and Urban Ecology Chapter."
# 79	Commissioner Mike Serrone	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	Retail: lots of pictures showing a great time. Developers don't want to build, it's a loser on their proforma analysis. Is it aspirational, is it forced somehow?	Section 4.6 includes requirements for neighborhood-serving uses, including retail, services, and community office. No change recommended.
# 80	City	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	Clarify uses	Add footnote to end of definitions: "For more information on the specific uses, see the permitted uses for Moffett Park in the Zoning Code."
# 81	Google	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	<u>Recommendation:</u> Identify retail (frontage) areas via a 'bubble diagram' rather than defining very specific locations. In North and South Java, remove any emphasis on a new activity center along a 'pedestrian main street' and emphasize activation of the public realm along Borregas Avenue in the North and South Java Neighborhoods and at Crossman Square in the Crossman Neighborhood. Provide clear statements of intent for how retail frontages should interact with the public realm. Then, allow Site Master Plans (SMPs) to set eventual retail frontage locations within those more loosely defined 'bubbles.' (The diagrams currently shown in the Draft MPSP are highly-prescriptive for blocks that have yet to be designed (e.g., Borregas Alley).) <u>See Exhibit #1 in Appendix</u>	Modify standard: "3. Neighborhood-serving retail and commercial ground floors. New development shall meet the following requirements: Frontages shall meet the following standards: <del>a. Ground floor frontage. Within North Java, South Java, and Crossman neighborhoods, a minimum 85% of building frontage identified in Figure 27 shall be retail and commercial storefronts. For other neighborhoods, a minimum 50% of building frontage identified shall be retail and commercial storefronts.</del> <b>a. Amount of Retail.</b> Areas identified in Figure 27 shall provide the required minimum amount of floor area in retail and commercial storefronts. Storefronts shall be on the ground floor fronting public rights-of-way or open spaces and laneways with public access easements. North Java/Borregas Square: 50,000 square feet; and 15,000 square feet medium format tenant space South Java Mini Park/Laneway: 40,000 square feet; and 15,000 square feet medium format tenant space Crossman Square and Laneways: 50,000 square feet; and 30,000 square feet medium format tenant space Chesapeake Greenbelt: 10,000 square feet West Mathilda/LHM Way: 6,000 square feet Tech Corners (11th and Discovery Way): 2,000 square feet 5th Avenue VTA Station: 2,000 square feet
# 82	Google	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	<u>Recommendation:</u> Identify retail (frontage) areas via a 'bubble diagram' rather than defining very specific locations. In North and South Java, remove any emphasis on a new activity center along a 'pedestrian main street' and emphasize activation of the public realm along Borregas Avenue in the North and South Java Neighborhoods and at Crossman Square in the Crossman Neighborhood. Provide clear statements of intent for how retail frontages should interact with the public realm. Then, allow Site Master Plans (SMPs) to set eventual retail frontage locations within those more loosely defined 'bubbles.' (The diagrams currently shown in the Draft MPSP are highly-prescriptive for blocks that have yet to be designed (e.g., Borregas Alley).) <u>See Exhibit #1 in Appendix</u>	<b>c. Location of Retail/Commercial Storefronts.</b> The minimum of amount of retail required shall be located in the following locations. North Java/Borregas Square. 50% of required retail shall front Borregas Square and north/south laneway connecting from Java Drive to the Caspian Community Park. South Java Mini Park/Laneway. 50% of required retail shall front the north/south laneway connecting from Java Drive south. Chesapeake Greenbelt. Required retail shall be located on the north side of the Chesapeake Greenbelt and should be split between the two parcels fronting the Greenbelt. West Mathilda/LHM Way. Required retail shall be located on the north side of Lockheed Martin Way. Tech Corners. Required retail shall be located fronting publicly-accessible open space at the intersection of 11th Avenue and Discovery Way. 5th Avenue VTA Station. Required retail shall be located fronting 5th Avenue adjacent to or across the street from the VTA Station.
# 83	Google	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> For bullet point 3.1, modify language to say 'Within North Java, South Java, and Crossman neighborhoods, with a minimum of 25% up to a maximum of 75% of building frontage within identified Community-Serving Use Areas in Figure 27 shall be retail, commercial, and/or community-serving storefronts. (This modified standard incorporates a blended definition of retail and community uses, and a market-appropriate reduction in retail quantum.)	See revisions to Standard 3, page 90.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 84	Google	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Delete bullet point 3.b: "Ground floor retail and commercial storefronts shall have a minimum depth of 25 feet and a minimum of 50% of the frontages shall have a minimum depth greater than 50 feet". (Given current and likely market conditions, specified retail depth(s) may make tenanting overly prescriptive, resulting in a reduction in the number of spaces that can likely be leased.	Revise standard: " <b>b. Ground floor depth.</b> Ground floor retail and commercial storefronts shall have a minimum depth of 25 feet and a minimum of 50% of the total frontage in each area identified in Figure 27 shall have a minimum depth greater than 50 feet. <b>Exceptions to the minimum depth may be made for a maximum of 10% of total frontage in each area.</b> "
# 85	Chuck Fraleigh	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	Include at least one additional retail location over 50,000 s.f. for a larger grocery store to be located to serve the future MPSP residents	Larger grocery stores would be permitted, only the minimum required size is included in the Specific Plan. No change recommended.
# 86	Google	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Modify bullet point 4.a to read, "A minimum of one medium format retailer with a minimum floor area greater than 7,500 square feet shall be located in the North Java neighborhood." (For this location, 7,500 square feet of retail is a more reasonable minimum given current and likely market conditions. (Developers can always provide more if market conditions improve).)	Medium-format retail includes spaces for tenants such as grocery stores, pharmacies, hardware stores, or other retailers that require larger retail shells typically ranging from 15,000 to 40,000 square feet. Shells may be temporarily subdivided through a minor use permit as the demand for those uses grows. No change recommended.
# 87	Google	4	4.6	91	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Modify bullet point 4.c to read "A minimum of one medium format retailer with a minimum floor area greater than 7,500 square feet shall be located in the Crossman neighborhood". (For this location, 7,500 square feet of retail is a more reasonable minimum given current and likely market conditions. (Developers can always provide more if market conditions improve).)	Medium-format retail includes spaces for tenants such as grocery stores, pharmacies, hardware stores, or other retailers that require larger retail shells typically ranging from 15,000 to 40,000 square feet. Shells may be temporarily subdivided through a minor use permit as the demand for those uses grows. No change recommended.
# 88	Google	4	4.6	91	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	<u>Recommendation:</u> Blend the 'retail / commercial' and 'office / community' uses into a single category, providing developers with greater flexibility to provide market-responsive solutions to neighborhood needs. (In so doing, we recognize the need for certain uses / formats (e.g., a grocery store) and the need for flexibility considering the changing face of retail coupled with the rebuilding of businesses following the pandemic.)	Neighborhood-serving office and community uses provide space for non-profit office, medical clinics, medical offices, childcare, adult daycare, yoga/dance studios, education businesses, or other similar uses. These uses complement, but are different from, neighborhood-serving retail and commercial uses, which provide space for uses like retail sales, personal services, financial institutions, service commercial, and restaurants. Both types of uses are important to the success of Moffett Park over the long term, which is why the MPSP includes requirements for both. No change recommended.
# 89		4	4.6	92	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	Interested in a public library.	The Specific Plan provides a framework to create opportunities for institutional and community-serving uses, such as libraries (Goal LU-1). Project developers are required to provide space for community center or library uses in the North Java and Crossman Neighborhoods (Section 4.6). No change recommended.
# 90	Jay Paul Company	4	4.6	92	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	Figure 27 - Neighborhood Serving Use Locations. The planned Activity Center at the corner of 11th and Discovery Way and the retail requirement in this location should be eliminated. Activity Centers in other parts of the plan area make sense because there are a variety of uses and the critical mass of adjacent retail to assure successful attraction and retention of retail tenants. This is not the case in this particular location because stand-alone Retail is difficult to Lease and co-locating retail in a building that would typically be leased on a single tenant basis will create security issues for the tenant and will make the building extremely difficult to lease. Our Moffett Towers and Moffett Towers 2 campuses both have stand alone retail spaces that are currently vacant and have been problematic to fill over the life of both projects. The Discovery Neighborhood is comprised of large campuses that are leased on a single tenant building basis to tenants that provide significant onsite amenities and subsidized high quality food service to their employees. Its very difficult for either subsidized or unsubsidized retail to compete; attracting small retail tenants has been nearly impossible. Co-locating retail space within buildings typically leased on a single tenant basis will pose significant security concerns to potential tenants making buildings challenging to lease. These tenants lease entire buildings so they can control what happens in and around their buildings. This is an infill site; retail in this location will be a security issue to tenants. Retail is best located in larger concentrations eg the high density, mixed use neighborhoods east of Mathilda or close to the planned residential in the West Mathilda Neighborhood. Its not appropriate in infill buildings located in existing secure campuses.	In order to support workers and residents, and to create a walkable community, Moffett Park's neighborhood-serving uses help fulfill daily needs within a short walk or bike ride from new homes and businesses. A reduced minimum amount of 2,000 square feet is proposed. See revisions to Standard 3, page 90.
# 91	Ellis Partners	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Eliminate requirement for Creation and Innovation space outside of Activity Centers. Suggested making creation and innovation requirement optional and incentivize this requirement by excluding them from FAR calculations and granting community benefits credit for constructing them	The City envisions Moffett Park as a vibrant ecological innovation district, with a variety of businesses and tenants, including those that will need spaces suitable for innovation and creation. In recent decades, the high value of Class A office space has reduced the availability of leasable space for small businesses, start-up, creators, and makers. This requirement ensures that space for innovation and creation continues in Moffett Park. No change recommended.
# 92	US Navy	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	The Navy requests the MPSP review this level of Innovation and Creation space and reduce to a minimum requirement of 5%.	Staff is not recommending a change, however the option to modify the plan to include this change can be handled through the alternative to adopt the plan with additional modifications.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 93	Staff	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Create small project exemption	Revise standard: " <b>1. Innovation and creation space minimum area.</b> A minimum of 7.5% of all net new office and R+D space shall be provided as innovation or creation space. Creation space floor area may be counted at 1.5 times innovation space to meet minimum amount (i.e., 10,000 square feet of creation space = 15,000 square feet of innovation space). <b>Projects requesting less than 150,000 square feet of floor area from the small project reserve are exempt from innovation and creation space minimum area standard.</b> "
# 94	Staff	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Clarify adjacency to residential	Revise standard: " <b>4. Design standards for creation space.</b> a. Creation spaces shall be located on the ground floor and have a floor-to-floor height of 20 feet. b. Creation space shall not be located <del>adjacent to or across from residential uses</del> or within a 100 foot radius of ground floor residential units. c. Creation Space leases shall be limited to 40,000 square feet per lessee."
# 95	US Navy	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	The definition supplied in the Draft MPSP implies Innovation & Creation Space would be below market rental rate space because the space is reserved for "start-up" and "accelerators" which typically are viewed as below market rate rent customers. After clarification from the Sunnyvale Department of Community Development, it is now known that Innovation and Creation space do not require below market rate rental rates. The Navy suggests that the Draft MPSP denote this in the definitions of Innovation and Creation spaces.	Revised text: "It is preferred that Innovation Spaces are located within or near activity centers to provide a diversity of employment close to transit and within proximity to daily needs. <b>Innovation and creation space is not required to be provided at below market rental rates.</b> "
# 96	Newmark	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Rental cost for creation and innovation space would be too costly and would make the space sitting vacant. There are no demand for this kind of space and no corporate tenants would share space with another tenant due to security reasons. The design standards for creation and innovation standards make it expensive to construct. Recommendation: eliminate the requirement and make it as a community benefit option and incentivize them by not calculating into FAR	See response on page 93. Innovation and creation space is calculated as part of the non-residential development FAR. No change recommended.
# 97	Ellis Partners	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Design standards for the creation and innovation spaces (20-ft ceilings for creation space and divisible down to 3,600 s.f. for innovation space) make projects infeasible for office development if required outside of Activity Centers	See response on page 93. No change recommended.
# 98	Jay Paul Company	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Remove creation and innovation space requirement for existing campuses that are looking to add infill buildings	See response on page 93. No change recommended.
# 99	Jay Paul Company	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Requiring inclusion of creation and innovation space would create significant security issues for campus tenants. Consolidating creation and innovation space into a single family poses security issues as campuses are sometimes leased in their entirety by a single tenant. Impractical to provide 40,000 s.f. creation and innovation space for a single infill building	See response on page 93. No change recommended.
# 100	Jay Paul Company	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Creation and innovation space will be unaffordable for tenants and poses potential for permanent vacancies	See response on page 93. No change recommended.
# 101	Jay Paul Company	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Lease for non-creation and innovation space would need to increase for tenants to cover the cost of creation and innovation space, which would make Moffett Park less competitive	See response on page 93. No change recommended.
# 102	Jay Paul Company	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Co-locating creation space in Class A office buildings is not practical	See response on page 93. No change recommended.
# 103	Jay Paul Company	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Infill development of office should be exempt from the creation and innovation building	See response on page 93. No change recommended.
# 104	Brick	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Finally, we would like to highlight the requirement for Creation/Innovation spaces in the O-1 and O-2 zones. While we believe that these spaces have the potential to be an important asset to the new district, we have concerns about the specific requirements outlined in the Draft Moffett Park Specific Plan. The tenant market for these types of small spaces is limited, which will result in many empty spaces. Many large corporate tenants cannot share their campuses with other tenants due to security concerns. Additionally, the requirement for redundant infrastructure, such as electrical services and generators, will increase the carbon footprint of the project and place additional demands on the city's infrastructure.	See response on page 93. No change recommended.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 105	Jay Paul Company	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	While we agree its important to maintain a diversity of businesses in Moffett Park, the Innovation and Maker Space requirement should not be imposed on existing campuses adding infill buildings as it is detrimental to the secure environment these campuses have been carefully designed to achieve and the single tenant nature of campus buildings. Tech tenants lease space in suburban campuses because they can create highly secure environments for their most sensitive projects. Requiring the inclusion of Innovation and Creation Space in new infill buildings, will create significant security issues for tech tenants as they typically lease an entire building to control access and security in and around their buildings. The option to consolidate all Innovation and Creation Space into a single facility on a campus still poses security issues as campuses are sometimes leased in their entirety by a single tenant. Further, its just not practical to say, build a 40,000 sf building to satisfy the maker space requirement for a single infill building. Innovation and Creation space is typically located in older first and second generation space in Moffett Park because these buildings are affordable. The high rental rates infill developers must charge to offset Innovation and Creation space development costs, however will be unaffordable to these types of tenants, creating the potential for permanent vacancies. Finally, The demand for this type of space is being created by the demolition of existing maker space type buildings in Moffett Park, not the addition of infill buildings on existing campuses. Infill buildings should be exempt from the Innovation and Creation Space requirement. Alternatively, the Innovation and Creation Space requirement could be encouraged through community benefits at the option of the developer.	See response on page 93. No change recommended.
# 106	Lockheed	4	4.7	93	Innovation and Creation Space	Clarify that Creation Space not being adjacent to residential means "not opposite the front entrance of residential buildings"	Revise standard: " <b>4. Design standards for creation space.</b> a. Creation spaces shall be located on the ground floor and have a floor-to-floor height of 20 feet. b. Creation space shall not be located <del>adjacent to or across from residential uses or</del> <b>within 100 feet of ground floor residential units.</b> c. Creation Space leases shall be limited to 40,000 square feet per lessee."
# 107	Lockheed	4	4.7	94	Development Reserve	Add language to end of 1. "unless otherwise permitted pursuant to pursuant to a development agreement approved by City Council"	Per standard 3, all use of the development reserve is subject to City Council approval. No change recommended.
# 108	R+A	4	4.8	94	Development Reserve	Clarify Innovation and Creation Space	Add standard. " <b>3. Innovation and creation space inclusion in development reserve. Required square footage for creation and innovation space (Section 4.7) is included in the development reserve allocation.</b> "
# 109	Commissioner Carol Weiss	4	4.8	94	Development Reserve	Development reserve: Lowerance station reserve was flexible to allow for changes in market conditions. Is the reserve static? Or can there be a provision to allow changes based on market changes?	The City will review the development by neighborhood every five years and either reconfirm the distribution or amend it based on the needs of the community and the emerging development patterns. No change recommended.
# 110	Commissioner Mike Serrone	4	4.8	94	Development Reserve	Development reserve: is there a reason why it does not include retail?	Retail was separated from office, R&D, and industrial uses in both the Specific Plan and in the EIR. No change recommended.
# 111	Chuck Fraleigh	4	4.8	94	Development Reserve	Balance the job/housing for MPSP by either reducing the amount of office addition allowed or increasing the housing	At the direction of City Council, the City studied 10,000,000 square feet of office, R&D, and industrial uses and 20,000 housing units in the Specific Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Draft Environmental Impact Report, as required, includes an analysis of project alternatives, which includes a reduced development alternative that does not meet the City's objectives to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan. Additional housing was not studied. No change recommended.
# 112	US Navy	4	4.8	95	Development Reserve	Development Reserve for the West Mathilda neighborhood is listed as 800,199 sf. If the Navy parcel were redeveloped with a 75% FAR, the net new sf would be 860,049 sf. This would completely deplete the Development Reserve for the West Mathilda neighborhood (800,199 sf) and would not allow for any future redevelopment a FAR greater than 72% to not exceed the Development Reserve maximum. The Navy requests either this Development Reserve for West Mathilda be raised considerably or please clarify if our understanding of the Table is incorrect.	In addition to the Neighborhood Reserve, the Base FAR Reserve applies to the West Mathilda neighborhood. The Base FAR Reserve consists of 2 million additional square feet, which may be acquired through the TDR program. The MP-E1 allows for up to 150% FAR with TDR, enabling the transfer of development to the Navy site or other sites. No change recommended.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 113	Jay Paul Company	4	4.8	95	Development Reserve	<p>Table 4 - Estimated Office R&amp;D and Industrial Total FAR at Plan Buildout. The estimate of 7.7 million sf of total development in the Discovery Neighborhood is understated. We previously submitted information to the City indicating we intend to develop an additional 1.1 million SF in this neighborhood. This would bring the potential total development closer to 8 million sf.</p> <p>The Development Reserve should be allocated more equitably between the various neighborhoods. The draft Plan currently allocates 60% of the Development Reserve excluding the Base FAR and Small Project Reserves to the South Java and Crossman neighborhoods which represent only 32% of the plan area. In contrast, the Discovery Neighborhood, which represents nearly 20% of the plan area is only allocated 10% of the net reserve. While we understand one of the goals of the draft plan is to encourage higher density development in the neighborhoods east of Mathilda, this disproportionate allocation means sites in the Discovery Neighborhood must acquire expensive TDR's, if available from private parties, in a disproportionate amount when compared to other neighborhoods. Further, FAR achieved through the purchase of Base Reserve TDR's would also be subject to community benefits requirements, making development in the Discovery Neighborhood much more expensive than other neighborhoods in Moffett Park. Allocating just 714k to the entire Discovery Neighborhood is not equitable.</p> <p>Development reserve is disproportionate within different neighborhoods (60% of the development reserve allocated to South Java and Crossman neighborhoods, and only 11% of the net reserve in Discovery neighborhood)</p>	<p>The Development Reserve allocates Bonus FAR to each neighborhood in Moffett Park to incentivize the vision for an ecological innovation district. The maximum net new SF is 10 million across the entire district which is allocated to 6 different neighborhoods in the area. Currently, 53% of the non-residential square footage is located in the Discovery and West Matilda Neighborhoods. The Development Reserve rebalances the square footage, focusing net new development in the North Java, South Java, and Crossman Neighborhoods into the walkable fine grain core and mixed-used neighborhoods. Individuals neighborhoods, however, may use the TDR program to capture additional non-residential square feet consistent with Table 1. No change recommended.</p>
# 114	Ellis Partners	4	4.9	96	Dedication and Easement Requirements	<p>Only require replacement of streets and sidewalks that are disrepair or near the end of their useful life</p>	<p>The Specific Plan requires a robust and complete network of mobility and infrastructure improvements. Requiring replacement for infrastructure that are in disrepair or at the end of their useful life would result in delays in the development of the networks. No change recommended.</p> <p>To provide context regarding the need for dedication and easement requirements to meet the open space and complete street goals in the plan. Modify text:  <span style="color: red;">"The existing condition includes 1,156 acres of net private parcel area over the 1,275-acre plan area. To meet the vision for Moffett Park, an estimated 350 to 400 acres of land will be needed for complete streets and open spaces. Net developable area across the plan area is estimated to be approximately 65% of the existing 1,156 acres of private parcels (amount of development is based on gross parcel area). The following section describes the dedication and easement requirements for new Complete Streets and open spaces. Additional design standards for Complete Streets are included in Chapter 5 Development Standards and Chapter 7 Mobility. Additional design standards for open spaces are included in Chapter 6 Open Space and Urban Ecology."</span></p>
# 115	Jay Paul Company	4	4.9	96	Dedication and Easement Requirements	<p>11th Avenue and Innovation Way west of Mathilda to be developed with a new standard though these streets were reconstructed to City standards as "complete streets" during the initial redevelopment of the adjacent campuses and should not be required to redevelop because of the new requirements (like protected bike lane). If not, this should be considered as a community benefit.</p>	<p>Streets and other infrastructure improvements identified in the Specific Plan are requirements of new development, not community benefits. No change recommended.</p>
# 116	Jay Paul Company	4	4.9	96	Dedication and Easement Requirements	<p>Private streets previously developed to City standards with redevelopment projects should not be required to be upgraded again unless the street is not "complete". This obligation is overburdensome in the context of infill development of existing campus sites. Enforcement support by the City and at considerable maintenance costs to the private landowner.</p>	<p>Streets and other infrastructure improvements identified in the Specific Plan are requirements of new development, not community benefits. New streets will be dedicated, any existing private streets will remain private. No change recommended.</p>

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 117	Jay Paul Company	4	4.9	96	Dedication and Easement Requirements	Further, from a functional standpoint, the draft Plan treats private roads as if they were public improvements. From an operational and cost perspective, developers are expected to build and maintain these improvements as if they were private. In other words, private developers will be responsible for bearing the cost of maintaining roadways that function as public roads while developers in other parts of the Plan area enjoy use of public roads without bearing any operational costs. Further, the City does not provide traffic enforcement on private roads which has been problematic for existing campuses served by these roads. More analysis of this issue should be undertaken to assure equitable provision of services and costs for all developments in Moffett Park. In addition, the plan assumes that these private streets will somehow have public access even if no additional development takes place prompting a public access easement. Its unfair to expect existing landowners who have not granted public access easements to bear the additional cost and liability of providing public access across currently private roads and streets. This is especially true in the Discovery neighborhood where the Mary Avenue overpass is planned to land. The only public access easement is currently in the section of Discovery between 11th and 5th. Access to the rest of Moffett Park will require travel over private roads with no traffic enforcement support by the City and at considerable maintenance costs to the private landowner.	The proposed street network for Moffett Park is composed of existing streets (public and private) and new streets for vehicles and/or people who walk or bike. Changes to the existing network and new facilities will be phased over time as development occurs. While some new connections will become public streets, others existing private streets will continue to be easements across private property. Final street requirements to be determined by Site Master Plan process. No change recommended.
# 118	Lockheed	4	4.9	96	Dedications and Easement Requirements	Add language to end of 2. "including new streets west of Mathilda"	Noted. No change recommended.
# 119	Lockheed	4	4.9	97	Dedications and Easement Requirements	Open spaces over a certain size, (0.5 acres?) should be operated and maintained by the City or a non-profit	The Specific Plan does not define the long-term ownership and maintenance of each open space. Decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis. No change recommended.
# 120	Lockheed	4	4.9	97	Dedications and Easement Requirements	Section 3a. Should clarify that only sections of private utilities adjacent to the development site need to be upgraded	Revise standard: "2.a. <b>Existing private utilities.</b> Private utilities <b>adjacent to the development site</b> shall be improved up to City of Sunnyvale standards and either maintained as private infrastructure or dedicated to the City."
# 121	Staff	5	5.2	103	Development Standards	Add clarifying language about potential adverse impacts on the environment	5.2 Site Design Site design standards regulate block design, building placement and setbacks, and lot coverage. These standards support the health and safety of future residents and employees by providing standards to ensure a walkable block structure and safe pedestrian experience, reduce vehicle miles traveled, contribute to climate mitigation efforts, minimize the heat island effect, and improve ecological resiliency. <b>Each development shall implement the required standards to ensure no adverse impact on the environment.</b>
# 122	Jay Paul Company	5	5.2	103	Development Standards	Differentiate requirements between infill development and new development. Infill development should be permitted to be similar in form and function to other existing buildings within the same campus. Campus building tenants prefer similar floor plates across multiple buildings. Similar building designs would allow faster review time.	See Changes Memo pages 20-21 (Chapter 5 - Development Standards, Outside the Fine Grain and line #155)
# 123	Jay Paul Company	5	5.2	103	Development Standards	Development standards are overly prescriptive and offers no flexibility.	While all new development is excepted to comply with the standards set forth in the Specific Plan, new developments may be provided with some flexibility in meeting design standards based on special site conditions. Section 10.2 outlines these exceptions. No change recommended.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 124	RJR	5	5.2	103, 140	Site Design & Fig 32 (Park and Open Space Framework)	<p>Certainty of Laneway Location.</p> <p>The Draft Plan states that block breaks will be accomplished via creation of laneways equivalent to with a minimum width of 50' which may or may not be open to vehicular access. The Draft Plan states that the location of these laneways on Draft Plan figures are diagrammatic, flexible and will be determined through the Site Master Plan review process for proposed redevelopments. However, location of laneways is also to be determined to some extent through maximum lot size and dimensional restrictions.</p> <p>As properties within the plan area are anticipated to be redeveloped over time, there is a potential that the first site design to be approved will result in precedential laneway placement that negatively impacts the potential for future residential development on adjacent sites, or that the first site to be developed would be required to absorb a disproportionate burden of full laneway area dedication within their own parcel.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> In order to ensure equitable division of existing land parcels, increase certainty in the future redevelopment process, and ensure a well-coordinated transportation network consistent with the Draft Plan's vision, the Owner requests that the Draft Plan provide a fixed location for future laneways and their operation.</p> <p>On the Property's block, the Owner suggests the following guiding principles:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single east-west laneway be required at approximately the centerline of the block with vehicular access.</li> <li>• Laneways straddle existing property lines (e.g. a 52-ft wide laneway encroach no more than 26-ft inward from each existing property lines.</li> <li>• Laneways not be required in a manner that splits exiting parcels.</li> </ul> </p>	See Summary Changes Memo pages 35-48 (Chapter 7 - Mobility). Detail will be added to the plan for location of open spaces, laneways, and complete streets in the form of Appendix C. Plan lines will be drawn at a later time for complete streets but the recommended changes add more detail to each street in the plan area and generally retains existing curbs.
# 125	R+A	5	5.2	103	Site Design	Misspelled mitigation	Revise text: "mitigation"
# 126	US Navy	5	5.2.1	103	Block Structure	Block Structure - 5. Special Location Alternative. The Navy appreciates the Draft MPSP allowing an exception to the "fine grain core block standards" by allowing for a "mega block" concept. The Navy however asks for the flexibility to move the location to the western portion of the parcel and also be flexible to accommodate a 1,000,000 sf block that is not restrained by the limit of 1,000 sf x 1,000 sf dimensions. This alternative would allow the "mega block" to not interfere with ongoing groundwater cleanup activities if it was required to be located in the southeastern edge of the site as suggested in the Draft MPSP. Please refer to the Navy supplied "Navy Parcel Alternative Conceptual Layout Figure."	<p>More detail will be added to the plan on location standards for Navy Park. Specific concerns can be made during the SMP process. The preference would be that access to groundwater cleanup activities occur within private open space, not within Navy Park.</p> <p>Revise standard: "<b>5. Special location alternative.</b> The former US Navy site, bounded by 5th Avenue, Mathilda Avenue, Lockheed Martin Way, and the future continuation of Discovery Way, provides a unique opportunity for a large office campus. As an alternative to meeting the fine grain core block structure standards, an applicant may choose to increase publicly accessible open space and limit development of the campus to one mega block with a maximum 1,000 feet by 1,000 feet dimension located at southeastern edge of the site.</p> <p><b>Navy Park shall front Lockheed Martin Way for a minimum of 50% of the street frontage between the Discovery Way extension and Mathilda Avenue. The minimum required frontage area shall have a minimum depth of 200 feet. Navy Park shall meet the intersection of the Discovery Way extension and Lockheed Martin Way. Any part of Navy Park fronting Lockheed Martin Way shall have a minimum depth of 75 feet."</b></p>
# 127	Google	5	5.2.1	103	Block Structure	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Modify bullet point 4.a to read, "<i>Blocks may be broken by private or public streets, laneways, or open spaces with a minimum width of 40 feet. This break in block shall also be inclusive of a total 12 feet minimum of bike/ped paths</i>". (This corresponds to the recommended reduction of the minimum ROW of the Laneway Park/Path (Typical) from 50' to 40'. 40' provides ample dimension for the proposed shared use path and landscaping and sufficient in meeting the intent of breaking up larger blocks with public access. Further, revising the language associated with bike/ped paths as optional and not a requirement will differentiate the pedestrian experience throughout the district.)</p>	<p>Specific Plan will align what counts as a break in a block to align with Laneway requirements.</p> <p>Revise standard: "<b>4. Breaks in blocks.</b>  a. Blocks may be broken by private or public streets, laneways, or open spaces with a minimum width of 50 feet <del>and a shared bike/pedestrian path with a minimum width of 12 feet.</del>  b. Breaks shall have a public access easement with a minimum width of 20 feet <del>equal to its width to new property line (exclusive of required building setbacks).</del>  c. Breaks in blocks may occur through a building courtyard if open to the public at all times and the path of travel is ADA compliant and meets all public access standards. <del>Entry to break shall include a minimum 50 feet wide building break with a minimum depth of 10 feet. Access through to courtyard shall include a minimum gateway height of 16 feet clear. Access easement shall be a minimum 20 feet wide.</del>  d. <del>Alleyways or streets that function primarily as service and vehicle accessways shall not count as a break in block length.</del>  d. Appendix C outlines specific block break locations for neighborhoods with multiple property owners and existing condition constraints. Where these requirements conflict with the above standards, the specific design requirements in Appendix C prevail."</p>
# 128	Google	5	5.2.1	103	Block Structure	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Modify bullet point 4.d to read, "<i>Alleyways or streets that function primarily as service and vehicle accessways narrower than 40 feet in width and without bike/ped paths should function as a break in block</i>". (Both of these sections should work in concert allowing for a variety of block break lengths, for different functions).</p>	<p>Clarification of block breaks provided above. Strike standard:  "<del>d. Alleyways or streets that function primarily as service and vehicle accessways shall not count as a break in block length.</del>"</p>



**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 129	Google	5	5.2.2	105	Building Setbacks	<p><u>Proposed Modifications:</u>                      Modify bullet point 2.c to read, "Ground floor office. Where ground floor office space is provided, the setback character should enhance the public realm through landscaping, private open space areas, and grade separation. Building setback areas abutting ground floor office uses shall be a minimum <b>40%</b> landscape area".                      Modify bullet point 2.d to read, "Ground floor residential. Where ground floor residential units are provided, the setback character should enhance the privacy of the residential units through landscaping, private open space areas, and grade separation. Building setback areas abutting ground floor residential use shall be a minimum <b>40%</b> landscape area                      Modify bullet point 2.e to read, "Adjacent to channels and Ecological Combining District. Setback character adjacent to channels and ECD should enhance urban ecology through an appropriate planting palette. Building setback areas abutting ground floor office uses shall be a minimum <b>40%</b> landscape area."                      (2 c through e - These (3) sections indicate precise percentages of landscaping area subject to storefront or ground floor function. The intent of these sections is to ensure that landscaping be considered integral to the setback area, however the application of 40 to 80% of landscaping coverage based on use does not seem appropriate.                      Recommend that these sections be collapsed into a single section, that allows for a minimum percentage landscaping of 40%, subject to adjacent programming such as open space or laneway, etc. Also, include seating areas, sculptures/art, bike parking, etc. as qualifying for landscape coverage)</p>	<p>Modify standard: "<b>2. Setback character.</b> Developments shall meet the following setback character requirements. Landscape areas may be at grade or in structured planters. Where the vertical distance between back-of-walk and required ground floor finished floor height exceeds 4 feet (except adjacent to the Ecological Combining District (ECD)) stairs and ramps may be excluded from setback character calculations. <b>The following ground floor projections and intrusions into the setback area shall be excluded from calculations: building entries, seating areas with direct access to interior spaces, residential porches/balconies, public art, driveways, bike parking."</b></p>
# 130	Jay Paul Company	5	5.2.2	106	Building Setbacks	<p>No surface parking allowed in setback, building setback for Moffett Place 15' max and MT1 and MT2 25' max. This standard should not apply to existing parking lots of infill projects; existing setbacks should be allowed.</p>	<p>No change to policy but will revise surface parking standards outside fine grain core.                      Modify standard:  <b>"5. Surface parking.</b> Surface parking lots are strongly discouraged <b>within the fine grain core. Surface parking outside the fine grain core shall minimize frontage along and shall not be located between a building and streets, laneways, and open spaces. Surface parking is allowed along Caribbean Drive.</b>  <b>a. Surface parking size.</b> New surface parking lots <b>in the fine grain core</b> shall be no larger than 20 spaces and shall be located behind buildings, perpendicular to the street/laneway, and/or screened from the street."</p>
# 131	Google	5	5.2.2	106 & 107	Building Setbacks	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Modify Table 5 (Building Setback Requirements) to reduce minimum setbacks within Mixed-Use Neighborhoods to 10 feet (both for Office and Residential Buildings) and 0 feet when facing publicly accessible open space and laneways. Current significant setbacks of 18 to 20 feet will not comply with Aerial EVA requirements while also contradicting the overall goal to achieve a walkable fine grain as per the goals set out in 5.1. Furthermore, as summarized in the introduction under 'Urban Form', the current Draft MPSP setbacks, in congruence with the building design standards, leads to significant residential unit loss.</p>	<p>The City will meet with the FD to review standards. EVA alternatives for laneways have been added to the plan. No recommended change to setback requirements.</p>
# 132	Google	5	5.2.3	106	Building Setbacks	<p><u>Proposed modification:</u> Revise bullet point 3.c to read, "<b>Habitable spaces such as bays, balconies, or other building modulations may project up to "6 feet" into the setback area</b>". (Expansion to 6 feet allows for compliance with ADA for occupiable balconies as well as allows for more variability of building massing and facades)</p>	<p>Modify 3.c to read, "Habitable spaces such as bays, balconies, or other building modulations may project up to <b>"6 feet"</b> into the setback area".</p>
# 133	Miramar Capital	5	5.2.3	109	Lot Coverage and Paving Area	<p>Maximum lot coverage of 70% further limits developability of the site as Type V or Type III are only viable construction type for residential development in this market.</p>	<p>Lot coverage term has been changed to building mass and the standard has been clarified as outlined below                      Modify: "<b>1. Building mass <del>Lot</del> coverage.</b> Development shall comply with <b>building mass <del>lot</del> coverage</b> maximums in Table 6. Maximum area is based on net parcel areas excluding publicly accessible open spaces and complete street easements and dedications. <b>Building mass coverage calculations may be taken at the podium level if the podium is less than 35 feet in height."</b></p>

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 134	RJR	5	5.2.3	109	Lot Coverage and Paving Area	<p>Lot Coverage.</p> <p>The Draft Plan states that development in the MP-R District will be subject to a maximum lot coverage area of 70%. However, the term "lot coverage" is not clearly defined, and is controlled through other detailed form-based density restrictions such as a public area dedication and minimum building setback requirements along public streets and future laneways.</p> <p>From the team's preliminary discussion with Planning staff on 2/1/23, it is our understanding that the intent is for this lot coverage restriction to apply above a building base of up to two levels (or 25 feet) high.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> Please clarify that this 70% lot coverage requirement would begin Lot coverage be measured above a 'podium', at least two levels (or 25- feet) high.</p> <p>We further request either that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the lot coverage requirement be increased to 80% of Net Parcel Area; or</li> <li>for purposes of Total Maximum FAR and maximum lot coverage, the Net Parcel Area be based upon existing parcel dimensions (prior to open space dedications).</li> </ul>	<p>Lot coverage term has been changed to building mass and the standard has been clarified as outlined below. Diagram will be added to final document</p> <p>Modify: "<b>1. Building mass lot coverage.</b> Development shall comply with <b>building mass lot coverage</b> maximums in Table 6. Maximum area is based on net parcel areas excluding publicly accessible open spaces and complete street easements and dedications. <b>Building mass coverage calculations may be taken at the podium level if the podium is less than 35 feet in height.</b>"</p>
# 135	Jay Paul Company	5	5.2.3	109	Lot Coverage and Paving Area	<p>The requirement for bldg area coverage of 70% maximum, paving 25% max, landscape are 20% max should be weighed against the goal of providing the maximum amount of housing units.</p>	<p>Modify standard: "<b>3. Landscape area.</b> Development outside of the fine grain core shall have a minimum landscape area of 20% of net parcel area <b>or shall meet all the standards of development within the fine grain core.</b>"</p>
# 136	Google	5	5.3.1	110	Building Design	<p><b>Comment:</b> The sum application of specifically dimensioned design standards related to urban form (ig. setbacks, massing breaks, building setbacks, upper floor reduction) has a significant negative impact on human-scale experience and overall residential unit yield. Considering the substantial massing and residential unit impact of the larger massing breaks and floorplate reduction / setback, developers will likely conform to the minimum requirements and produce monotonous street walls.</p> <p>The following recommendations for the Development Standards are intended to help achieve the vision of the MPSP.</p> <p><a href="#">See Exhibit #2 in Appendix</a></p>	<p>The staff recommended changes include modifications to many of the standards where flexibility would not detract from the overall goal and vision for the plan.</p>
# 137	Google	5	5.3.1	110	Building Height and Ground Floor Elevation	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Revise bullet point 1.b to read, "<i>Building height' means the vertical distance as measured from the average grade plane established 5 feet offset from any proposed building edge.</i>"</p>	<p>This definition is consistent with the Sunnyvale Zoning Code 19.12.030 (10) "Building height" means the vertical distance measured from the top of the curb closest to the main building, or if there is no curb, from the highest point of the street adjacent to the main building, to the highest point of the main building. No change recommended.</p>
# 138	Google	5	5.3.1	110	Building Height and Ground Floor Elevation	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Add text that clarifies: <b>Maximum building height, or 'highest point of the main building' shall be based on top of any building systems screening or lift overrun. Regardless of maximum building heights allowed in Fig. 30, all buildings shall meet the height standards set forth by the Moffett Field comprehensive Land Use Plan.</b> (The proposed Standard limits potential means of compliance, creating uniformity which is contrary to the perceived intent. The proposed height and grade definitions and interpretations will align with IBC standards.)</p>	<p>We will update the plan with reference to the City code on what is allowed to exceed the maximum building heights.</p> <p>Modify "a." to state: "<b>a. Compliance with the Moffett Field Comprehensive Land Use Plan. All buildings or parts of buildings shall not exceed maximum heights set forth by the Moffett Field Comprehensive Land Use Plan. When measuring development height for consistency with the Moffett Federal Airfield (NUQ) Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) Part 77 Heights, height is to be measured from above mean sea level (AMSL) to the top of the highest point of the development.</b>"</p> <p>Add new standard "<b>b. Building height may be exceeded up to 25 feet as allowed in SMC 19.32.030 (a).</b>"</p>
# 139	ALUC	5	5.3	110	Building Height and Ground Floor Elevation	<p>ALUC Condition of Approval. Add the following language for measurement of building height: "When measuring development height for consistency with the Moffett Federal Airfield (NUQ) Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) Part 77 Heights, height is to be measured from above mean sea level (AMSL) to the top of the highest point of the development."</p>	<p>We will update the plan with reference to the City code on what is allowed to exceed the maximum building heights.</p> <p>Modify "a." to state: "<b>a. Compliance with the Moffett Field Comprehensive Land Use Plan. All buildings or parts of buildings shall not exceed maximum heights set forth by the Moffett Field Comprehensive Land Use Plan. When measuring development height for consistency with the Moffett Federal Airfield (NUQ) Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) Part 77 Heights, height is to be measured from above mean sea level (AMSL) to the top of the highest point of the development.</b>"</p> <p>Add new standard "<b>b. Building height may be exceeded up to 25 feet as allowed in SMC 19.32.030 (a).</b>"</p>

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 140	Google	5	5.3.1	110	Building Height and Ground Floor Elevation	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b>                      Revise bullet point 2.c to read, "Ground floor finished level for residential units shall be a minimum 2 feet above sidewalk grade.  <del>or setback a minimum 12 feet from back of walk. Ground floor residential units greater than 8 feet above sidewalk grade shall be setback a minimum 15 feet from back of walk.</del>"                      (Revising setback/grade change standard ensures privacy separation for ground floor residential units, while maintaining pedestrian scale street widths and minimizing impact to yield and accessibility.)</p>	<p>Revise standard: "2c. Ground floor residential. Ground floor finished level for residential units shall be a minimum 2 feet above sidewalk grade or setback a minimum 12 feet from back of walk. Ground floor residential units greater than 8 feet above sidewalk grade shall be setback a minimum 15 feet from back of walk."</p>
# 141	Google	5	5.3.1	111	Building Height and Ground Floor Elevation	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> 5.3.1.1 Maximum Building Heights (Figure 30) Revise map to expand max development height from 160 feet to 170 feet for the entirety of the 'Caspian Block' (Java/Borregas to Caspian/Geneva). In addition, revise the map to expand the max height to 160 feet for the 'NORLA block' (Baltic/Crossman to Caribbean/East Channel).                      (The inclusion of these (2) modifications will ensure the proposed development potential and vision of the MPSP can be achieved by allowing for an additional floor level of development, while remaining in compliance with the FAA height limitation.)                      See Exhibit #3 in Appendix</p>	<p>The map will be simplified with 170 height limit along all of Java Drive between the VTA stations. The Norla block will be increased from 130 ft to 145 ft along with all 130 ft areas. The height map is included in the summary memo.</p>
# 142	RJR	5	5.3.1	111	Building Height and Ground Floor Elevation	<p>Clarification of Maximum Building Height. Figure 30 shows maximum building heights throughout the Draft Plan area. This figure indicates that the Property is largely within a 160' height district, with a portion along the west edge shown as 170'.   <b>Request:</b>                      Please clarify the map is accurately reflecting the proposed height limits on this Property, and clarify the proposed dimensions of split height district intended for the Property.</p>	<p>Modify Height map to increase 170 ft area to include full area long Java between transit stations up to Caspian. The height map is included in the summary memo.</p>
# 143	Google	5	5.3.1	111	Building Height and Ground Floor Elevation	<p>Staff generated change</p>	<p>Modify Height map to increase 170 ft area to include full area long Java between transit stations up to Caspian. The height map is included in the summary memo.</p>
# 144	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.1	111	Building Height and Ground Floor Elevation	<p>Building heights- We don't see the additional 10% in this section. We assume that the mechanical penthouse/roof screen heights are additional to this table, based on the mechanical requirements for tech office tenants. Please note that tech office Penthouse/roof screens typically take up 70-80% of roof area.                      MPSP proposal. JPC project proposal                      a.150' at MT2 (B7) – proposed 160'                      b.130' at MT2 (B6) - proposed 145'                      c.130' at MT1 - okay                      d.130' at MPL (B8) – proposed 160'                      e.160' at MPL (B7) – proposed 170'                      f.130' at MG office – proposed 170'                      g.160' at MG residential – proposed 170'                      h.160' at Innovation – okay                      Building heights need to be max. to FAA limit, as was suggested by several City Council members previously and also by Andy Minor at the very start of the MPSP update process. Alternatively, building heights for infill buildings should be allowed to be the max FAA height limit to encourage a variety of building heights and more efficient use of the ground plane by reducing the footprint of buildings.</p>	<p>10% rule does not apply to height. Mechanical penthouse and screening is allowed above the height in the map as per the Zoning Code but may not exceed ALUC heights.                       The staff recommendations is to increase the 130 ft areas to 145 in the height map.</p>
# 145	Google	5	5.3.2	112	Building Massing	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b>                      Replace bullet point 2.a.i.01 Floor Plate Reduction with, "<b>Floor Plate Modification. Building floorplates greater than the 7th story in height may include façade modulation, material articulation, or reduction of floor area of the ground floor area or the building floor area of the podium level</b>"                      (A 75% floor plate reduction Standard limits potential means of compliance, creating uniformity which is contrary to the intent of character driven design. Original standard floor plate reduction is not acceptable for office or residential uses and would create financial challenges and impact residential yield.)</p>	<p>Remove standard 2.a. "<del>a. Upper floor massing in the fine grain core. All buildings within the fine grain core shall meet the following standards:</del>  <del>i. Mid-rise buildings. Buildings greater than 65 feet in height shall provide a variety in building heights and reduce the massing of upper floors through one or more of the following techniques:-</del>  <del>01. Floor plate reduction. Building floorplates greater than the 7th story in height shall include a floor area less than 75% of the ground floor area or the building floor area of the podium level, whichever is less; or</del>  <del>02. Façade step back. Step back façade of floors above the 7th story for a minimum depth of 10 feet for a minimum 60% of the total façade perimeter length dimension of all complete streets and change to "publicly accessible" open space facing façades."</del></p>

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 146	Google	5	5.3.2	112	Building Massing	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Delete bullet point 2.a.i.02, and combine with previous comment on bullet point 2.a.i.01 to allow for flexible compliance with intent of variable design outcomes. (Requiring a 10 foot stepback at the 7th floor is excessive in its impacts to development potential, construction typology (problematic for timber), and architectural expression. As noted, we recommend consolidating into a new standard allowing for more design flexibility.)	See line 145 for response.
# 147	Miramar Capital	5	5.3.2	112	Building Massing	Floor Plate Reduction and Façade Step-Back above the 7-story are not compatible with high density mid-rise residential apartment design.	See line 145 for response.
# 148	R+A	5	5.3.2	112	Building Massing	Simplify number of height standards to call out Mid-rise building separate from High-rise buildings and exclude MP-AC from distant standards	High rise standard has been revamped. Replace standard with below language: Remove: All standards on page 113 ii. High-rise buildings. Any portion of a building greater than 90 feet in height within the fine grain core area shall meet the following standards: 01. High-rise building spacing. The applicable building portion shall be located a minimum 60 feet from all other buildings greater than 90 feet in height regardless of whether the adjacent building is on the same parcel or different parcel. 02. High-rise building façade. Building facades greater than 100 feet in length shall be located a minimum 120 feet from all other buildings greater than 90 feet in height. 03. High-rise building dimension. A. For residential buildings the applicable building portion shall not have a building dimension that exceeds 160 feet in length. B. For non-residential buildings in MP-AC zones, the applicable building portion shall not have a dimension that exceeds 200 feet in length. C. For all other non-residential buildings, the applicable building portion shall not have a dimension that exceed 300 feet in length. 04. High-rise residential floor plate. Residential floor plates on the applicable building portion shall not exceed 16,000 square feet. b. Building floor plates greater than 110 feet in height shall include a floor area less than 75% of the floor plate immediately below the 110 feet height.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
							<p>Add standards:</p> <p>ii. High-rise buildings in the MP-AC districts. Applies to all portions of a building greater than 90 feet in height.</p> <p>01. Building spacing. The portion of a building greater than 90 feet in height shall be located a minimum 60 feet from all other buildings greater than 90 feet in height regardless of whether the adjacent building is on the same parcel or different parcel. Where two adjacent parcels are under different ownership, portions of a building greater than 90 feet in height shall be located a minimum 30 feet from adjoining property line.</p> <p>02. Building dimensions. The portion of a building greater than 90 feet in height shall not have any dimension that exceeds 250 feet in length .</p> <p>03. Reduction in mass. Building floor plates greater than 145 feet in height shall not exceed 20,000 square feet.</p> <p>iii. High-rise buildings in MP-R and MP-MU districts. Applies to all portions of a building greater than 90 feet in height.</p> <p>01. Building spacing. The portion of a building greater than 90 feet in height shall be located a minimum 60 feet from all other buildings greater than 90 feet in height regardless of whether the adjacent building is on the same parcel or different parcel. Where two adjacent parcels are under different ownership, portions of a building greater than 90 feet in height shall be located a minimum 30 feet from adjoining property line.</p> <p>Residential building facades greater than 100 feet in length shall be located a minimum 120 feet from all other buildings facades greater than 100 feet in length and greater than 90 feet in height .</p> <p>02. Building dimension. For residential buildings the portion of the building above 90 feet shall not have a continuous façade building dimension that exceeds 200 feet in length. For non-residential buildings, the portion of a building greater than 90 feet in height shall not have any dimension that exceeds 300 feet in length.</p> <p>0.3 Reduction in mass. Building floor plates greater than 90 feet in height shall not exceed 25,000 square feet. Building floor plates greater than 130 feet in height shall not exceed 18,000 square feet. Building floor plates greater than 160 feet in height shall not exceed 14,000 square feet.</p>
# 149	Google	5	5.3.2	113	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Modify bullet point 2.a.ii.02 to read, “<i>Building facades greater than <b>120 feet</b> in length shall be located a minimum <b>100 feet</b> from all other buildings greater than 90 feet in height, <b>except on singular development parcels with podiums and multiple buildings.</b>” (The revisions in bold allow for optimal high rise building dimensions and architectural expression on large development parcels with multiple buildings and unifying podiums.)</i></p>	Staff recommended to eliminate the 120 ft requirement in MP-AC areas. See Summary changes to page 113 in line #148.
# 150	Google	5	5.3.2	113	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Modify bullet point 2.a.ii.03.a to read, “<i>For residential buildings the applicable building portion shall not have a <b>continuous facade</b> building dimension that exceeds <b>220 feet in length</b>” (A 160 foot length will reduce natural light/vent opportunities for larger residential units, lengthening buildings will reduce environmental impacts.)</i></p>	See Summary changes to page 113 in line #148
# 151	Google	5	5.3.2	113	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 2.a.ii.03.b to read, “<i>For non-residential buildings in MP-AC zones, the applicable building portion may have a dimension greater than 200 feet through the use of major and/or minor breaks.</i>” (The proposed Standard of 200 feet is too prescriptive and limits development potential and/or floorplate optimization for non-residential uses.)</p>	See Summary changes to page 113 in line #148
# 152	Google	5	5.3.2	113	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 2.a.ii.03.c to read, “<i>For all other non-residential buildings, the applicable building portion may have dimensions of <b>380 feet limit within the Fine Grain Core. 600 feet outside the Fine Grain Core will be allowed in a low or mid-rise building typology</b>” (The draft MPSP text is too restrictive and would invalidate previous block length standards.)</i></p>	This is what is currently written into the plan on page 112
# 153	Google	5	5.3.2	113	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 2.a.ii.04 to read, “<i>Residential floor plates on the applicable building portion shall not exceed <b>18,000 square feet.</b>” (Enlarging the floor plate area allows for more architectural design flexibility and higher residential yield.)</i></p>	See Summary changes to page 113 in line #148

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 154	Google	5	5.3.2	113	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u>                      Revise bullet point 2.a.ii.04.b to read, <i>"Building floor plates that qualify as high rise construction, above 85 feet in height, may include facade modulation, material articulation, or reduction of floor area of the floorplate immediately below high rise designation."</i>                      (Similar to the previous section, application of 110 foot height standard is contrary to intent of character driven neighborhood. By applying high rise designation, and not a prescriptive height, more variability in design outcomes can be achieved.)</p>	See Summary changes to page 113 in line #148
# 155	Google	5	5.3.2	114	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u>                      Revise bullet point 3.a to read, <i>"Building facades greater than 250 feet in length shall have at least one facade break, or two distinct facade compositions and/or architectural articulations. Building facades greater than 400 feet in length shall have at least two breaks, or three distinct facade compositions and/or architectural articulations."</i>                      (Similar to the above example, application of this highly prescriptive standard would create uniformity amongst many developed sites. Further, this impacts development potential and likely prohibits the use of innovative embedded carbon construction typologies such as mass timber.)</p>	<p>OUTSIDE FINE GRAIN CORE                      Modify Standard:                      "3. Façade modulation outside the fine grain core (FGC). All buildings located outside the fine grain core shall meet the following standards. Exemptions may be made on a case-by-case basis for new buildings outside the fine grain core within an existing campus to maintain a consistency of architecture:                      a. Number of breaks. Building facades greater than 300 <del>250</del> feet in length shall have at least one major break, or two distinct facade compositions and/or architectural articulations. Building facades greater than 400 feet in length shall have at least two major breaks.                      i. Major break dimensions. The first major break required shall be a minimum 25 feet wide and 10<del>25</del> feet deep. If two major breaks are required, the second major break shall be a minimum 25<del>40</del> feet wide and 25<del>40</del> feet deep.                      ii. Major break location. A major break may extend to the corner of a building with a maximum width of 80 feet.                      iii. Major break height. A major break shall extend from the finished ground floor through the full height of the building including breaking the roof plane. Retail ground floor up to 20 feet above ground floor level is exempt."                      b. Mass timber building exception. Mass timber buildings may receive an exception from building massing standards related to major and minor breaks subject to approval from the Zoning Administrator. Applicants for new development must provide findings on how the new development meets the intent of the standards and document constraints to meeting the standards.</p>
# 156	Google	5	5.3.2	114	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u>                      Revise bullet point 3.a.i to read, <i>"The first major break required shall be a minimum 25 feet wide and 10 feet deep"</i>.                      (The proposed 20 feet deep break will have significant impacts on residential yield and building efficiency. Reducing the dimension of a 'major break' allows for more design flexibility, and viability to any given building's structure, particularly Mass Timber.)</p>	See line #155
# 157	Google	5	5.3.2	114	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u>                      Revise bullet point 3.a.iii to read, <i>"Major break height. A major break shall extend from podium level (or 20 feet above ground floor level) through the full height of the building including breaking the roof plane."</i>                      (Revising this standard to above podium, or 20 feet, will ensure maximum potential for ground level retail and programming. A disjointed retail or active edge will not be beneficial to the public realm. This should apply to all development areas, including Fine Grain Core.)</p>	Modify: 3 and 4.1.iii: Major break height. A major break shall extend from the finished ground floor through the full height of the building including breaking the roof plane. Retail ground floor up to 20 feet above ground floor level is exempt. See line #155
# 158	Google	5	5.3.2	114	Building Massing	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u>                      Revise bullet point 4.a to read, <i>"Building facades greater than 150 feet in length shall have at least one facade break, or two distinct facade compositions and/or architectural articulations."</i>  <i>Building facades greater than 250 feet in length shall have at least two breaks, or three distinct facade compositions and/or architectural articulations."</i>                      (Revising the standard to add flexibility to comply with the MPSP's desire for massing variability will allow for a more diverse and character driven built form.)</p>	<p>FINE GRAIN CORE                      Modify Standard:                      "4. Façade modulation in the fine grain core. All buildings located within the fine grain core shall meet the following standards:                      a. Major breaks. Building facades greater than 200<del>150</del> feet in length shall have at least one major break. Building facades greater than 250 feet in length shall have at least two major breaks.                      i. Major break dimensions. The first major break required shall be a minimum 20<del>25</del> feet wide and 10<del>20</del> feet deep. If two major breaks are required, the second major break shall be a minimum 20 feet wide and 20<del>40</del> feet deep.                      ii. Major break location. A major break may extend to the corner of a building with a maximum width of 50 feet.                      iii. Major break height. A major break shall extend from the finished ground floor through the full height of the building including breaking the roof plane. Retail ground floors up to 20 feet above ground floor level area exempt from the first major break.                      b. Minor breaks. Façade planes in Fine Grain Core shall not exceed 150<del>100</del> feet in length as measured from façade break (major or minor) to façade break or corner of a building. Minor break design standards include:                      i. Depth. Minor breaks shall be a minimum 2 feet deep.                      ii. Width. Minor breaks shall be a minimum 4 feet wide and a maximum 40 feet wide.                      iii. Location. A minor break may extend from the edge of a major break or the corner of a building.                      iv. Height. A minor break shall extend from the top of the ground floor through the full height of the building including breaking the roof plane.</p>

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
							<p>c. Façade articulation. Building facades greater than 150 feet in length shall have at least two distinct façade compositions with at least two unique features of fenestration scale; rhythm and pattern; material and color; modulation of building form; or façade articulation. Modulation of building form and façade articulation shall be greater than 18 inches in depth and shall occur for a minimum of 60 percent of the building height. Major and minor breaks less than 25 feet in width shall not be considered a distinct façade composition. Each distinct façade composition shall make up a minimum of 20% of the total horizontal face of the façade. (Composition A shall be a minimum 20% of façade length but may be broken up, example: [A-B-A-B-A] where each B is 10% or [A-B] where B is 20%)”</p> <p>d. Mass timber building exception. Mass timber buildings may receive an exception from building massing standards related to major and minor breaks subject to approval from the Zoning Administrator. Applicants for new development must provide findings on how the new development meets the intent of the standards and document constraints to meeting the standards.</p>
# 159	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.2	114	Building Massing	Proposed periodic breaks in façades for entire height of building are much too prescriptive. This does not allow for creative architecture, nor accommodate the ability to design buildings that can remain compatible with an established architectural vocabulary for various infill buildings on tech office campuses.	See line #155 and line #158
# 160	Miramar Capital	5	5.3.2	114	Building Massing	Major Break requirement within the Fine Graine Core Area reduces the potential for residential density. Alternatively, a 5-foot deep recess instead of the required 20-foot recess would allow meaningful mass break without limiting residential developability of the site	See line #158
# 161	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.2	112-113	Building Massing	The suggested bldg. massing requirements are invasive on bldg. design creativity / functionality - especially in the context of infill buildings in previously redeveloped campuses. Infill buildings in previously redeveloped campuses should be permitted to be similar in form and function to other existing buildings within the same campus in order maintain a cohesive campus environment. The proposed building design standards do not differentiate between infill buildings in existing campuses and buildings for completely new sites and as a consequence, infill buildings may look and function differently from existing campus buildings. While this might be desirable in some cases, it may also prove detrimental to existing campus design in others. Tenants leasing space in suburban campus environments appreciate the cost effectiveness of similar floor plates across multiple buildings. Similarity between floors and buildings allow these tenants to rapidly design and construct their improvements and makes City permit review cycles much more efficient. We suggest that design standards for infill buildings should be adjusted to permit the design of infill buildings to be similar to existing buildings on the same campus (updating for changes in code etc).	See line #155 and line #158
# 162	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.2	112-113	Building Massing	a. Step backs at 8th floor, bldg. length, required massing entry locations, are too prescriptive to architectural creativity and on many cases to functional needs of large scale tech office users.	See line 145 for response.
# 163	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.2	112-113	Building Massing	b. Overall, the guidelines are much too prescriptive in building façade design.	These standards are in place to ensure a pedestrian scale environment to support a walkable neighborhood. Changes were made to increase flexibility outside the fine grain core.
# 164	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.2	112-113	Building Massing	c. There needs to be more flexibility in bldg. and façade design so all projects do not have the same massing design character, design needs to respond to context and not be arbitrary as these guidelines suggest.	These standards are in place to ensure a pedestrian scale environment to support a walkable neighborhood. Changes were made to increase flexibility outside the fine grain core.
# 165	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.2	112-113	Building Massing	d. Gateway resi building max. 160' in length, above 90' height only 16,000 sf footprint allowed and min. 60' separation between buildings - this will reduce number of potential units. This should not be a requirement for basic massing design.	See Summary changes to page 113 in line #148
# 166	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.2	112-113	Building Massing	e. For example our proposed MPL B7 has max. length of 300' (currently designed at 360' long) and MT2, MT1, MPL B8 and MG, Innovation requires 75% floorplate above 110' height ( 8th floor onwards) This is too prescriptive, need design flexibility.	Changes were made to provide more flexibility. See summary changes
# 167	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.2	112-113	Building Massing	f. Moffett Gateway and Moffett Place sites should not be exempted from the requirements of the fine grain core, this line has been arbitrarily drawn as cutting through the site. the actual context should be taken into account, preserving the ability to design a cohesive campus with buildings that are compatible for an existing campus.	To create a walkable fine grain core that supports the plan objectives, existing campuses may need to be reconfigured when additional buildings are added to support walkability goals
# 168	R+A			113		Summary of modifications to page 113.	See Summary changes to page 113 in line #148



**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 169	Google	5	5.3.3	116	Ground Floor Design and Build Entries	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 1 to read, "Utilities, loading, and parking access shall not be located on primary building facades provided a building design has more than 2 frontages on a vehicular street." (The revision allows for more design flexibility while still maintaining the intent of the standard.)	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 1 to read, "Utilities, loading, and parking access shall not be located on primary building facades provided a building design has more than 2 frontages on a vehicular street."
# 170	Google	5	5.3.3	116	Ground Floor Design and Build Entries	<u>Recommendation:</u> Revise bullet point 2.a 'Number of Entries - Activity Centers' to conform with building code and architectural standards in compliance with egress needs, or alternately revise standard to be a guideline with intent to provide activation to the ground floor public realm experiential quality of the adjacent street. (Requiring a building entry per every 75 feet significantly impacts the architectural design potential of any given site, with no clear value add or purpose.)	Remove standard 2.a <del>a. Number of entries - Activity Centers. Where ground floor storefront is not required, buildings located in an MP-AC district shall have a minimum of one building entry per every 75 feet of building length.</del>  Add standard 1.c: Ground floor frontages in MP-AC areas shall include active ground floor uses facing public plazas/open spaces and along primary facades. Active ground floor uses may include storefronts, accessory residential areas, ground floor residential units, shared office accessory spaces, neighborhood serving office/community space, or other use that provides visual interest to pedestrians.
# 171	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.3	116	Ground floor Design and Building Entries	Building entries need to be responsive to the needs of the interior planning of a building.. the location and number of entries need to be of that same requirement. This would compromise the proposed entries for MPL B7 and MG Residential building. The location and number of entries can only be determined due to campus layout and tenant requirements. The following examples are not always appropriate, based on context: a. Primary entry needs to face a laneway or publicly accessible open space b. Laneway ROW 52' min. (publicly accessible) , laneway sections on Page 201 c. Requires 2 entries, 1 entry for every 150' length of bldg.	See line #170
# 172	Miramar Capital	5	5.3.3	117	Ground Floor Design and Build Entries	Requiring transformers to be located inside of buildings or underground makes residential construction impractical and infeasible. PG&E prohibits undergrounding transformers.	The City feels this is important to the character of the fine grain core.
# 173	Google	5	5.3.3	117	Ground Floor Design and Build Entries	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 3.a to read, "Storefront spaces shall have a minimum floor to ceiling height of 12 feet, with flexibility in overall height to allow for variability in architectural massing." (Variability of ground floor creates overall building height variability, adding to character aspirations of Specific Plan.)	Modify Standard: Floor-to-floor height. In MP-AC district, storefront spaces shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 18 feet and minimum 16 feet clear floor-to-ceiling dimension for the first 25 feet of storefront depth. In MP-MU and MP-R districts, storefront spaces shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 feet and minimum 12 feet clear floor-to-ceiling dimension.
# 174	Google	5	5.3.4	118	Usable Open Space	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 1.b to read, "Minimum 50 square feet per unit." (Revising this area requirement will allow for design flexibility. The MPSP proposed standard of 75 feet doesn't take into account access to open spaces adjacent to residential uses.)	Revise bullet point 1.b to read, "Minimum 50 square feet per unit."
# 175	Google	5	5.3.4	118	Usable Open Space	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 2.f.i to read, "In the case of a courtyard where the common open space is enclosed by three sides of a building, the minimum width shall be determined by solar orientation and/or daylight access to all residential units within the courtyard." (80% of highest building height as a design standard fails to take into account building orientation or location and is far too restrictive. We recommend revising this to a guideline, or at least removing dimension standard.)	If a courtyard is surrounded by 80 feet high building facades, the minimum courtyard width would be 64 feet. More typical will be building facades at 6 to 7 stories that would require a minimum dimension of 52-60 feet in width. This seems appropriate to allow light into lower level units. Slide modification made to cap the minimum dimension required at 55 feet.  Modify: i. Dimensions for partially enclosed interior courtyards. In the case of a courtyard where the common open space is enclosed by three sides of a building, the minimum width shall be equal to or greater than 80% of the highest height of the adjoining facade or 55 feet, whichever is less.
# 176	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.4	118	Usable Open Space	These requirements much too prescriptive on opens space relative to building placement and connection to the ground plane.	Open space is a critical feature of the plan area is required by the plan in order to meet the needs of the future MPSP population.
# 177	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.4	119	Usable Open Space	This is not always appropriate, and flexibility is required: Residential common open space width needs to be 80% of height of building, i.e. 160' height requires open space 135' wide.	A cap to the minimum width was added:  2.f.ii. Dimensions for fully enclosed interior courtyards. In the case of a courtyard where the common open space is enclosed on all four sides, one minimum dimension of the open space shall be equal to or greater than the highest height (up to 80 feet) of the adjoining facades. The second dimension shall be equal to or greater than 80% of the highest height of the adjoining facades or 55 feet, whichever is less.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 178	RJR	5	5.3.4 5.4.3	118-119 126-128	Usable Open Space Green Roofs	<p>Open Space – Amount and Credit</p> <p>Under the Draft Plan, public open space dedication reduces Net Parcel Area, but despite the practical function of providing usable open space for both building residents and the community at large these areas are not credited against project usable open space requirements. Under the Draft Plan, building setback areas in addition to public open space dedication areas may not count toward project usable open space requirements. Under the Draft Plan, certain minimum green roof requirements apply.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> We suggest allowing development to credit the area of public open space provided through required easements to be credited toward private usable open space requirements. We suggest allowing the area of required ground-level setbacks on a property to be credited toward private usable open space requirements of development on that property, regardless of minimum width dimensions.</p> <p>We suggest allowing development to provide additional publicly-accessible private-open-space ("POPOS") areas beyond the public easement areas required by the Plan, and to credit the area of POPOS toward private open space requirements of the development at a reduced ratio (i.e. every square foot of voluntary POPOS provided credited as 2 square feet of common usable open space). Please clarify that the area of Green Roof provided may count toward usable open space requirements.</p>	<p>Moffett Park currently has about 10% public ROW and Open Space, a typical city has about 30-40% public ROW and Open Space. The City of San Francisco falls into that category and requires 80 sf of usable open space per unit. The SP requires only 50 sf of usable open space per unit.</p> <p>Green Roof can count as usable open space if it is accessible to residents and meet the requirements for usable open space</p>
# 179	Lockheed	5	5.3.5	120	Parking Facility Design	A straight 20 spaces surface park limit is too low for larger developments recommend 1 surface spot per 2,500 SF	<p>Revise standard:  <b>"5. Surface parking.</b> Surface parking lots are strongly discouraged <b>within the fine grain core. Surface parking outside the fine grain core shall minimize frontage along and shall not be located between a building and streets, laneways, and open spaces. Surface parking is allowed along Caribbean Drive. If built, surface parking shall meet the following standards:</b>  <b>a. Surface parking size.</b> New surface parking lots <b>in the fine grain core</b> shall be no larger than 20 spaces and shall be located behind buildings, perpendicular to the street/laneway, and/or screened from the street."</p>
# 180	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.5	120	Parking Facility Design	In some infill situations, the parking facilities may require flexibility on location relative to the street. There could be an issue relative to efficient ingress/egress	<p>No change to policy but will revise surface parking standards outside fine grain core. Modify standard:  <b>"5. Surface parking.</b> Surface parking lots are strongly discouraged <b>within the fine grain core. Surface parking outside the fine grain core shall minimize street frontage and shall not be located between a building and streets, laneways, and open spaces. Surface parking is allowed along Caribbean Drive.</b>  <b>a. Surface parking size.</b> New surface parking lots <b>in the fine grain core</b> shall be no larger than 20 spaces and shall be located behind buildings, perpendicular to the street/laneway, and/or screened from the street."</p>
# 181	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.5	120	Parking Facility Design	<p>Parking:</p> <p>a.Surface parking lots at 20 spaces max is not viable within the development of the park. There may be many cases where ADA stall demands require surface parking spaces in excess of this arbitrary number.</p> <p>b.Stand-alone garages not allowed fronting the diagonal, MPL garage E is planned facing diagonal- the site layout of infill buildings on an existing campus may need additional flexibility to achieve the best site plan and architectural layout.</p> <p>c.Above grade parking levels facing a street will have 20' min. / 16' for resi. habitable/commercial space, applies to all parking garages. MG, Innovation, proposed garages are street facing. This is not viable in office projects. (need exemption for small sites and infill development, exemption if garage facade looks similar to building facade)</p>	<p>No change to policy but will revise surface parking standards outside fine grain core. Modify standard:  <b>"5. Surface parking.</b> Surface parking lots are strongly discouraged <b>within the fine grain core. Surface parking outside the fine grain core shall minimize street frontage and shall not be located between a building and streets, laneways, and open spaces. Surface parking is allowed along Caribbean Drive.</b>  <b>a. Surface parking size.</b> New surface parking lots <b>in the fine grain core</b> shall be no larger than 20 spaces and shall be located behind buildings, perpendicular to the street/laneway, and/or screened from the street."</p>
# 182	Google	5	5.3.5	120	Parking Facility Design	<p><u>Proposed modification(s):</u>                      Revise bullet point 3.a to include, "<b>Shared residential only, or mixed use parking structures (self park or mechanical) shall be allowed within MP-R land use, particularly MP-AC land use.</b>"                      (Revising this standard will conform with the masterplan vision as well as support the end goal of unbundling parking from residential units.)</p>	<p>Modify to only restrict in residential: "<b>a. Location.</b> Stand-alone parking structures are prohibited <del>in the following locations:</del>                      Residential districts (MP-R).                      ii- Locations fronting to any Neighborhood or Community Park.                      iii- Locations fronting any portion of the Diagonal."</p>

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 183	Google	5	5.3.5	120	Parking Facility Design	<b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Revise bullet point 3.c to read, "All parapet edges and/or facades shall be designed to screen, or reduce visual impact of vehicles from public view. All parapet edges of parking levels, including roofs shall be a minimum 42 inches in height to reduce light transmittance to adjacent properties from vehicle headlights." (There should be more flexible language about reducing light transmittance, as written the standard may force garages to be mechanically ventilated).	Revise standard: "3.c Screening. All parapet edges and/or facades shall be designed to screen, or reduce visual impact of vehicles from public view. All parapet edges of parking levels, including roofs shall be a minimum 42 inches in height to reduce light transmittance to adjacent properties from vehicle headlights."
# 184	Jay Paul Company	5	5.3.5	121	Parking Facility Design	The concept of parking garage heights at 9' clear is not viable economically. The conversion of parking garage to resi. or commercial is not viable due to vibration criteria, column spacing, MEP systems, sloped floors, as well as due to additional cost by increasing facade heights by 20%. Eg. Parking garage at MT2 adds additional complexity in terms of achieving the proposed design.	Removing this regulation for areas outside the fine grain core. Will only be required in MP-MU areas. This is a guideline, not a requirement.  Modify Guideline 1.c: "In MP-MU districts, floor-to-structure heights with a minimum 9 feet clear to accommodate future residential or commercial conversion"
# 185	Google	5	5.3.6	122	Building Elements and Required Facilities	<b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Replace bullet point 1.a to read, "Visual shadow lines shall be employed to create facade or material articulation where windows are present." (A 4 inch uniform dimensional standard for windows is overly prescriptive, limits architectural creativity, and will foster monotony.)	Modify standard: "1.a. Windows shall be recessed a minimum of 4 inches for non-residential buildings and minimum of 2 inches for residential buildings. Façades or portions of façades utilizing a curtain wall are exempt from this standard."
# 186	Miramar Capital	5	5.3.6	122	Building Elements and Required Facilities	4" offset form glazing to the exterior building finish will require more complicated framing and waterproofing	Modify standard: "1.a. Windows shall be recessed a minimum of 4 inches for non-residential buildings and minimum of 2 inches for residential buildings. Façades or portions of façades utilizing a curtain wall are exempt from this standard."
# 187	Google	5	5.3.6	122	Building Elements and Required Facilities	<b>Proposed modification :</b> "Residential lockable storage. Developer may provide personal storage opportunities in response to market demands. Personal storage may be integrated into the design of each unit or located in an accessible common area. Bike storage facilities shall not be counted towards personal storage requirements." (Adding the language in bold allows developers to offer storage solutions that are based on the market demand/needs of a particular project.)	The Specific Plan reduced the City requirement of 200-300 sf per unit based on unit size to 125 sf per unit. (4'x3.5'). No change recommended.
# 188	City	5	5.4.3	124	Bird Safe Design	We will also fix the duplicated facade treatments language. Remove #2 and keep #4, as it includes green roofs and is more comprehensive.	Remove duplicate standard: Remove duplicate: " <del>2-Façade treatment. No more than 10% of the surface area of a building's total exterior façade shall have untreated glazing between the ground and 60 feet above ground. Birdfriendly glazing treatments can include the use of opaque glass, the covering of clear glass surface with patterns, the use of paned glass with fenestration patterns, and the use of external screens over non-reflective glass. All façade glazing shall have reflectivity ratings no greater than 30%.</del> "
# 189	Jay Paul Company	5	5.4.3	124	Bird Safe Design	There should be more flexibility on the approach on bird safe glass design approach. As is noted in the San Francisco Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, there are numerous methods to achieve successful solutions. SF's guidelines were thoroughly researched and are widely noted and used as a standard - perhaps instead refer to this set of standards instead?	Bird safety standards were modeled after SF standards with the exception of UV as a treatment option. We specifically excluded UV based on conversations with experts about its low efficacy in preventing bird collisions. The rest of the treatment options included in SF's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings are included in the proposed bird safety standards.  Revise standard #4 to read: "Façade treatment. No more than 10% of the surface area of a building's total exterior façade between the ground and 60 feet above ground or within 15 feet above a green roof shall have untreated glazing. Bird-friendly glazing treatments can include the use of opaque glass, the covering of clear glass surface with patterns, the use of paned glass with fenestration patterns, and the use of external screens and/or netting over non-reflective glass. All façade glazing shall have reflectivity ratings no greater than 15%30%.  Revise standard #4a "Glazing treatment. Bird-friendly glazing treatments shall include elements with a minimum horizontal width of 1/4 inch and minimum vertical height of 1/8 inch with a maximum vertical spacing of 42 inches and maximum horizontal spacing of 2 inches."

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 190	Brick	5	5.4.3	126	Green Roofs	Another area of concern is the requirement for green roofs. As architects, we believe that green roofs are an important tool for reducing the urban heat island effect, improving air quality, and providing additional outdoor space. However, we also believe that the requirement for green roofs may limit the feasibility of mass timber projects given the weight requirements and the additional structural support necessary. The sustainable benefits of a green roof, namely stormwater retention and heat island reduction, can be achieved in other ways that do not require increasing the structural capacity of the building.	Green roofs are an important part to reducing heat island effect and the eco innovation district, we do understand the difficulties with mass timber and will exempt those projects from green roofs.  Revise standard: "1. <b>Green roof size.</b> Green roofs shall be required for any new development or development expansions with a minimum net roof area (gross roof area – allowed deductions) addition of 5,000 square feet and shall only be applied to the expanded portion. The following uses are exempt from net roof area calculations: codified amenity spaces, codified setbacks, HVAC systems, fire suppression systems, <del>and</del> associated easements and <b>service maintenance pathways to all equipment, and</b> emergency corridors. Public buildings <b>and mass timber buildings</b> are fully exempt from this standard. Table 7 defines the following graduated spatial requirement shall be used to determine the green roof size."
# 191	Lockheed	5	5.4.3	126	Green Roofs	The proposed green roof requirements are too expensive for speculative development. We suggest under 10K SF be exempt; 10K Sf to 30K sf be 20%; 30K Sf to 50K Sf be 35% and above 50K Sf be 50%	Noted. No change recommended.
# 192	Google	5	5.4.3	126	Green Roofs	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 1 to read, "Green roofs shall be <b>encouraged with incentives for any development or development expansions with a minimum net roof area (gross roof area - allowed deductions) addition of 5,000 square feet and shall only be applied to the expanded portion.</b> The following uses are exempt from net roof area calculations: codified amenity spaces, codified setbacks, HVAC systems, fire suppression systems, and associated easements <b>and service maintenance pathways to all equipment, emergency corridors and PV panels.</b> Public buildings are fully exempt from this standard. Table 7 defines the following graduated spatial requirement shall be used to determine the green roof size." (Adding the bold text incentivizes installation of green roofs, and ensures that only optimal locations for green roofs are counted towards the standard.)	The plan will keep this as a requirement and will not add incentives. We agree to add service maintenance pathways to the exempt areas but PV panels are complementary to green roofs and their area should not be exempt.  Revise standard: "1. <b>Green roof size.</b> Green roofs shall be required for any new development or development expansions with a minimum net roof area (gross roof area – allowed deductions) addition of 5,000 square feet and shall only be applied to the expanded portion. The following uses are exempt from net roof area calculations: codified amenity spaces, codified setbacks, HVAC systems, fire suppression systems, <del>and</del> associated easements and <b>service maintenance pathways to all equipment, and</b> emergency corridors. Public buildings <b>and mass timber buildings</b> are fully exempt from this standard. Table 7 defines the following graduated spatial requirement shall be used to determine the green roof size."
# 193	Jay Paul Company	5	5.4.3	126	Green Roofs	Regarding required green roof over 5000 sf, this may or may not be viable, depending on HVAC location. T24 should dictate this, not the MPSP. Accessibility is typically not viable because of functional and OSHA safety requirements.	See revision to Standard 1. Modify Table 7 left column heading to "Net Roof Area for Entire Development**"  **See exemptions to gross roof area in Standard #1 to calculate net roof area"
# 194	Ellis Partners	5	5.4.3	126	Green Roofs	Eliminate green roof requirement which will increase construction costs substantially. Green roofs have questionable sustainability benefits and actually may increase carbon footprint of the project due to increased structural supports.	Exemption was added for green roof standards for mass timber buildings. No additional change recommended.  Modify Standard: "4. <b>Mass timber buildings.</b> Mass timber buildings are exempt from green roof standard."
# 195	Lockheed	5	5.4.3	127	Green Roofs	Exempt SCIFs from requires due to national security concerns.	Add standard: "4. <b>Sensitive compartmented information facility (SCIF) exception.</b> SCIFs may receive an exception from green roof standards subject to approval from the Zoning Administrator. Applicants for new development must provide findings documenting security constraints to meeting the standards and provide an alternative approach, such as a cool roof."
# 196	Google	5	5.5	129	Public Art	<u>Proposed Modification(s):</u> Modify the first bullet point to read, "Provision of on-site art installations within the private development area <b>or SMP, with an installation valued at 2.0% of the building permit valuation; or</b> " (Large public art installations can serve an important role in helping to create a sense of place for the new Moffett Park. This modification would clarify that Public Art Installations could be provided in POPA's or other privately owned and maintained community centers)	Modify text: "Provision of on-site art installations within the private development area <b>or SMP, with an installation valued at 2.0% of the building permit valuation; or</b> "
# 197	R+A	6	6.1	131	Open Space	Modify Open Space definition to reflect new open space type, "contributing open space"	Modify definition: "FOR PURPOSES OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN, OPEN SPACE IS DEFINED AS: Publicly accessible open spaces, parks, and natural areas which serve the community by providing public access, active transportation corridors, recreational, cultural programs and ecosystem services. These may include undeveloped natural areas, areas of ecological and ecosystem value, greenbelts and trails, recreation areas, community and neighborhood parks, areas of cultural historic significance, <b>contributing open spaces,</b> public plazas and squares. They may be publicly owned and managed, or privately owned publicly accessible spaces."
# 198	Google	6	6.1	132	Open Space Context	<u>Recommendation:</u> Figure 31 does not accurately reflect existing open spaces within Moffett Park in 2022. Figure 31 cites that the information was sourced via "City of Sunnyvale (2020); County of Santa Clara (2020); ESRI (2020), but should be updated to reflect the latest (2022) open space conditions and show the private open space at Google's 100/200 Caribbean development on the plan, as well as the private open spaces within Moffett Towers, Moffett Place, Moffett Gateway, 399 Java, and Humboldt, and any other newly constructed or currently under construction open spaces. It is important to depict accurate site conditions when the specific plan is adopted in order to evaluate the differences between the existing and future private and public green spaces.	The <b>Figure 31 Existing Open Spaces and Open Space Context</b> has been updated to include the private open spaces noted in the comment.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 199	Jay Paul Company	6	6.1	132		Please show the major existing open spaces in the JPC projects more accurately. These are extensive areas and are in each of our campuses which typically provide approx 40% landscaped open space.	The <b>Figure 31 Existing Open Spaces and Open Space Context</b> has been updated to include the private open spaces noted in the comment.
# 200	Commissioner John Howe	6	6.1	132	Open Space Context	Twin Creeks and Baylands park - are these in the City limits? And owned by the County? Please clarify in the EIR	Yes, these are within the City limits. They are owned by the County. No change recommended.
# 201	Commissioner Mike Serrone	6	6.1	132	Open Space Context	Salt ponds. We don't have these.	The Specific Plan references former salt ponds. No change recommended.
# 202	Google	6	6.1	133	Open Space Context	<u>Recommendation:</u> The MPSP seeks to foster urban ecology through a network of parks and open spaces throughout Moffett Park. While that network is needed to create open space and park amenities, the MPSP states a level of service inconsistent with the rest of Sunnyvale. Specifically, the MPSP seeks to codify an increase from 5.00 acres /1,000 residents to 5.34 acres/1,000 residents. This increase would put an added and untested burden on the developers within Moffett Park, and could inadvertently reduce acreage intended for housing. Figure 5.34 should be updated to clearly stated that the 5.34 acres/1,000 residents is an aspirational guideline, as stated in the City's General Plan, because the MPSP's requirements should conform with the Citywide Open Space Level of Service of 5.00 acres/1,000 residents consistent with the City Code.	In 2009, the City Council adopted as a target to maintain an open space level of service of 5.34 acres per 1,000 residents. This is a City wide target. The Municipal Code requirement remains 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents. No change in codification is proposed.
# 203	Google	6	6.2	135	Open Space and Urban Ecology Principles, Goals, and Policies	<u>Proposed Modification(s):</u> In paragraph 5, modify the first sentence to say: <i>"Additionally, the open space network can act as part of the flood management system and provide communal/centralized stormwater treatment for buildings, public and private roads and private open spaces."</i> Also, add: <i>"Where practical, in large open spaces, alternative treatment devices should also be considered for sites that are constrained or for City roads where Green-stormwater infrastructure may be challenging to install and/or cost prohibitive."</i> (This aligns with section 6 (Open Space Chapter) that indicates centralized treatment devices located within public open spaces can serve multiple sites/development types. It also makes it clear to the City Parks department, transportation department, stormwater departments and private developers, reading this plan, that centralized / shared treatment can be utilized for both private and public works projects.)	Add new policy: <b>"Policy OSE-1.10: Permit the open space network to act as part of the flood management system. When owned and maintained as a publicly-accessible private open spaces, enable open spaces to provide centralized treatment for buildings, roads, and open spaces."</b>
# 204	R+A	6	6.2	136	Open Space and Urban Ecology Principles, Goals, and Policies	Correct Spelling Error of impervious	Revise policy: <b>"Policy OSE-3.3: Design new development to support a healthy and biodiverse environment through landscape and planting design, reduction in imperious impervious coverage, green roof habitat patches, and bird-safe design."</b>
# 205	R+A					Consistency Note	Check name of Planting Palette for consistency throughout document
# 206	Chuck Fraleigh	6	6.2	136	Open Space and Urban Ecology Principles, Goals, and Policies	Address the open space needed to support any new schools	Noted. No change recommended.
# 207	Community Non-profit Organizations	6	6.2	136	Open Space and Urban Ecology Principles, Goals, and Policies	Specify and incorporate additional nature based solutions and green infrastructure for urban heat island effects and predicted flooding issues	The Specific Plan includes goal and policy language related to nature-based solutions and green infrastructure. See OSE-3 and IU-4. No change recommended.
# 208		6	6.2	136	Open Space and Urban Ecology Principles, Goals, and Policies	<u>Add clarifying language about potential adverse impacts on the environment.</u>	Revise standard: <b>"2. Park and open space size. To meet the open space and urban ecology goals of the plan, parks and open spaces shall meet minimum gross sizes identified in Table 9 to ensure no adverse impact on the environment."</b>

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 16	CMG	5	6.3	138	Updates to OS Types	Clarifying revisions	Add language to end of first paragraph: "The Open Space and Urban Ecology Frameworks work in concert to define the allocation and improvement of parks and achieve the goals and policies of this Chapter. The Urban Ecology Framework is an overlay to the Open Space Framework. Most of the Neighborhood Parks will serve as Ecological Patches and all of the public and private open spaces in the plan area will contribute to urban ecology by providing canopy cover and understorey vegetation consistent with Section 6.6 Parks and Open Space Standards and Guidelines."
# 209	US Navy	6	6.3	140	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	Figure 32 depicts an "oval" or "kidney" shaped park along the northern border of the Navy parcel. The Navy requests flexibility regarding placement of the park area to align with the current cleanup efforts. Please refer to the Navy supplied "Navy Parcel Alternative Conceptual Layout Figure."  Figure 34 depicts an "oval" or "kidney" shaped park along the northern border of the Navy parcel. The Navy requests flexibility regarding placement of the park area to align with the current cleanup efforts. Please refer to the Navy supplied "Navy Parcel Alternative Conceptual Layout Figure."	The Specific Plan allows for park and open space flexibility (see standard 4 p. 139). Changes in the location may be approved through the site master plan process.  To clarify the goals for the open space in the Specific Plan, the following standard will be added to Community Parks (p. 150-151):  "The Navy Park shall front Lockheed Martin Way for a minimum of 50% of the street frontage between the Discovery Way extension and Mathilda Avenue. The minimum required frontage area shall have a minimum depth of 200 feet. Navy Park shall meet the intersection of the Discovery Way extension and Lockheed Martin Way. Any part of Navy Park fronting Lockheed Martin Way shall have a minimum depth of 75 feet."
# 210	Google	6	6.3	140	Open Space & Urban Ecology Framework	Recommendation: Update 'Figure 32 Parks and Open Space Framework' and 'Figure 34 Park and Open Space Location and Size' to reflect a more continuous and linear network of park spaces in the North of Java neighborhood, between the West and East Channels. Modify the "Community Park-Ecological Corridor" labeled "7/Caspian Community Park" to contiguously connect Borregas Ave to Crossman Ave, better integrating the Meta Campus into this East-West open space network. Also update the geometries of each shape shown to be more bubbly and less prescriptive in nature, much like the Community Park shape we see in the West Mathilda Neighborhood just south of Lockheed Martin Way. See Exhibit #4 in Appendix	Figure 32 Parks and Open Space Framework and Figure 34 Park and Open Space Location and Size revised to reflect a more continuous connection between Geneva and Crossman. The diagrammatic shape of Open Spaces has also been revised to be consistent throughout the plan area.
# 211	Berlinger Cohen LLP	6	6.3	140	Open Space & Urban Ecology Framework	Assumption of multiple property owners to collaborate in the development and dedication of a potential park is not realistic	Figure 32 Parks and Open Space Framework and Figure 34 Park and Open Space Location and Size have been revised to show two smaller adjacent parks that account for multiple property owners. Supplementary figures have been added showing the amount of open space required on each parcel.
# 212	Community Non-profit Organizations	6	6.3	141	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	Ensure spatial equity by committing to going above and beyond the minimum 44 acres of high habitat value eco patches recommended in the San Francisco Estuary Institute Technical Report, with emphasis in areas and neighborhoods slated for affordable housing development.	The Specific Plan provides for more than 44 acres of urban ecology. Biodiversity hubs, ecological corridors, and habitat patches total over 175 acres. No change recommended.
# 213	Lockheed	6	6.3	143	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	The map does not seem to reflect accurately the core campus boundary - specifically the buffer/setback north of Bldg. 076 is included as a Greenway - Ecological Corridor	Figure 32 Parks and Open Space Framework will be revised with the Lockheed Martin campus boundary.
# 214	Jay Paul Company	6	6.3	143	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	The mini park/plaza at 11th and Discovery Way (Figure 34) is not practicle or viable. A plaza in this location does not make sense in the context of the population in the immediate area and planned traffic improvements. This plaza would be located on a high traffic corner where the Mary Avenue overpass initially drops into Moffett Park. It seems contrary to safety to encourage pedestrian traffic in this area. Further, we believe the plaza will be underutilized as it is surrounded by highly amenitized, tech office campuses that already provide significant open space and outdoor gathering opportunities for employees. With respect to park access for residential projects, the closest potential residential development (at Innovation and Mathilda) is ½ mile away from this corner and there is park planned immediately across Innovation on the Juniper Campus. We therefore believe this requirement will not be used for its intended purpose, creates pedestrian safety issues and should therefore be eliminated.  The plaza at the corner of 11th and Discovery Way does not make sense as this would be located on a high traffic corner where Mary Avenue overpass would be located and would be contrary to safety to encourage pedestrian traffic in this area. The plaza will be underutilized as single-tenant buildings already have large open space and outdoor gathering areas for their employees. This requirement should be removed from the plan.	The vision for Moffett Park includes an interconnected network of parks and open spaces that provides a wide range of uses to serve entire communities of all ages and abilities and address ecological, social, equity, and health issues. The park and open space typologies and sizes are tailored to the unique conditions of each neighborhood and function. As additional development occurs in the Discovery Neighborhood campuses, new habitat patches and open spaces will be required to support the development and create places for gathering and ecology. No change recommended.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 215	Jay Paul Company	6	6.3	143	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	The three acre Neighborhood Park at the corner of 5th Avenue and Discovery Way (Figure 34) is not practical or viable. While we understand the City's desire for open space, a park in this location does not make sense given the surrounding area is comprised of high density office campuses which already provide significant landscaped open space for use by project occupants. There is no residential or mixed use space in the immediate area and realistically, the only potential users of the proposed park will be the existing employee population which already enjoys a highly amenitized campus environment with over 42% usable, landscaped open space. The addition of a neighborhood park in this location would require the removal and relocation of existing landscaped open space, including a significant art installation, on a campus that seeks only to add infill buildings. Further, there are multiple parks and open spaces being planned for the planned residential north of 1st Avenue including a 9 acre Community Park on the Navy Site, a Greenway and a Natural Area/Bio Diversity Hub immediately adjace to that site.	The vision for Moffett Park includes an interconnected network of parks and open spaces that provides a wide range of uses to serve entire communities of all ages and abilities and address ecological, social, equity, and health issues. The park and open space typologies and sizes are tailored to the unique conditions of each neighborhood and function. As additional development occurs in the Discovery Neighborhood campuses, new habitat patches and open spaces will be required to support the development and create places for gathering and ecology. No change recommended.
# 216	R+A	6	6.3	144	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	Update table for consistency with revised map.	Update Table 9 to be consistent with changes to Figure 34 and new open space regulations for South Java and Chesapeake
# 217	Jay Paul Company	6	6.3	145	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	The location of a neighborhood park of 3-acre in Discovery neighborhood does not make sense as it is in the middle of high density office campuses with significant landscaped open space and no residential or mixed use in the immediate vicinity.	The vision for Moffett Park includes an interconnected network of parks and open spaces that provides a wide range of uses to serve entire communities of all ages and abilities and address ecological, social, equity, and health issues. The park and open space typologies and sizes are tailored to the unique conditions of each neighborhood and function. As additional development occurs in the Discovery Neighborhood campuses, new habitat patches and open spaces will be required to support the development and create places for gathering and ecology. No change recommended.
# 218	Jay Paul Company	6	6.3	145	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	The proposed neighborhood park in Discovery neighborhood would require removal and relocation of existing landscaped open space.	The Specific Plan does not require the removal of the landscaped open space. The area may be integrated into the proposed open space. No change recommended.
# 219	Jay Paul Company	6	6.3	145	Open Space and Urban Ecology Framework	The navy site includes a nine-acre neighborhood park which will serve the residential planned north of 1st Ave, which is more than 1.1 miles away from this neighborhood park at 5th Ave/Discovery.	The Specific Plan aims to create Greenbelt - Ecological Corridor along Discovery Way with adjacent habitat patches to support urban ecology. There is no residential development allowed north of 1st Avenue; rather it is planned directly across from the Navy Park. No change recommended.
# 220	Google	6	6.5	148	Natural Areas- Biodiversity Hubs and Habitat Patches	<b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Revise bullet point 4.e to read, " <b>West Channel Park areas shall not include the recently approved (2019) Caribbean project's private open spaces, which is not required as publicly dedicated as a park or as public open space</b> ". (The West Channel Park "Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub" area currently encroaches on Google's Caribbean Project and will overlap with the properties' private open spaces, which have already been provided as part of the approved Caribbean project and in fulfillment of the project's conditions of approval. Therefore, those open spaces should not also be subject to the MPSP's expansion of public accessibility or "Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub" requirements. This new Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub area should be altered to not cover the previously approved use of the Caribbean Project's property.)	Added Text at end of paragraph: " <b>Biodiversity Hubs and Habitat Patches may be a combination of public open spaces, private open spaces with public access, and private open spaces that are not accessible to the public, provided they meet the standards defined in Table 11.</b> "
# 221	Google	6	6.5	155	Contributing Open Space	<b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Revise bullet point 4.e to read, " <b>West Channel Park areas shall not include the recently approved (2019) Caribbean project's private open spaces, which is not required as publicly dedicated as a park or as public open space</b> ". (The West Channel Park "Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub" area currently encroaches on Google's Caribbean Project and will overlap with the properties' private open spaces, which have already been provided as part of the approved Caribbean project and in fulfillment of the project's conditions of approval. Therefore, those open spaces should not also be subject to the MPSP's expansion of public accessibility or "Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub" requirements. This new Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub area should be altered to not cover the previously approved use of the Caribbean Project's property.)	Add Contributing Open Space Type: <b>"Contributing Open Space:</b> Contributing Open Spaces may include public open spaces, natural areas, and private open spaces that include limited public access via a publicly accessible pathway through the space. Contributing Open Spaces shall be visible from and directly adjacent to a public or publicly accessible right-of-way. Contributing Open Spaces not designated in the Specific Plan shall not be permitted to offset designated public or publicly accessible open spaces. <b>Contributing Open Space Design Standards, Scale:</b> 1 - 8 acres, Service Area: Neighborhood-Community, Minimum Resources: Accessible Pathway(s), Seating Areas, Potential Program: Similar to Neighborhood Park, Landscape and Lighting Design: Landscape design shall be per Section 6.6.6 Landscape Design. Landscape lighting shall be per Section 6.6.9 Exterior Lighting."
# 222	Google	6	6.5	156	Caspian Community Park	<b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Revise bullet point 1 "Minimum Dimensions" to read: " <b>200 feet West of Geneva Dr and East of Borregas Ave and 150 feet East of Geneva Dr. At least one space that has a minimum dimension of 250 feet by 300 feet.</b> " (This provides greater flexibility to amalgamate adjacent open spaces and better facilitates the movement of people, plants and animals; in line with the overarching open space vision) <u>See Exhibit #5 in Appendix</u>	Revise standard. " <b>1. Minimum Dimension:</b> 200 feet between Borregas Ave. and Geneva Drive. 150 feet between Geneva Dr. and Crossman Ave. At least one space with a minimum dimension of 300 feet by 300 feet between Borregas Ave. and Geneva Drive. <del>with At least one space that has a minimum dimension of 300 feet by 300 feet."</del>



**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 223	Divcowest	6	6.5	156	Caspian Community Park	<p>As noted above, the MPSP proposes to abandon Caspian Drive at an undetermined point in the future in order to accommodate a proposed Caspian Community Park and other open space amenities. The abandonment of Caspian Drive, as proposed, would completely eliminate the Property's primary vehicular site access—our literal front door (as highlighted in yellow in Figure 35, Illustrative Caspian Community Park Section and Figure 20, Illustrative North Java Neighborhood Diagram, respectively, below).</p> <p>This potential elimination of Caspian Drive obviously is very troubling to the Property's ownership (and likely to other property owners along that corridor) because of the loss of critical vehicular access that the Property has relied on for decades, thus causing substantial negative impacts to the Property value. We recognize that, as the properties in the MPSP redevelop, there will be an expectation that applicants work with the City and adjacent property owners to solve for these significant impacts to neighboring properties; however, the MPSP does not explicitly define or outline any particular policy that formalizes such an expectation.</p> <p>Therefore, we respectfully request that specific policy language be added to the MPSP that provides necessary assurances to adjacent owners as part of any future Site Master Plan process or public infrastructure improvement projects. We recommend the following language be added to Chapter 10.3 General Submittals and Site Master Plans (and/or anywhere else in the MPSP that Planning staff sees fit):</p> <p>All Site Master Plan development applicants, including any public infrastructure improvement projects, shall either facilitate the retention of existing site access or provide equivalent access to properties adjacent to future improvements.</p>	<p>Add standard: "4.c. Caspian Community Park improvements including changes to Caspian Drive shall be completed in tandem with or after improvements to ensure site access to all properties."</p>
# 224	Commissioner Mike Serrone	6	6.5	158	Diagonal	<p>Diagonal: I think it's great. How do you implement the diagonal when it runs through all of those properties?</p>	<p>The Diagonal and all other open spaces are a requirement of residential development and incentivized through the Bonus FAR program for non-residential development. The new open spaces and complete street network is distributed amongst all properties, including the Diagonal. No change recommended.</p> <p>To clarify the need for reducing net developable land by approximately 35% to create an integrated open space, urban ecology, and mobility network. Modify text on page 64: "Each neighborhood is distinct with a unique mix of land uses that blends the historic development of the area with future needs to create an ecological innovation district. Each neighborhood is planned around an active transportation network, parks and open space, and community-supporting services. To provide for these new spaces and services, each parcel's developable area will be approximately 60-70% depending on specific circumstances."</p>
# 225	Miramar Capital	6	6.5	158	Diagonal	<p>50-foot diagonal bike/ped path would bisect the site at 352 E Java Dr would drastically reduce the developability of the site (currently considering 330 dwelling units) and suggests for bike and pedestrian access on the perimeter to link to the Java Drive LRT station</p>	<p>The Diagonal and all other open spaces are a requirement of residential development and incentivized through the Bonus FAR program for non-residential development. The new open spaces and complete street network is distributed amongst all properties, including the Diagonal. No change recommended.</p> <p>Add the following language to page 158 to ensure improvements are included in the development because they are essential in meeting CEQA findings: "The Diagonal is envisioned an urban promenade that will provide continuous visual and active transportation corridor from Mathilda Avenue to Crossman Square and the East Channel Park. The South Java Neighborhood Park, mini parks, plazas, and squares should be situated at key nodes along its length. Seating and gathering areas should be located intermittently and the Diagonal should include a continuous canopy of trees. The design of the diagonal should include a common palette of paving, lighting, site furnishings and other elements to create a distinct and cohesive identity and experience.</p> <p>The Diagonal is a required improvement and is needed to avoid adverse impacts on the environment</p>

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 226	Miramar Capital	6	6.5	158	Diagonal	Diagonal is not feasible. It bisects many parcels creating irregular or triangular "leftover" parcels that are not developable. The remaining parcel are not practical for residential development. It results in creating two-building condition which adds costs by doubling all building elevations and systems (i.e. elevators, trash chutes, fire and life safety systems, water heating). Proposed changes include: a bike/ped path along the perimeter of sites, shared with adjacent properties, with no property encumbered with more than 25" of ROW, would serve the purpose of Ped/Bike connectivity envisioned by the Diagonal without unduly encumbering the development on the parcels.	To provide specific details for location and size of required open spaces, block structure, and complete streets in the South Java Neighborhood, additional figures will be included as an appendix C to the Specific Plan.
# 227	Jay Paul Company	6	6.5	158	Diagonal	The suggested Moffett Place B7 diagonal cannot be 50' wide; The existing condition and current design are shown at 25' wide. The need of vehicle access for the building would conflict with the existing current driveway.	If Bonus FAR is added to an existing campus, the Specific Plan may require reconfiguration of building access, parking, or landscaped area to meet the vision of an ecological innovation district. No change recommended.
# 228	Google	6	6.5	160	Crossman Square	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 3 'Minimum Area' to read: " <b>15,000 square feet</b> " (15,000 square feet allows for a more intimate space and a human scale environment, where activation can be concentrated to deliver a vibrant civic heart.) <u>See Exhibit #6 in Appendix</u>	Reducing the minimum area of the plaza would require a reduction in the minimum dimensions. Considering the programmatic intent, and allowable building heights, the minimum area and dimensions in the Specific Plan are appropriate for a well-scaled urban plaza. No change recommended.
# 229	Berlinger Cohen LLP	6	6.5	161	South Java and Chesapeake Neighborhood Open Space	Recommend removing bubble #18 (neighborhood park) from the property 1225 Bordeaux Dr property or identify all the properties that would be affected to contribute to this open space requirement.  Clearly state the intent and requirements for park dedication for the properties within the open space diagram (bubbles) so that readers can clearly and objectively understand the constraints on development  Parkland dedication assumption, which requires dedication put o 2/3 of the property, is unrealistic for smaller properties like 1225 Bordeaux Dr	To provide specific details for location and size of required open spaces, block structure, and complete streets in the South Java Neighborhood, additional figures and detail will be included as an appendix to the Specific Plan.  Add new section: <b>"South Java and Chesapeake Neighborhood Open Spaces</b> <b>The South Java and Chesapeake Neighborhoods are anchored by a series of open spaces, the Diagonal, and the East and West Channel Greenbelts. Open spaces within these neighborhoods span multiple properties (with multiple owners) which will require a higher level of coordination. Required open spaces, block structure, and complete street network shall be met onsite as illustrated in Appendix Figure C or the development shall submit a joint Site Master Plan with all properties adjacent to the required open space or network connection to be modified from the illustrated Figures."</b>
# 230	Google	6	6.5	161	East and West Channel Parks	<u>Proposed modification(s):</u> Revise bullet point 1 'Minimum Dimensions' to read, " <b>East Channel Park: 250 feet, West Channel Park: 100ft</b> " Revise bullet point 2 'Minimum Area' to read, " <b>East Channel Park: 9 Acres, West Channel Park: 3 Acres</b> " (Sizing of the West Channel Park should recognize that the landscaped areas of 100 and 200 Caribbean are an already established private open space that should not also be subject to the MPSP's proposed expansion of public accessibility or "Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub" requirements.)	West Channel Park has been removed and replaced with West Channel Biodiversity Hub, located in the naturalized channel area (currently under construction) between Caspian and Caribbean. The minimum dimension shall be consistent with the approved plans.  Minimum Dimensions and Area for East Channel Park have been added as follows: " <b>East Channel Park: Minimum Dimensions: 250-foot, Minimum Area: 9 acres</b> "
# 231	Google	6	6.5	161	East and West Channel Parks	<u>Proposed modification(s): East and West Channel Parks</u> <u>Modify bullet point 4.c to include, "Incentives will be provided for nature-based solutions that reduce the height and extent of the flood walls. Incentives will include Parkland Improvement value credits and/or eligibility as a Community Benefit".</u> (Incentivizing developers to coordinate with Valley Water (within E&W channel park extents) will allow for improved outcomes and greater ability to deliver on the Specific Plan's guiding principles, standards, and overarching vision to create an ecological innovation district.)	As noted in Table 15, in channel segments where property owners coordinate with Valley Water to provide required flood protection with naturalized channels that eliminate flood walls, the minimum open space and setback standards may be reduced as indicated in the table. Additionally, the City may provide community benefits credits for ecological or environmental enhancements as noted in Table 3. No change recommended.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 232	Google	6	6.5	161	East and West Channel Parks	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b>                      Revise bullet point 4.e to read, "West Channel Park areas shall <b>not include the recently approved (2019) Caribbean project's private open spaces, which is not required as publicly dedicated as a park or as public open space</b>".                      (The West Channel Park "Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub" area currently encroaches on Google's Caribbean Project and will overlap with the properties' private open spaces, which have already been provided as part of the approved Caribbean project and in fulfillment of the project's conditions of approval. Therefore, those open spaces should not also be subject to the MPSP's expansion of public accessibility or "Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub" requirements. This new Natural Area - Biodiversity Hub area should be altered to not cover the previously approved use of the Caribbean Project's property.)</p>	<p>Additional OS Type has been added to Pg 138: "Contributing Open Space" Page 140, <b>Figure 32 revised to include Contributing OS at the Caribbean Project (referenced in this comment) and at other applicable locations.</b> Page 142, <b>Figure 33 revised to show revisions to Urban Ecology Framework.</b> Page 143, <b>Figure 34 revised based on the above.</b> Page 144-145, <b>Table 9 revised to reflect changes outlined above.</b> Biodiversity hubs have been redefined on Page 148. Contributing Open Space added after Page 155.</p>
# 233	Google	6	6.5	165	East and West Channel Greenbelts	<p><b>Recommendation:</b>                      Incentivize developers to coordinate with Valley Water to improve the West &amp; East Channels, (and/or City Stormwater Ditch) to create connected Open Space which may provide naturalized flood protection, active use, reduced flood walls and improved ecological functions where possible. Incentives could include parkland improvement value credits and/or eligibility as a Community Benefit.                      (Encouraging developers to coordinate with City, PG&amp;E and Valley Water (within Greenbelt extents) will allow for improved outcomes and greater ability to deliver on the Specific Plan's guiding principles, standards, and overarching vision to create an ecological innovation district.)</p>	<p>Revise Table 15:  <b>Minimum Required Open Space: "100 feet width in segments where channel flood protection is naturalized channel flood protection"</b>  <b>Minimum Total Open Space Width: "300 feet width in segments where channel flood protection is naturalized channel flood protection"</b>  <b>Public Open Space Setbacks: "30 feet minimum width from property line in all instances including naturalization channel flood protection and PG&amp;E undergrounding."</b>                      Add footnotes:                      "If PG&amp;E easement is reduced, building setback may be reduced to minimum setback from top of bank.                      If channel flood protection is naturalized, minimum corridor width may be reduced to 300 feet.                      Additionally, the City may provide community benefits credits for ecological or environmental enhancements as noted in Table 3. No change recommended."</p>
# 234	Google	6	6.5	165	East and West Channel Greenbelts	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add language stating that "The undergrounding of PG&amp;E's high voltage power lines along the eastern edge of the East Channel would enable additional high quality open space benefits within the Moffett Park Specific Plan. It would further contribute to the City's vision for an East Channel open space corridor and is eligible as a park and open space dedication credit equivalent for its improvement value. Reduced open space setbacks along the East Channel Greenbelt, may also be considered, if the HV lines are undergrounded."                      (Encouraging developers to coordinate with PG&amp;E will allow for improved outcomes and greater ability to deliver on the Specific Plan's guiding principles, standards, and overarching vision to create an ecological innovation district.)</p>	<p>Modify Table 15  <b>Public Open Space Setbacks: "30 feet minimum in all instances including naturalization channel flood protection and PG&amp;E undergrounding"</b>                      Add footnotes:                      "If PG&amp;E easement is reduced, building setback may be reduced to minimum setback from top of bank."</p>
# 235	Jay Paul Company	6	6.5	165	East and West Channel Greenbelts	<p>The west channel cross section suggests 70' wide public open space on Moffett Place B7 site; this is not viable since we have existing surface parking lot in this location.</p>	<p>While the intent is to provide a continuous open space, habitat, and multi-use trail connection, West Channel Greenbelt improvements will not be required unless the parcel is redeveloped in the future. No change recommended.</p>
# 236	Commissioner Mike Serrone	6	6.5	166	Ecological Combining District	<p>What is happening on the Lockheed open space area? Who owes it? Is the plan specifying this as open space or is a regional authority taking this on?</p>	<p>The Specific Plan establishes an ecological combining district. Ecological combining district standards are included in Section 6.5. Lockheed Martin is the primary owner of this area. No change recommended.</p>
# 237	Lockheed	6	6.5	167	Ecological Combining District	<p>The dimension of ECD from the northern boundary should be 1,000 feet not 1,040 feet.</p>	<p>A 1,040 ft distance from the northern property line has been consistently illustrated during the MPSP process. City staff understands this is different than the diagonal line shown by the property owner. The <b>Figure 39 Ecological Combining District</b> will be updated to accurately depict the required Lockheed Martin buffers from the buildings.</p>
# 238	Google	6	6.6.3	171	Urban Forest	<p><b>Proposed modification(s):</b>                      Revise bullet point 1.a to read, " For isolated noncompliance areas with documented technical restrictions/circumstances (e.g. utility and programmatic conflicts), the required land areas for canopy cover may be reduced by up to <b>20%</b> with approval by the City."                      (Greater flexibility around canopy cover targets, particularly for site master plans that incorporate the major activity centers and high-density residential neighborhoods, will ensure impacts on human-scale experience and overall residential unit yield are not compromised)</p>	<p>Revise standard: "1.a. <b>Minimum Canopy Cover.</b> Canopy cover<sup>10</sup> shall be managed and monitored at different scales and in relation to different open space types, street types, and private open spaces, with the goal of maximizing coverage within Moffett Park. For <b>small</b> isolated noncompliance areas with documented technical restrictions/circumstances (e.g. utility and programmatic conflicts), the required land areas for canopy cover may be reduced by up to <b>15%</b> <del>10%</del> with approval by the City. <b>The reduced percentage shall be compensated for elsewhere in the Site Master Plan unless applicant can demonstrate that the canopy removed from the isolated noncompliance areas cannot be installed elsewhere within the Site Master Plan.</b>"</p>

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 239	Google	6	6.6.3	171	Urban Forest	<b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Modify bullet points 1.a.iii.05 to read, "New fine grain office open space: 30% on grade, and 0% on building podium or rooftops" Modify bullet points 1.a.iii.06 to read, "New large campus open space: 50% on grade, and 0% on building podium or rooftops" Modify bullet points 1.a.iii.07 to read, "New Residential open space: 30% on grade, and 0% on building podium or rooftops" (Allowing flexibility around programming of private rooftop courtyards and podiums ensure they are not restricted by canopy cover targets. Additionally, providing tree canopy on rooftops and podiums would pose financial, structural, and maintenance challenges)	Revise standards: "1.a.iii. Private Open Spaces ... 04. New MP-AC Land Use District: 0% 05. New Fine grain core open space: 30% on grade, 15% on building podium, 0% on rooftops. 06. New Large campus open space: 50% on grade, 15% on building podium, 0% on rooftops. 07. New Residential open space: 30% on grade, 15% on building podium, 0% on rooftops."
# 240	G Steel	6	6.6.6	175	Landscape Design	Consider including California native forest using Miyawaki planting methods that speed up the whole forest formation. Ideally they would not have paths through them that increases water loss, damage through trampling and ingress of invasive species	The Miyawaki method may be appropriate in certain situations, however specifying particular planting/revegetation techniques is outside the scope of this plan. No change recommended.
# 241	Google	6	6.6.6	175	Landscape Design	<b>Proposed modification(s):</b> Add new sub-bullet point 2 a.iii. "City will consider additional species/varieties outside what is included in the Planting Palette so long as it is coordinated with the City's Ecologist and City Parks department representative as part of a development review process." (City should allow opportunities for a developer's professional ecologist or licensed landscape architect to expand on the planting palette species list. There are 49 tree species locally native to the Bay Area that are available in Bay Area plant nurseries and only 19 trees in the MPSP plant palette. The trees in the MPSP are hyper native to Santa Clara Valley and many of the species have high water demand, are not tolerant to recycled water irrigation, and widespread planting of these species will not increase climate resilience. It would be beneficial to expand the tree palette to include more native species, particularly more drought tolerant species and species that can be irrigated with recycled water. Increasing the diversity of the planting palette will increase resilience to climate change, reduce pest and pathogen impacts, and increase habitat support for wildlife.)	The current plant palette represents a subset of locally native species selected in accordance with historical ecosystem composition in Santa Clara Valley, as these are the species expected to best tolerate local environmental conditions and support locally adapted biodiversity. While additional tree species with tolerance for drought and/or recycled water may be beneficial, expanding the list to include any species native to the broader Bay Area would include some species inappropriate for the locally native ecosystems. Additional tree species will be reviewed and added to the plant palette as appropriate.  The species with higher water demand are native to riparian areas and other mesic habitats, and would be ecologically beneficial in sites with sufficient water availability.  Add new standard ""2.a.iii: The City may consider additional species/varieties from those included in the Planting Palette, in coordination with the Department of Public Works as part of a development review process. Species locally native to Santa Clara Valley will be prioritized. If there is consideration to expand the plant palette to include species not locally native to Santa Clara County, careful consideration should be given to a number of factors to ensure that the plantings are ecologically beneficial and suitable for local site conditions, such as native range, native habitat association(s), water requirements, salinity tolerance, sun/shade tolerance, soil tolerance, wildlife support, depth to groundwater, and climate change resilience."
# 242	US Navy	6	6.6.8	177	Site Furnishings	Site furnishing for "Navey" (sp?) Park. Since most of the Navy parcel will have Land Use Controls incorporated in the deed regarding future occupied building requirements for Soil Vapor mitigation, the placement of the public restrooms within the designated "Navy Park" should be discussed and agreed upon by the City and Navy environmental specialists and/or consultants.	The Navy site includes a community park that would potentially include flex fields and other programming. Restrooms are appropriate on a site like this. No change recommended.  Modify: Make spelling change "Navy" will be made.
# 243	Chuck Fraleigh	6	6.6.10	179	Multi-Use Flex Fields	Increase the number of fields in the plan area, especially to support youth sports	The Specific Plan includes standards and approximate locations for new multi-use flex fields (Section 6.6.10). This includes locations for 3 U-10 fields and a guideline for one large flex fields equivalent to a high school sized soccer field. Additional fields are located to the north of Moffett Park in the Twin Creeks. No changes recommended.
# 244	US Navy	6	6.6.10	179	Multi-Use Flex Fields	Figure 40 depicts the park area as a potential flex field location on the Navy parcel and is an "oval" or "kidney" shaped park located along the northern border of the Navy parcel. The Navy requests flexibility regarding placement of the park area to align with the current cleanup efforts. Please refer to the Navy supplied "Navy Parcel Alternative Conceptual Layout Figure."	The Specific Plan allows for park and open space flexibility (see standard 4 p. 139). Changes in the location may be approved through the site master plan process. No change recommended.
# 245	Lockheed	6	6.6.3	180	Multi-Use Flex Fields	The map does not seem to reflect accurately the core campus boundary - specifically the buffer/setback north of Bldg. 076 is included as a Greenway - Ecological Corridor	Figure 40 Potential Flex Fields will be revised with the Lockheed Martin campus boundary.
# 246	Community Non-profit Organizations	7	7.1	184	Mobility Goals and Policies	Adjust the MPSP to be consistent with MTC's recently adopted Transit Oriented Communities Policy, wherever relevant.	The Specific Plan is consistent with the recently-adopted Transit-Oriented Communities policy. The policy covers: minimum residential and commercial office densities for new development; affordable housing production, preservation and protection, and stabilizing businesses to prevent displacement; parking management; and transit station access. No change recommended.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 247	Lockheed	7	7.2	186	Complete Streets Typology and Network	First Avenue west of Mathilda should remain the major street providing access to the redevelopment of the LM's North parcel. Any new street along the LM channel should be a laneway. North Parcel will be redeveloped before LM's East parcel.	To address comments about 1st Avenue and future phasing configurations, City staff recommends reconfiguring existing 4-lane street into a 2-lane street with Greenbelt connection to Ecological Combining District. This will allow the existing curb-to-curb dimensions to be retained. <b>Add new section for 1st Avenue. See figure below. Add table with dimensions as follows:</b> Curb-to-Curb: 28' Right-of-Way: 98' or greater Pedestrian Zone: 12' Class I shared-use path on north side to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle travel; 14' landscaping buffer. On south side, 8' sidewalk and 7' landscape buffer Bicycle Facilities: 6' Class IV separated bikeway on the east side protected by 1' buffer. Vehicle Lanes: One 11' travel lane in each direction Curbside Zone: N/A Medians: N/A Intersection: Intersection with Mathilda Ave shall be narrowed to a maximum of 3 lanes.
# 248	Lockheed	7	7.2	186	Complete Streets Typology and Network	The City should accept dedication of all new public roads West of Mathilda such as the proposed extension of Discovery Way	The plan area West of Mathilda has traditionally included private streets and other private utility improvements with portions of private streets providing public access. The plan is consistent with current policy. No change is recommended.
# 249	R+A	7	7.2	187	Complete Streets Typology and Network	Staff generated comment.	The Specific Plan recognizes the need for flexibility in the location and alignment of new streets as defined in Section 7.2. In addition, in Section 5.2.1, a location alternative is provided for a large campus on the Navy site. Change <b>Figure 43: Conceptual Vehicle Street Network</b> to remove one of the north/south neighborhood streets on the Navy parcel.
# 250	R+A	7	7.2	187	Complete Streets Typology and Network	Publicly is misspelled in the map legend	Revise: "Existing Streets (Private, Not Publically Accessible)" Revise: "Existing Private Vehicular Streets (Not Publicaly Accessible)"
# 251	Jay Paul Company	7	7.2	187	Complete Streets Typology and Network	There should be no requirement to rebuild existing neighborhood street when infill building is being proposed. In all of the JPC campuses the adjacent streets were designed and built to City standards with the initial development and are "complete streets". In most cases, these streets are approx. 12 years old and in some cases, less than 10 years old. The requirement for rebuilding City streets is more appropriately associated with the 30 and 40 year old streets in other areas of the mark- mostly in the eastern areas - especially if the streets are not "complete". If the City desires reconstruction of newer "complete streets", the cost should be considered a community benefit or credited against other fees.	The Specific Plan requires a robust and complete network of mobility and infrastructure improvements. Requiring replacement for infrastructure that are in disrepair or at the end of their useful life would result in delays in the development of the networks. No change recommended.
# 252	Jay Paul Company	7	7.2	187	Complete Streets Typology and Network	More study needed for equitable provision of services and costs for all development. Not equitable for private roads to be developed to the City standards and developer to bear the cost of improvements as well as maintenance but roads are used as public roads. City provides no traffic enforcement on these private roads.	All streets in Moffett Park should be accessible to the public, unless they only provide access within private properties, such as Lockheed Martin's secure campus. Existing private road were established through a development agreement process and will need to be addressed individually if there is a desire to change the terms of that agreement. No change recommended.
# 253	US Navy	7	7.2	188	Complete Streets Typology and Network	The Figure depicts 3 Neighborhood Streets, and 2 Laneways bisecting the Navy parcel. The Navy requests flexibility in placement of these roadways and laneways to accommodate Navy cleanup activities and maximize size of future developable areas while maintaining the goal of "walkable neighborhoods" as mentioned in Section 3.7 (pg.51) Please refer to the Navy supplied "Navy Parcel Alternative Conceptual Layout Figure."  Figure 44 Complete Conceptual Street Network. The Navy requests flexibility in placement of these roadways and laneways to accommodate Navy cleanup activities and maximize size of future developable areas while maintaining the goal of "walkable neighborhoods" as mentioned in Section 3.7 (pg.51)	The Specific Plan recognizes the need for flexibility in the location and alignment of new streets as defined in Section 7.2. In addition, in Section 5.2.1, a location alternative is provided for a large campus on the Navy site. Change <b>Figure 44: Complete Conceptual Street Network</b> to remove one of the north/south neighborhood streets on the Navy parcel.
# 254	Commissioner Mike Serrone	7	7.2	188	Complete Streets Typology and Network	Traffic: There are 4 routes in and out of Moffett Park. What is assumed for the Mary Avenue overpass?	The Mary Avenue Overcrossing project is under consideration for approval in 2023. See <a href="https://www.sunnyvale.ca.gov/business-and-development/projects-in-sunnyvale/infrastructure-projects/mary-avenue-overcrossing">https://www.sunnyvale.ca.gov/business-and-development/projects-in-sunnyvale/infrastructure-projects/mary-avenue-overcrossing</a> for more details. No change recommended.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 255	Commissioner Martin Pyne	7	7.2	188	Complete Streets Typology and Network	The limited mobility connections to Moffett Park are my biggest worry. There is limited capacity	Noted. No change recommended.
# 256		7	7.2	189	Complete Streets Typology and Network	Add clarifying language about potential adverse impacts on the environment	Revise Text: 7.3 Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology "Street designs shall meet City design requirements identified in Figure 44: Complete Conceptual Street Framework and 57: Complete Bicycle Network as defined in Table 18A through Table 22B. The standards presented in these tables describe the streets' end-state at plan full build-out. The implementation of the Complete Street and Complete Bicycle Network are required to ensure no adverse impact on the environment. Some street designs may vary from the street design standards depending on the existing conditions (e.g., preservation of existing trees and underground utility infrastructure). Each street will require additional analysis and review by the City before designs are finalized, with the Transportation & Traffic Manager and Director of Public Works making a final determination during the Site Master Plan process."
# 257	Google	7	7.3	192-200	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	<b>Recommendation:</b> Allow an exception via the Site Master Plan or Development Agreement process for a minimum sidewalk width of 8' and landscape buffer width of 5' along both sides of the street for the following street types: Java Drive (Figure 46 and Table 18B), Crosstown Connector with (Figure 48 and Table 19A) and without Flex Space (Figure 49 and table 19B), Crossman Avenue (Figure and Table 20A), and Neighborhood Street with (Figure 54 and Table 21B) and without Bicycle Facility (Figure 53 and Table 21A). Similarly, a minimum 5' wide landscape buffer should also be allowed along Caribbean Drive (Figure 45 and Table 18B).  (While we recognize the value of a minimum 10' sidewalk and 6' buffer for creating a pedestrian-friendly district, we believe there will be some areas within the District where pedestrian flows will not be as heavy, and that reductions in overall right-of-way width could help enable adjacent development.)	To reduce the right-of-way of most streets, reduce Pedestrian Zone dimension for all street types except Anchor Streets and Laneways.  Modify cross section dimensions in <b>Figures 48 – 54 and Tables 19A – 21B</b> . Modify Pedestrian Zone standard from: 16' (10' sidewalk; and 6' landscape buffer) to 15' (9' sidewalk and 6' landscape buffer).  NACTO minimum recommendation is 8' sidewalk throughway. The 6 foot curb and planting area is important to maintain for large canopy trees.
# 258	R+A	7	7.3	195	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Clarify implementation of two different design conditions, and to generally maintain curb-to-curb dimensions, add the following new sections to the plan for Moffett Park Drive in the Chesapeake Neighborhood.	Add proposed street cross sections and add table with dimensions as follows: <b>Moffett Park Drive (Chesapeake Neighborhood)</b> Curb-to-Curb: 44' New Right-of-Way: 74' (56' existing) Pedestrian Zone: 9' sidewalk; 6' landscape buffer Bicycle Facilities: 5' to 6' Class IV separated bikeway in each direction protected by 1' to 2' buffer depending on available right-of-way and expected vehicle volumes Vehicle Lanes: One 11' travel lane in each direction Curbside Zone: 8' flex space on the west side. Medians: N/A  <b>Moffett Park Drive + Greenbelt (Chesapeake Neighborhood)</b> Curb-to-Curb: 44' New Right-of-Way: 134' inclusive of 75' wide greenbelt open space on north side (56' existing) Pedestrian Zone: North side: 12' Class I shared-use path on west side to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle travel; and 9' sidewalk adjacent to properties to the north. South Side side, 9' sidewalk and 6' landscape buffer Bicycle Facilities: 6' Class IV separated bikeway on the east side protected by 2' buffer. And shared-use path through Greenbelt Open Space Vehicle Lanes: One 11' travel lane in each direction Curbside Zone: 7' flex space available for landscaping, loading, or short-term parking Medians: N/A
# 259	R+A	7	7.3	195	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	To provide flexibility around the implementation of Moffett Park (frontage road) condition due to multiple configurations of the street, add new performance standards.	Add minimum requirements for Moffett Park (frontage road) as follows: Traffic: one lane in each direction, flex lane optional Curb-to-Curb: 32' Sidewalks/Bike Facilities: 12' multiuse path (location flexible but shall be designed to connect to adjacent properties) 6' landscape buffer (location flexible) Building setback to begin north of minimal facilities or ROW whichever is greater"

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 260	R+A	7	7.3	196	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Make the following changes and additions to street sections.	Modify Figure 50 Crossman Avenue (Typical) cross section. See figure below.  "8' flex space required on east side of the street adjacent to and within the Activity Center on the east side if ROW allows, available for loading or short-term parking in high-demand locations. 8' flex space optional for areas north of Activity Center to maintain existing curb-to-curb dimension."
# 261	R+A	7	7.3	196	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Remove extra "2".	Modify standard: "Two 11' travel lanes in each direction; lane width 11'; Reallocate turning lane space to Pedestrian Zone and/or Bicycle Facilities"
# 262	R+A	7	7.3	196	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Provide flexibility for the Crossman Avenue flex spaces.	See line #260
# 263	R+A	7	7.3	200	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Add section for 1st Avenue	Add new section for 1st Avenue. See figure below. Add table with dimensions as follows: <b>Curb-to-Curb: 28'</b> <b>Right-of-Way: 98' or greater</b> <b>Pedestrian Zone: 12' Class I shared-use path on north side to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle travel; 14' landscaping buffer. On south side, 8' sidewalk and 7' landscape buffer</b> <b>Bicycle Facilities: 6' Class IV separated bikeway on the east side protected by 1' buffer.</b> <b>Vehicle Lanes: One 11' travel lane in each direction</b> <b>Curbside Zone: N/A</b> <b>Medians: N/A</b> <b>Intersection: Intersection with Mathilda Ave shall be narrowed to a maximum of 3 lanes.</b>
# 264	BPAC	7	7.3	200	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Provide cross section for existing Neighborhood Streets within curb-to-curb, including Bordeaux, Geneva, Orleans, and other locations where existing curb-to-curb is 43-44 feet in width. Raise bicycle lanes	To generally maintain existing curbs, modify typical sections for Neighborhood Street with bicycle facility (Bordeaux, Geneva, Orleans, and other locations where existing curb-to-curb is 43-44 feet in width) to reduce dimension. Modify bike facilities up to sidewalk level consistent with BPAC guidance. Add new section Revise Figure 54: Neighborhood Street with Bicycle Facility (Typical). Revise table with dimensions as follows: •Curb-to-Curb: <del>62' 43-44'</del> where modifying existing street, curb-to-curb dimension may vary for new Neighborhood Streets. •Right-of-Way: <del>88' 94'-86'</del> •Pedestrian Zone: <del>10' 9'</del> sidewalk; 6' landscape buffer •Bicycle Facilities 6' Class IV separated bikeway in each direction protected by a 3' to 6' buffer. depending on available right-of-way and expected vehicle volumes; buffer should be planted (above grade planters allowed) Street-specific guidelines: 6' Class II bicycle lane on Innovation east of Mathilda Avenue; 6' Class IIB buffered bike lane with 3' buffer on Geneva Drive and Orleans Drive; 10' two-way Class IV separated bikeway with 3' buffer on the south side of Gibraltar Drive and 5' Class II bicycle lane on the north side. •Vehicle Lanes: One 11' travel lane in each direction •Curbside Zone: 8' flex space available for landscaping, loading, or short-term parking in high-demand locations •Medians: <del>Optional; not typical</del> N/A
# 265	Google	7	7.3	200	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	<u>Recommendation:</u> The bikeway standards currently exclude the Green Link network, however, the Green Link network can be an encouraged bikeway type by incorporating the following description under Bicycle Network Standards: " <b>Green Link network is a two-way cycle track (Class I and IV) . A two-way cycle track on one side of the street shall be provided with a buffer between the cycle track and vehicular traffic lane. Exceptions to the Complete Street Design Standards specified in Section 7.3 will be considered should a Project applicant propose to implement the Green Link design standard along specific street segments.</b> "	Add Expetition: <b>"Gibraltar Drive: New sections shall continue GreenLink design with 10' two-way Class IV separated bikeway with 3' buffer on the south side of street Gibraltar Drive and 5' Class II bicycle lane on the north side. North side of the street shall meet minimum sidewalk standards including a minimum 9' sidewalk and 6' landscape buffer"</b>



Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 266	R+A	7	7.3	201	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Simplify laneway and shared street design	Modify <b>Figure 55 Laneway Shared Street (Typical)</b> cross section. Add note: “If EVA is required, shared street may be required to be increased to 20’, aerial apparatus location may include flex space for 26’ area.” Modify standard: 8’ flex space available for loading, micro-mobility parking, landscaping; flex space on Laneways/shares streets is designed to accommodate chicanes, which are encouraged on alternate sides of the street every 200 to 300 feet to slow traffic and increase safety for people walking, biking, and using micromobility.”
# 267	R+A	7	7.3	201	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Revise Laneway sections and standards	Modify <b>Figure 55 Laneway Shared Street (Typical)</b> cross section.  Add note: “If EVA is required, shared street may be required to be increased to 20’, aerial apparatus location may include flex space for 26’ area.” Modify standard: 8’ flex space available for loading, micro-mobility parking, landscaping; flex space on Laneways/shares streets is designed to accommodate chicanes, which are encouraged on alternate sides of the street every 200 to 300 feet to slow traffic and increase safety for people walking, biking, and using micromobility.  Modify <b>Figure 56 Laneway Park/Path (Typical)</b> cross section. Add new section for Laneway.  Modify Table: Pedestrian Zone: <del>8’ sidewalk; 5’ landscape buffer</del> Minimum of 1 pedestrian path or sidewalk on either side of laneway with minimum 6 feet width; 30’ landscaped area that could accommodate furnishings, or other park amenities, landscaped area may be reduced in width to 24’ to accommodate EVA Bicycle Facilities: <del>No dedicated/stripped facilities, two-way riding allowed within 18’ two-way travel lane</del> 12’ two-way cycle track; No vehicle lanes; emergency vehicle access only  Add standard: “Laneway Park/Paths are preferred to be located and designed without need for EVA.”
# 268	R+A	7	7.3	202	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology		Modify <b>Figure 56 Laneway Park/Path (Typical)</b> cross section. Add new section for Laneway.  Add standard: “Laneway/parks are preferred to be located and designed without need for EVA.”
# 269		7	7.3	202	Complete Streets Design Standards by Street Typology	Add Street Lighting Standards per Public Works	Add street lighting standards per the Summary of Changes Memo “Street lighting table” on page 49
# 270	R+A	7	7.4	205	Bicycle Network	There is inconsistency on Figure 44 & 57 on the bike facilities required on the north-south street between Borregas Ave and Insbrook	<b>Figure 44 Complete Conceptual Bicycle Network</b> and <b>Figure 57 Complete Bicycle Network</b> will be made consistent.
# 271	US Navy	7	7.4	205	Bicycle Network	Figure 57 Complete Bicycle Network depicts a Bicycle Lane along/near the western border of the Navy parcel. Navy requests flexibility to move this Bicycle Lane to the Eastern border of the parcel that would be parallel to the VTA railway. This move would coincide with the cleanup efforts currently underway by Navy. Please refer to the Navy supplied “Navy Parcel Alternative Conceptual Layout Figure.”	The Specific Plan identified Discovery Way as a critical multi-modal connection from the Mary Avenue overpass to the Bay Trail. No change recommended.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 272	Community Non-profit Organizations	7	7.6	210	Transit Network	Include an explicit commitment to engage in regional transit integration plans to expand equitable access to the plan area including: MTC Connected Network Plan, VTA's Visionary Network, and an MTC-convened regional initiative laying the groundwork for a regional funding measures for public transportation.	Revise to text under the Regional Transit Service: "In Moffett Park, VTA is responding to challenges of low ridership and high operating costs through recent service changes that increase frequency, particularly on weekends, and increased regional connectivity by reorienting direct service to the future Milpitas BART station. <b>The Moffett Park Specific Plan should be considered in regional transit integration plans to expand equitable access, including, MTC Connected Network Plan and VTA's Visionary Network.</b> Furthermore, VTA's Rapid 523 bus facilitates improved local connections from Moffett Park to Downtown Sunnyvale and San José. The Rapid 523 bus demonstrates an opportunity of Mathilda Avenue as an enhanced high-capacity transitway, with frequent service encouraging transit access to the district. The following sections discuss how both bus and light rail service can best serve the future of Moffett Park."
# 273	Ellis Partners	7	7.6	215	Transit Network	Expand the Circulator Shuttle route to serve perimeter parcels within the Plan area and connecting to the Sunnyvale Caltrain station and Milpitas BART station	The Specific Plan includes an implementation action in Section 10.4 for the TMA and City to complete a circulator study as a medium-term action. <b>No change recommended.</b>
# 274	Google	8	8.1	221	TDM and Parking Goals and Policies	<b>Recommendation:</b> Expand Policy TDMP-1.6 or insert new Policy TDMP-1.7 to document the following recommended policy: <i>"Encourage existing developments to share and/or transfer parking rights from an existing site to a new development site to minimize the amount of new parking that is implemented."</i>  (Providing policies that encourage the sharing and/or transfer of parking supply rights from an existing site to a new development site maximizes the flexibility for new developments to provide adequate parking supply within the district wide parking cap. Doing so also lowers trip generation rates and parking demand of existing development sites that choose to share/transfer surplus parking supply.)	The Specific Plan removes parking minimums. This means that property owners are already welcome to use existing parking or share parking from an existing site rather than build new parking. Policy added for emphasis: <b>"Policy TDMP-1.7: Encourage existing developments to share and/or transfer parking rights from an existing site to a new development site to minimize the amount of new parking that is implemented."</b>
# 275	City	8	8.1	222	TDM and Parking Goals and Policies	Confirm City role in TDM plan submission, review, and enforcement.	Revise policy: <b>"Policy TDMP-2.1: Establish a Moffett Park Transportation Management Association (TMA) to support the City in efforts to oversee mobility improvements, coordinate efforts, and manage a district-wide TDM strategy."</b>
# 276	Jay Paul Company	8	8.2	223	Transportation Demand Management	Requiring residential tenants to join the TMA is not practical. Given all applicable fees etc are the obligation of the building owner, the building owner should also have the obligation to assure compliance of its renters through lease document provisions. This should be an obligation of the building owner who can then impose TDM obligations through lease documents. Residential unit owners should be required to join, but not renters.	Revise standard for clarity: <b>"1.a. Join the TMA and record a deed restriction agreeing to require all commercial building tenants and residential property managers to become members of the TMA in perpetuity from the date of final inspection or certificate of occupancy."</b>
# 277	Jay Paul Company	8	8.2	223	Transportation Demand Management	TMA membership requirement is costly and further increase rent for innovation and creation space tenants.	Noted. No change recommended.
# 278	Community Non-profit Organizations	8	8.2	223	Transportation Demand Management	Require increased investment in TDM measures that seek to attain the goals before assessing penalties for non-attainment.	The specific structure of the monitoring, enforcement, and any penalties leveed have not been defined and would be established through the formation of a TMA.. No change recommended.
# 279	Jay Paul Company	8	8.2	223	Transportation Demand Management	Dependency of large corporate like Google to provide private transportation network and TMA to pick up the slack of the lack of public transit system within the plan area is not sustainable.	A TMA will be responsible for overseeing and managing TDM programs within Moffett Park. Additionally, there are a variety of strategies in place to support multimodal trips, including high quality all-ages-and-abilities bike facilities and a network of off-street paths, so short-distance walking and biking trips are an appealing alternative to drive-alone. No change recommended.
# 280	Jay Paul Company	8	8.2	223	Transportation Demand Management	Public transportation in and out of Moffett Park is currently not robust enough to be a meaningful alternative for most employees and the draft Plan does not adequately address how public transportation will be increased to address additional demand. Further, the draft Plan/DEIR assumes that 27% of non vehicle trips will be provided by private transportation networks (i.e. Google buses) which may or may not be the case in the future. If this is not the case, the TMA will need to "pick up the slack" but the TMA will not have the financial resources to make up for this lack of infrastructure – simply running shuttles to Cal Train and within Moffett Park will not provide the regional transportation network necessary to support mobility in a suburban location. Large employers like Google are able to spread their regional transportation costs over many sites throughout the Bay Area and are providing this service as an employee amenity. This will not be the case for the TMA; the City needs to carefully evaluate this strategy to see if it will realistically achieve its goals in the context of the potential development contemplated by the draft Plan.	A TMA will be responsible for overseeing and managing TDM programs within Moffett Park. Additionally, there are a variety of strategies in place to support multimodal trips, including high quality all-ages-and-abilities bike facilities and a network of off-street paths, so short-distance walking and biking trips are an appealing alternative to drive-alone. No change recommended.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 281	City	8	8.2	224	Transportation Demand Management	Confirm City role in TDM plan submission, review, and enforcement.	Revise standard: " <b>4. Trip reduction goals.</b> Trip reduction goals for new development are as follows: <b>a. Non-residential.</b> The applicant shall develop and implement a TDM Plan that meets an a.m. and p.m. peak-hour trip reduction target from baseline conditions. Trip reduction goals shall be outlined in the TDM plan submitted to the <del>City TMA</del> and may be subject to periodic revision to address new conditions at the project site and/or new services or programs in the plan area. <b>b. Residential.</b> The applicant shall develop a TDM Plan using the existing multifamily residential TDM program with modified project size tiers, point thresholds, and additional TDM measures considered for Moffett Park. TDM point targets shall be outlined in the TDM plan submitted to the <del>City TMA</del> and may be subject to periodic revision to address new conditions at the project site and/or new services or programs in the plan area."
# 282	Jay Paul Company	8	8.2	224	Transportation Demand Management	Trip reduction goals need to be better defined for both Residential and non-residential development. The "baseline" needs to be clearly defined as well as target trip reductions which should be equally applied to all new development.	A TMA will be responsible for overseeing and managing TDM programs within Moffett Park. Additionally, there are a variety of strategies in place to support multimodal trips, including high quality all-ages-and-abilities bike facilities and a network of off-street paths, so short-distance walking and biking trips are an appealing alternative to drive-alone. The plan also includes Trip Reduction Goals to reduce over all and peak hour trips and to maintain gateway capacity.  Add standard. " <b>4.c. Trip reduction goal.</b> New development is to meet the following peak hour trip reduction rates through efforts defined in a submitted Transportation Demand Plan (TDM) and through participation in programs of the MPSP Transportation Management Association (TMA)."  Add table with reduction goals (see summary memo)
# 283	City	8	8.2	224	Transportation Demand Management	Confirm City role in TDM plan submission, review, and enforcement.	Revise standard: " <b>6. TDM plan implementation.</b> Property owners shall implement TDM programs at building occupancy, however each site will not be subject to monitoring until it has reached 75% occupancy. It is the owner's responsibility to inform the <del>City and</del> TMA when sites have reached 75% occupancy."
# 284	Jay Paul Company	8	8.3	225	Vehicular Parking Requirements	Park Once - it should be noted that the existing large scale campuses in Moffett Park redeveloped by Jay Paul have been carefully designed to provide a cohesive environment to encourage employees to "park once" and stay on campus throughout the work day. They are highly amenitized with significant usable open space, high quality wellness/fitness centers, restaurant quality food service, and other amenities. Employees working at these facilities do not create additional trips throughout the day and typically alter their commuting patterns to arrive early or stay late to take advantage of the free amenities provided in a campus environment.	Noted. No change recommended.
# 285	Google	8	8.3.1	226	Vehicle Parking Maximums	<u>Recommendation:</u> Add language: " <b>The City, in its discretion, can approve higher parking ratios through the SMP process.</b> " (Flexible parking ratios support vehicular trip reduction goals while positioning the TMA and employer-funded TDM programs for success. Flexible ratios also respond to market realities and other landowner comments we've heard.)	Revise " <b>1. Parking maximums.</b> All new development shall adhere to the maximum parking requirements in Table 24. A project may exceed that maximum by up to 50% of the maximum ratio, provided that all of the additional spaces over the maximum shall be shared with the public, a private entity, a public agency, or other users at all times. <del>A parking management plan must be submitted to the City and/or TMA demonstrating reasonable access to shared parking on a daily basis.</del> The <del>TMA</del> City should monitor parking needs and review the supply periodically to determine when parking <del>maximum</del> standards should be changed to adapt to evolving development conditions."
# 286	RJR	8	8.3.1	226	Vehicle Parking Maximums	Parking Ratio – Shared Parking Bonus. The Draft Plan allows development to exceed otherwise permitted maximum parking limits by up to 50%, provided that all of the additional spaces over the maximum "shall be shared with the public at all times."  <b>Request:</b> Please clarify that this 50% bonus is tied to the per-unit maximum parking ratio in effect at the time the development is approved. (ex: At plan adoption, the residential maximum of 1 space per unit would increase to 1.5 spaces per unit).  We request that the Draft Plan language be amended to allow shared public parking spaces to be made available to the public only during daylight hours or fixed hours (ex: from 7 a.m.-10 p.m.) rather than "at all times." This is to address security concerns that arise with public access to private residential development 24/7.	Revise " <b>1. Parking maximums.</b> All new development shall adhere to the maximum parking requirements in Table 24. A project may exceed that maximum by up to 50% of the maximum ratio, provided that all of the additional spaces over the maximum shall be shared with the public, a private entity, a public agency, or other users at all times. <del>A parking management plan must be submitted to the City demonstrating reasonable access to shared parking on a daily basis.</del> The <del>TMA</del> City should monitor parking needs and review the supply periodically to determine when parking <del>maximum</del> standards should be changed to adapt to evolving development conditions."

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 287	US Navy	8	8.3.1	226	Vehicle Parking Maximums	The Navy requests the statement "A project may exceed that maximum by up to 50% of the maximum ratio, provided that all of the additional spaces over the maximum shall be shared with the public at all times," be revised to "A project may exceed that maximum by up to 50% of the maximum ratio, provided that all of the additional spaces over the maximum shall be shared with the public at specified times agreed upon by the City Council and landowner through the Development Agreement." This would allow for shared parking during evenings, weekends and holidays and other times as negotiated, but still maintain a higher than 2/1,000 sf parking ratio in the early adoptive years of the plan.	Revise " <b>1. Parking maximums.</b> All new development shall adhere to the maximum parking requirements in Table 24. A project may exceed that maximum by up to 50% of the maximum ratio, provided that all of the additional spaces over the maximum shall be shared with the public, a private entity, a public agency, or other users at all times. A parking management plan must be submitted to the City and/or TMA demonstrating reasonable access to shared parking on a daily basis. The TMA City should monitor parking needs and review the supply periodically to determine when parking maximum standards should be changed to adapt to evolving development conditions."
# 288	R+A	8	8.3.1	226	Vehicle Parking Maximums	Strike duplicative shared parking standards. Included in Section 8.4.1	Remove standard, included in 8.4.1: " <del>1. Shared parking. Shared parking shall be defined as meeting the following characteristics: a. No individual spaces or parking areas shall be reserved for any individual, tenant, or class of individuals, except for persons with ADA placards or users of special vehicles, such as EV, carpool/vanpool, or carshare vehicles (noting that EV parking may become standard in the future). b. Non-residential property owners may exclude anyone other than district residents from parking for more than 24 hours. c. Public/visitor parking may be separated from employee or resident parking.</del> "
# 289	R+A	8	8.3.1	226	Vehicle Parking Maximums	Move shared parking guidelines to Section 8.4.1	Move to 8.4.1: " <b>4. Location.</b> Shared parking facilities should be located close to major office uses and activity centers and other mixed-use areas. In order to protect areas that are designed for greater walking and biking, shared parking facilities are encouraged on the perimeter of the plan area and near the gateways in and out of the area. <b>5. Proximity.</b> Parking facilities should be located within a comfortable walking distance of key Activity Centers to encourage accessibility. A distance of 1,000-1,500 feet, an approximately five-to-10-minute walk, is preferred."
# 290	Google	8	8.3.1	226	Vehicle Parking Maximums	<u>Recommendation:</u> Modify Guideline 2 under Section 8.3.1 to allow for a maximum proximity threshold of 2,640' (10-15 minute walk or a bike ride of less than five minutes). (Increasing the proximity threshold expands the options to provide district parking, including shared parking arrangements.)	The Specific Plan establishes a guideline that shared parking facilities be located within 1,000-1,500 feet of the development, noting that this a five-to-10-minute walk. A distance of 2,640', or 1/2 mile, to an Activity Center, is allowed as written. No change recommended.
# 291	Ellis Partners	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	Parking standards to be determined by market conditions instead of mandatory maximums. Parking maximum at 2.0 parking spaces/1,000 s.f. (and less) do not meet the market demand for office and requests for at least 3.0 parking spaces/1,000 s.f. as public transit use is limited in the plan area.	The Specific Plan allows a 50% increase in the amount of allowed parking, up to 3.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet if parking is shared per Section 8.3.1. No change recommended.
# 292	Harvest Properties	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	Parking maximums proposed for the plan (2/1000 to 1/1000 at mid-term buildout to 0.75/1000 at full buildout) is too restrictive and making nonresidential development infeasible due to market demand. Request parking maximum to be adjusted to 3/1000	The Specific Plan allows a 50% increase in the amount of allowed parking, up to 3.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet if parking is shared per Section 8.3.1. No change recommended.
# 293	Newmark	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	With limited pattern of public transit use and the plan area located in suburban office park, any parking under 3.0/1000 ratio would make the plan area disadvantage	The Specific Plan allows a 50% increase in the amount of allowed parking, up to 3.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet if parking is shared per Section 8.3.1. No change recommended.
# 294	US Navy	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	The Table sets the maximum parking ratios at Plan Adoption, Mid-term and At Full Buildout. The Navy requests the Office/R&D ratio of 2/1,000 sf parking ratio maximum At Pan Adoption, be adjusted upwardly to 3/1,000 sf for Office/R&D due to the lack of other transportation means, At Plan Adoption, which is slated for early mid-2023.	The Specific Plan allows a 50% increase in the amount of allowed parking, up to 3.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet if parking is shared per Section 8.3.1. No change recommended.
# 295	Jay Paul Company	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	Parking maximums are not marketable and will make infill buildings difficult to lease. Suggested to increase 3.0 parking spaces/1000 s.f. like traditional suburban campuses.	The Specific Plan allows a 50% increase in the amount of allowed parking, up to 3.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet if parking is shared per Section 8.3.1. No change recommended.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 296	Google	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	<b>Recommendation:</b> In Table 24, adjust the Retail / Commercial parking maxima to be 2.5 stalls per 1,000 sf of Retail / Commercial uses and 4.0 stalls per 1,000 sf of Restaurant / Grocery Store uses under the Plan Adoption, Mid-Term and Full Build Out scenarios. The Grocery Store land use is recommended as a new use within Table 24 as grocery stores (and restaurants) typically generate higher parking demand compared to general Retail / Commercial uses. The table should also note that the City, in its discretion, can approve higher parking ratios through the SMP process (The proposed parking cap of 1.25 stalls per 1,000 sf is substantially lower than most other priority development areas within the region. If set too low, the parking cap may encourage business owners to invest in areas other than Moffett Park, resulting in empty ground level storefronts while causing future Moffett Park residents and workers to travel outside Moffett Park for their daily shopping needs.)	The Specific Plan provides flexibility and allows the City to change maximums to meet evolving needs. No change recommended.  Revise "1. Parking maximums. All new development shall adhere to the maximum parking requirements in Table 24. A project may exceed that maximum by up to 50% of the maximum ratio, provided that all of the additional spaces over the maximum shall be shared with the public, a private entity, a public agency, or other users at all times. A parking management plan must be submitted to the City and/or TMA demonstrating reasonable access to shared parking on a daily basis. The TMA City should monitor parking needs and review the supply periodically to determine when parking maximum standards should be changed to adapt to evolving development conditions."
# 297	Lockheed	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	The parking maximums are too restrictive and may lead to no new speculative office development, which is needed to fund public benefits. The parking requirements will decrease over time as residential development adds substantially to employees of Moffett Park that can commute to work on foot, bike or shuttle. Initially however, Moffett Park is a suburban business park with limited public transportation. Therefore we think that during the first 5 years after adoption the office parking max should be 2.75 spaces / 1,000 SF. After 5 years the office parking maximum should be 2.25 / 1,000 SF and after 10 years 1.75 per 1,000 SF. Residential should be consistent at 1.2 spaces per unit. Industrial should be 1 space per 1,000 SF for first 5 years and drop to .75 spaces / 1,000 SF thereafter Please note that 1) you are going to need slightly more spaces than cars 2) with hybrid work different sites will need varying amounts of parking on different days ("all hands meetings")	The Specific Plan allows a 50% increase in the amount of allowed parking, up to 3.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet if parking is shared per Section 8.3.1. No change recommended.
# 298	Jay Paul Company	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	Infill buildings should be allowed to maintain parking ratios similar to existing parking ratio of the same campus	This is not consistent with Specific Plan goals, which calls for significant changes to land use, densities, total development, and internal travel patterns. Near-term parking supply can stay at the near-term ratio, as long as the district wide maximum notches down over time and med- and long-term maxes are lower than average to make sure we don't develop the district with an excessive parking supply. Whether or not a building is infill doesn't make a difference. No change recommended.
# 299	Jay Paul Company	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	The parking ratios being proposed by the Plan, eg 2.0/1000 at plan implementation ratching down to .75/1000 at plan buildout are not realist, not market and will make infill buildings difficult to lease. Tenant demand will go to other cities with more traditional suburban parking ratios eg 3.3/1000. Further, within a single campus, there will be significant differences in the parking ratios among various buildings. This will impact marketability and achievable rental rates as some tenants with existing long term leases will have the benefit of higher ratios while others will be subject to the new maximums. Infill buildings should be allowed to maintain parking ratios similar to existing ratios within the same campus. Given traffic into and out of Moffett Park must function, it might be better to instead reduce the amount of potential commercial development anticipated by the Plan in order to maintain parking competitiveness with other cities	At the direction of City Council, the City studied 10,000,000 square feet of office, R&D, and industrial uses and 20,000 housing units in the Specific Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Draft Environmental Impact Report, as required, includes an analysis of project alternatives, which includes a reduced development alternative that does not meet the City's objectives to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan. No change recommended.
# 300	RJR	8	8.3.1	227	Vehicle Parking Maximums	Parking Ratio – Phasing. The Draft Plan indicates that maximum parking amounts will be phased.  <b>Request:</b> Please provide more information regarding the proposed phasing methodology. Would this be determined by set time periods within the overall Plan period or triggered by percentage of Plan area build-out?	Revise standard: "2. Parking maximum phasing. Parking maximums for new development shall be phased in over time as shown in Table 24. As defined in the Site Master Plan (see Chapter 10, section 10.3), the phasing of all new development, based on the timeline for vertical development, shall adhere to the phased implementation of the off-street vehicle parking standards. Mid-Term is defined as when one third of estimated office, R+D, and industrial total floor area at plan buildout established in Table 4: Development Reserve phased for vertical development. Long-Term is defined as when two thirds of estimated office, R+D, and industrial total floor area at plan buildout."
# 301	Jay Paul Company	8	8.3.2	228	Unbundled Parking	Unbundling parking should not be required for infill building for existing campuses. Free parking available for employees without unbundling makes Sunnyvale more competitive with the nearby cities	The Specific Plan requires unbundling for all new residential and non-residential parking. Employers would still be able to lease parking for their employees, but the cost to do so would now be a separate line item on their lease agreement. Employers will now be more aware of the cost to provide employees parking. With unbundling, employers would still have the discretion to pass that parking cost on to their employees or not, taking into account their own assessment of what makes a competitive job offer in the Sunnyvale or the region. Charging for parking would be a TDM tool at their disposal to meet their TDM requirements. Providing free parking will likely make it harder to meet their TDM requirement and incentivize fewer SOV trips. No change recommended.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 302	R+A	8	8.4.1	232	Shared Parking	Move shared parking standards from Section 8.3.1 to Section 8.4.1. Remove duplicative location standard in 8.4.1	Remove standard for clarity: " <del>2. Shared parking locations</del> . Shared parking facilities shall be within easy walking distance (approximately 1,000 feet or 4-5 minutes) of each other. These facilities will be primarily located close to major office uses (most of which are located west of Mathilda Avenue and along Caribbean Drive and Moffett Park Drive) and distributed to serve the Activity Centers with retail and other mixed uses."
# 303	Jay Paul Company	8	8.5	237	Bicycle Parking	Bike parking standards should be per T24 and LEED requirements, not necessarily the MPSP.	Bike parking standards are consistent with VTA Bike Program, as referenced in the footnote: <a href="https://www.vta.org/programs/bicycle-program">https://www.vta.org/programs/bicycle-program</a> . No change recommended.
# 304	City public works	8	8.5	237	Bicycle Parking	Public Work's changes to Bike Parking Standards	Revise Table 28. Revise: "Hotel: Long-Term 1 per 20 15 rooms; Short-Term 1 per 20 15 rooms" Separate restaurant from: "Retail / Commercial / Restaurant" Add: "Restaurant: Long-Term 1 per 3,000 SF; Short-Term 1 per 800 SF No Showers / Lockers Required" Add: "Industrial: Short-Term 1 per 5,000 SF" Add a reference to the "Sunnyvale Municipal Code 19.36.120"
# 305	Ellis Partners	9	9.1	240	Infrastructure Goals and Policies	Provide community benefit or impact fee credit for any upgrades to or replacements of public serving infrastructure	Modify policy: " <b>Policy IU-1.2:</b> Require new development to contribute toward fees, on-site and off-site improvements related to the project, and provide contributions to other required funding sources or allowed alternative mitigations. <b>Provide impact fee credit for construction of off-site improvements serving multiple property owners.</b> "
# 306	Ellis Partners	9	9.1	240	Infrastructure Goals and Policies	The requirement of code upgrade of existing utility infrastructure under all street improvements places an undue cost burden on developers. Utility upgrades should only be required if shown on Figure 62 and 63 of the draft plan or if necessitated as a direct result of new development. Otherwise, developer should receive community benefit or impact fee credit for performing the upgrades for existing infrastructure that are out of code or in disrepair	The City studied and is now including proposed MPSP impact fees to for water and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements as part of this approval process. Pending discussions with City staff during the Site Master Plan process, developments may construct the required improvement or pay the impact fee. No change recommended.
# 307	Jay Paul Company	9	9.1	240	Infrastructure Goals and Policies	Water mains and other utility infrastructure should not be required to be upsized unless the need for additional capacity is specific to the new development (the infill building). Any upsizing beyond should be a community benefit or the cost should be credited to developer.	The City is establishing an update to their impact fees to incorporate water and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements. Projects that elect to construct improvements will receive a credit against this fee. No change recommended.
# 308	Jay Paul Company	9	9.1	240	Infrastructure Goals and Policies	More study needed for equitable provision of services and costs for all development. Also not equitable for developer to pay to upsize and maintain infrastructure that will benefit other developments outside of the private infrastructure area.	The City is establishing an update to their impact fees to incorporate water and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements. Projects that elect to construct improvements will receive a credit against this fee. No change recommended.
# 309	Google	9	9.1	241	Infrastructure Goals and Policies	<u>Proposed Modification(s):</u> In Policy IU-2.5, add: " <b>Private developers that incorporate private District Systems will be eligible for community benefit credits (equivalent to its capital cost) and/or in-lieu fees and impact fee offsets.</b> " <i>(Encouraging developers to deliver private systems would alleviate capacity issues on existing infrastructure and allow for improved outcomes and greater ability to deliver on the Specific Plans guiding principles, standards, and overarching vision to create an ecological innovation district.)</i>	Modify policy: " <b>Policy IU-2.5:</b> Encourage district infrastructure systems and energy microgrids in Moffett Park and ensure there is a City process to enable such projects. <b>Provide project developers impact fee and/or community benefit credit for infrastructure and utility improvements. Community benefit credit should only apply in cases where developments provide an excess of required contributions that address the fair share of impacts needed to serve the development.</b> "

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 310	Commissioner Nathan Iglesias	9	9.2	244	Potable Water Supply System	How do we maintain responsible access to water?	To ensure adequate access to water, the Environmental Impact Report includes a Water Supply Assessment. The Specific Plan also includes policies to reduce the use of potable water in buildings and landscapes (see Section 4.4 green building requirements, Section 6.6.6 landscape design, and 6.6.7 irrigation) and to expand the use of recycled and grey and blackwater systems (Goal IU-3). No change recommended.
# 311	Brick	9	9.2	245	Street & Infrastructure Improvements	Firstly, we would like to address the issue of street and infrastructure improvements. While we support the goal of creating a sustainable community, we do not believe that upgrading all infrastructure, regardless of whether it is necessary or not, is an economically sustainable policy. This approach will certainly lead to a significant increase in costs for developers and may jeopardize the feasibility of many projects. Instead, we believe that the city should focus on upgrading infrastructure only when it is necessary and where it will have the greatest impact on sustainability and livability.	The City studied and is now including proposed MPSP impact fees to for water and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements as part of this approval process. Pending discussions with City staff during the Site Master Plan process, developments may construct the required improvement or pay the impact fee. No change recommended.
# 312	Jay Paul Company	9	9.2	245		Utilities - there are a number of requirements to upsize utilities the need of which may not be attributed to serving the additional capacity requirements of infill buildings. For example, the requirements for new 18" water line along 11th would not necessarily be triggered by an infill building. If upsizing these utilities to support other development is a plan goal, developers installing oversized improvements should be given credit for the cost against other fees or should be entitled to credit as a community benefit, especially in the context of private infrastructure that is being overly upsized to provide additional capacity to support development throughout the Plan area. See our comment in Section 4.9 above regarding the City's assumption that private infrastructure will somehow become public even if no additional development takes place to prompt public easements.	The City studied and is now including proposed MPSP impact fees to for water and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements as part of this approval process. Pending discussions with City staff during the Site Master Plan process, developments may construct the required improvement or pay the impact fee. No change recommended.
# 313	Google	9	9.6	254	Gas & Electricity	<b>Recommendation:</b> Add language stating that "The undergrounding of PG&E's high voltage power lines along the eastern edge of the East Channel would enable additional high quality open space benefits within the Moffett Park Specific Plan. It would further contribute to the City's vision for an East Channel open space corridor and is eligible as a park and open space dedication credit equivalent for its improvement value. Reduced open space setbacks along the East Channel Greenbelt, may also be considered, if the HV lines are undergrounded."  (Encouraging developers to coordinate with PG&E will allow for improved outcomes and greater ability to deliver on the Specific Plan's guiding principles, standards, and overarching vision to create an ecological innovation district.)	Add new sentence to paragraph #1: "The undergrounding of PG&E's high voltage power lines along the eastern edge of the East Channel would enable additional high quality open space benefits within Moffett Park, contributing to vision for an East Channel Greenbelt."
# 314	Commissioner Neela Shukla	9	9.6	254	Gas & Electricity	Greenhouse gases: you have jurisdiction when you have new development. Reduced the amount of gas in buildings to reduce emissions	Consistent with City policy, the Specific Plan includes a policy to prohibit new natural gas services in all buildings and infrastructure to support a transition to all-electric (Goal IU-5). Also included are collaborative pilot programs for the City to work with businesses and property owners to phase out natural gas systems within existing buildings (see Section 10.4). No change recommended.
# 315	Lockheed	9	9.6	254	Gas and Electricity	There should be an exception noted for gas use in manufacturing/industrial processes	Modify language: "Per existing City policy, all new buildings will be electric and natural gas will be phased out <b>except where required for manufacturing/industrial processes</b> . Immediate, medium, and long-term implementation will phase in programs to decarbonize existing buildings."
# 316	Google	10	10.2	259	Exceptions to Standards	<b>Proposed Modification(s):</b> Modify initial paragraph to read, "All new development shall comply with the standards set forth in this Specific Plan. New developments may be provided with some flexibility in meeting design standards based on special site conditions and constraints. To be considered for an exception, applicants for new development must: 1) provide findings on how the new development project meets the goals, policies, and intent of the standard where the exception is requested; and 2) document constraints to meeting the standard. City Staff or the Zoning Administrator may administratively approve exceptions from quantitative standards of up to 10% and exceptions to qualitative or other standards subject to an applicant's fulfillment of criteria 1 and 2 above. Site Master Plans may differ more than 10% from quantitative standards, or from qualitative or other standards, as well as include deviations outside of the listed exceptions, so long as they meet the intent and vision of the MPSP, comply with criteria 1 and 2 above, and have City Council approval."  (To meet the activation and innovative place vision of the MPSP exceptions to the standards will be required. At this early stage it is difficult to foresee all potential variances that may be needed. To expedite delivery of the vision all exceptions to the standard that deviate less than 10% should be handled administratively. SMPs and development agreements that deviate more than 10% should also be granted approval so long as they meet the vision and intent of the MPSP, and subject to City review and approval.)	The purpose of the Exceptions to Standards section is to provide flexibility in meeting the overall design and development standards established in the Specific Plan. It is not intended to provide an alternative compliance pathway for development that deviate beyond those specified exceptions. No change recommended.



Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 317	Miramar Capital	10	10.2	259	Exceptions to Standards	Language like "shall" provides no flexibility. Suggested using "encouraged" or "consider"	While all new development is excepted to comply with the standards set forth in the Specific Plan, new developments may be provided with some flexibility in meeting design standards based on special site conditions. Section 10.2 outlines these exceptions. No change recommended.
# 318	Jay Paul Company	10	10.2	259	Exceptions to Standards	Exception to Standards - 10% plus or minus deviation does not include building height (section 5.3.1) as previously mentioned.	No exceptions to building height shall be granted. In many cases, building heights will be defined by the ALUC standards. Some changes to the Building Heights were made and can be found in Section 5.3.1. No change recommended.
# 319	Google	10	10.3	260	General Submittals and Site Master Plans	<u>Recommendation:</u> Provide clear criteria for when a Site Master Plan (SMP) will be required and when one will not. Alternatively, provide clarity that smaller / simpler projects can move via an expedited path without an SMP. (Clearly-defined processes are needed to ensure both adequate review and efficient approvals for projects of all scales; the MPSP should recognize that smaller / simpler projects should move towards approvals more quickly than larger / more complicated ones.)	A Site Master Plan (SMP) will be required for all development projects in Moffett Park. The Site Master Plan process and requirements will be release during the adoption process. No change recommended.
# 320	Google	10	10.3	260	General Submittals and Site Master Plans	<u>Recommendation:</u> City should provide a MPSP standards template or checklist to track Compliance with Specific Plan Vision metrics. (Providing a template or checklist would add clarity for both the applicant and City reviewer on what standards should be adhered to)	The SMP will require applicants submit a checklist on meeting goals and standards of the plan. No change recommended.
# 321	RJR	10	10.3	260	General Submittals and Site Master Plans	The Draft Plan states that all development will be required to submit a Site Master Plan for review, and that neighborhood-serving commercial uses will be subject to permitting requirements in the City's Zoning Code. However, the current zoning code does not identify commercial permitting requirements for the future MP-R District, and the Draft Plan does not provides little additional detail on entitlement process for Plan area redevelopment. Draft Plan Section 10.3 states that Site Master Plan requirements are established in a separate set of guidelines.  Please provide additional detail regarding the proposed Site Master Plan review and approval process, and if additional entitlements are anticipated to be required for residential development within the MPSP area. Please also provide a reference to the Site Master Plan requirement guidelines.	A Site Master Plan will be required for all development projects in Moffett Park. The Site Master Plan process and requirements will be release during the adoption process. No change recommended.
# 322	DJPA	10	10.3.1	261	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Added to clarify that soils imported for future development projects be characterized per Department of Toxic Substances Control guidance and free off contaminants.	Add new standard: " <b>10.3.1-8: Imported Soil Testing.</b> Prior to issuance of building permits, any development project within Moffett Park that includes the importation of soil shall conduct proper sampling to ensure that the imported soil is free of contamination. Imported materials shall be characterized according to the DTSC's 2001 Information Advisory Clean Imported Fill Material.
# 323	DJPA	10	10.3.1	261	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Added to clarify that future development projects address the potential for organochlorinated pesticides and/or aerially deposited lead contamination, as relevant.	Revise standard: " <b>10.3.1-3: Phase II Environmental Site Assessment.</b> At properties with known or suspected environmental impacts that require additional investigation prior to subsurface disturbance activities, a Phase II ESA shall be prepared and implemented prior to development activities to determine the nature and extent of impacts. The Phase II ESA shall be reviewed and approved by a qualified environmental regulatory agency such as DTSC, RWQCB, or SCCDEH. Consideration should be given to obtaining approval for an investigation plan from the oversight agency prior to completing the Phase II investigation. The scope of work shall include soil, groundwater, and/or soil vapor sampling in areas of potential concern to evaluate if site-specific measures are needed to protect the health and safety of property occupants and construction workers. For example, for projects located on land historically used for agricultural, weed abatement, or related activities, the potential for elevated levels of organochlorinated pesticides shall be addressed. For projects located within proximity to SR 237, the potential for ADL contamination shall be addressed. Field techniques that may be employed under include but are not limited to:
# 324	DJPA	10	10.3.1	261	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Added to clarify that subsurface sampling be compared to the standards of the applicable regulatory agency in place at the time the project is proposed.	Revise standard: " <b>10.3.1-2: Site Management Plan.</b> At properties with known or suspected minor environmental impacts that can be addressed safely and effectively during subsurface disturbance activities, a Site Management Plan (SMP) shall be prepared prior to development activities to establish management practices for handling contaminated soil, soil vapor, groundwater, or other materials during construction activities. Subsurface sampling shall be compared to then-current DTSC, Water Board, or U.S. EPA screening levels for the proposed land use and background levels to determine if risk is present. The SMP shall also address management of site risks and previously unknown conditions during earthwork activities in areas where impacted soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater are present or suspected. Recommendations for elements to be included in site-specific Health and Safety Plans (HSPs), to be prepared by individual contractors for their employees' safety based on their work scope, may also be included in the SMP. Worker training requirements and health and safety shall be described in the SMP. The SMP shall be reviewed and approved by a qualified environmental regulatory agency such as California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health (SCCDEH).

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 325	DJPA	10	10.3.1	262	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Added to clarify the conditions under which contaminants are adequately remediated and that future development projects demonstrate that hazardous materials do not exist on the site or that construction/use of the site is approved by the oversight agency with jurisdiction.	<p>Revise standard:</p> <p><b>"10.3.1-4: Remediation and/or Management Measures.</b> At properties with known environmental impacts that must be addressed to make the property compatible with its future use, appropriate remediation and/or management measures must be implemented under the oversight and to the satisfaction of a qualified environmental regulatory agency such as DTSC, RWQCB, or SCCDEH. <b>Contaminants are considered adequately remediated if levels are at or below the current DTSC, Water Board, or U.S. EPA cleanup levels or background levels.</b> Remediation techniques may include but are not limited to excavation, extraction, bioremediation, oxidation, reduction, phytoremediation, and thermal treatment. Management measures may include engineering and administrative controls such as but not limited to impermeable surface caps, vapor intrusion mitigation systems, permeable reactive barriers, land use covenants, and deed restrictions. Field techniques that may be employed under include but are not limited to:</p> <p>Excavation, extraction, or removal of impacted material for off-site disposal or temporary on-site storage or treatment; Ex-situ (i.e., above-ground) treatment of impacted material via physical and/or chemical processing; and In-situ (i.e., below-ground) treatment of impacted material via intrusive physical and/or chemical processing.</p> <p>These field techniques include those currently known and used (e.g., dig-and-haul, landfarming, groundwater and soil vapor extraction and treatment, subsurface injection, etc.) and those that will become state of the art in the future. <b>Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall demonstrate that hazardous materials do not exist on the site or that the proposed construction and use of the site are approved by the environmental oversight agency with jurisdiction that meets the requirements of Health and Safety Code Section 101480."</b></p>
# 326	DJPA	10	10.3.5	271	Special Species	Added to clarify the timing of burrowing owl surveys, qualifications for surveying biologists, and need for additional preconstruction surveys if construction work is halted or paused for more than a week.	<p>Revise standard: <b>"10.3.5-2: Burrowing Owl Survey.</b> Preconstruction surveys shall be completed by a qualified biologist in areas where burrowing owl habitat occurs such as ruderal lots (not including impervious surfaces). <b>Each preconstruction survey shall consist of two surveys: an initial survey</b> no more than 14 days in advance of the on-set of ground-disturbing activity <b>and a follow-up survey occurring within 24 hours prior to the start of construction.</b> These surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the methods described in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation or the most recent California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) guidelines at the time development is proposed. The surveys shall cover all areas of suitable burrowing owl habitat within the construction zones.</p> <p>-If preconstruction surveys are undertaken during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31), any burrows occupied by resident owls in areas planned for construction shall be protected by a construction-free buffer with a radius of 150 to 250 feet around each active burrow, with the required buffer distance to be determined in each case by a qualified biologist <b>with at least two years of experience surveying for burrowing owls.</b> Passive relocation of resident owls is not recommended by the CDFW where it can be avoided. If passive relocation is unavoidable, resident owls may be passively relocated according to a relocation plan prepared by a qualified biologist.</p> <p>-If preconstruction surveys are undertaken during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31) and active nest burrows are located within or near construction zones, a construction-free buffer of 250 feet shall be established around all active owl nests. The buffer areas shall be enclosed with temporary fencing, and construction equipment and workers shall not be allowed to enter the enclosed setback areas. Buffers shall remain in place for the duration of the breeding season. <b>Should construction work be halted or paused for more than one week, new preconstruction surveys shall be prepared meeting the same requirements.</b> After the breeding season (i.e., once all young have left the nest), passive relocation of any remaining owls may take place but only under the conditions described below."</p>
# 327	DJPA	10	10.3.5	271	Special Species	Added to clarify the definition of a biologist qualified to complete focused special status plant surveys	<p>Revise standard: <b>"10.3.5-1: Special Status Plants.</b> At the time development is proposed, focused special status plant surveys shall be completed by a qualified biologist <b>(defined as a person with a minimum of a four-year degree in wildlife sciences, biology, environmental sciences, or equivalent experience in the biological sciences)</b> for alkali milk-vetch and Congdon's tarplant in the grasslands and vernal mesic areas (e.g., areas with a moderate supply of moisture) of Moffett Park's northwestern corner.</p>

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 328	DJPA	10	10.3.5	275	Special Species	Added to clarify the minimum compensation ratio and requirements of a Wetland/Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.	Add the following text to 10.3.5-11: "Future development must comply with all state and federal laws and regulations related to disturbance to jurisdictional waters. If it is determined that wetlands within Moffett Park under the USACE's and/or RWQCB's jurisdiction, future project developers would be required to obtain a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit from the USACE, Section 401 water quality certification from the RWQCB, and/or Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW or demonstrate that such permits are not necessary prior to initiating any construction-related activities within jurisdictional waters. Future project developers shall satisfy all agency requirements to mitigate aquatic impacts. These may include avoidance of aquatic resources, measures to minimize impacts, or compensation (e.g., habitat enhancement) for impacts at a minimum of 1:1. Mitigation for the permanent loss of waters of the US and/or state shall be required by either purchasing appropriate mitigation credits from an approved mitigation bank (currently mitigation banks do not exist for this location, but should one become available this would become an option) or via permittee responsible mitigation for which the applicant would need to provide a project-specific Wetland/Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (MMP) prepared by a qualified wetland restoration ecologist. The MMP would form the basis of the applicants permit package to the USACE, CDFW, and/or RWQCB and shall also be submitted to the City of Sunnyvale for review and approval. At a minimum this plan shall include: A description of the impacted water; A map depicting the location of the mitigation site(s) and a description of existing site conditions; A detailed description of the mitigation design that includes: (i) the location of the created wetlands; (ii) proposed construction schedule; (iii) a planting/vegetation plan; (iv) specific monitoring metrics, and objective performance and success criteria, such as delineation of created area as jurisdictional waters using USACE published methods; and (v) contingency measures if the created wetlands do not achieve the specified success criteria; and Short-term and long-term management and monitoring methods."
# 329	R+A	10	10.4	276	Implementation Actions	Rename Transportation Management Authority	Revise row 4 "Transportation Management Authority-Association"
# 330	Community Non-profit Organizations	10	10.4	276	Implementation Actions	Include public participation in developing and implementing the administrative guidelines and expected value of contributions for the Community Benefits Program.	Any development agreement and develop rights provided in exchange for community benefits is presented before the City Council for their consideration at a public hearing. The public will have great opportunity to provide input during that process.
# 331	Community Non-profit Organizations	10	10.4	276	Implementation Actions	Consider the establishment of a climate resilience task force focused on guidance of longer term resilience planning efforts.	The City's Sustainability Commission heads the City's efforts in climate change and climate resilience and will continue to help guide the City's longer term planning efforts.
# 332	Community Non-profit Organizations	10	10.4	276	Implementation Actions	Provide the Sunnyvale community an ongoing role as equity stakeholders in the Collaborative Entity for Infrastructure, TMA, and the Community Benefits Program's community benefits guidelines and contributions.	The City's interest in the TMA, its goals and programming, will be represented on the TMA as members. The Community Benefits that are received by projects will need approval from the City Council. No change recommended.

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 333	Sunnyvale School District	10	10.4	276	Implementation Actions	<p>•About 85%-of projected buildout of the Specific Plan area will occur within the boundaries of our District. Based on student generation data and the number and types of anticipated residential and commercial development within the Specific Plan, our District agrees that a realistic estimate of total new students is 1,200 but could be significantly higher depending on type and density of dwelling units approved.</p> <p>•With regard to the District's ultimate need for a TK-8 school site, we appreciate that some thought has been given to school locations in the Specific Plan area. It appears that a potential school site of approximately four acres is identified on page 71 of the Specific Plan in the artist rendering of the Crossman neighborhood, but this site is not reflected or studied in the DEIR. We note that the neither the Crossman parcel nor the parcels identified in the DEIR designated for institutional/school uses (on Bordeaux Drive and Innovation Way) may be approvable by the California Department of Education ("CDE") due to proximity to the Moffett Field airport facility, VTA rail lines and freeways. Because school sites must meet very high safety thresholds, it is critical that the City work with the District directly to locate, reserve and designate in the Specific Plan at least one potential future school site that has a reasonable likelihood of being approved by CDE.</p> <p>We recognize that high density neighborhoods may require some new approaches to school facility planning, and we are open to considering alternatives that call for less acreage than the state standard of 9-16 acres for an elementary school and 17-22 acres for a middle school.2 However, the needs created by a TK-8 grade span will necessitate significantly more than four acres of land.</p> <p>In order to address the above-described impacts, the District requests that additional strategies be included within the Specific Plan in support of public education, as well as included in the DEIR as mitigation measures to address and reduce the environmental impacts of the City's growth plans.</p>	<p>Throughout the Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report process, the City has coordinated with the Sunnyvale School District (SSD), Fremont Union High School District (FUHSD), Santa Clara Unified School District (SCUSD) boundaries, and Mountain View Whisman School District (MVWSD).</p> <p>While no school is proposed as part of the Specific Plan, the California Department of Education (CDE) developed the School Site Selection and Approval Guide to assist school districts in (1) selecting appropriate sites in compliance with regulations and CDE policies and (2) gaining state approval for the selected site. In the event a new school is proposed, a separate environmental review is required.</p> <p>The Specific Plan provides a framework to address students generated by housing development, creating opportunities for uses, such as schools (Goal LU-1) and co-locating those uses with open spaces (Goal OSE-2). Project developers are incentivized to dedicate land through a transfer of development rights program and community benefits program (Sections 4.4 and 4.5).</p> <p>The City will continue to coordinate with local school districts to determine the needs for public schools, transportation needs, and other issues that arise as Moffett Park evolves in the future (Section 10.4). This may include future actions such as working with the TMA to define safe and accessible transportation options for schools. No change recommended.</p>
# 334	Chuck Fraleigh	10	10.4	276	Implementation Actions	Provide details on how high school students would be able to get to existing high schools without traffic (fast and reliable transportation) and how this would be funded. The plan should propose locations for new elementary/middle schools within or nearby the plan area, and address who will fund the development of the new school. Include proposals for safe routes to school from housing.	See response to comment #330.
# 335	Commissioner Mike Serrone	10	10.4	276	Implementation Actions	Share concern about the school. How many schools are needed?	See response to comment #330.
# 336	Google	10	10.4	276	Implementation Actions	<u>Recommendation:</u> For Table 29 the City should include District Systems as an Implementation Item and note that the City will work with Applicants proposing District Systems to create a framework for review, approval, and implementation. (This recommendation is in accordance with Policy IU-2.5, enablement of District Infrastructure by land owners should be expressed in this chapter.)	Add Immediate Term implementation item: "Work with project applicants proposing district systems to create a framework for review, approval, and implementation of district systems." Participants: "Public Works, Environmental Services, Collaborative Entity, project applicants"
# 337	Kelly	10	10.4	279	Implementation Actions	Revise creation and innovation space reference	Revise text: "Establish an internal City process for monitoring compliance with non-monetary community benefits contributions, such as <b>innovation and</b> creation <del>and innovation</del> space, access to shared district infrastructure/facilities, provision of childcare facilities, etc."
# 338	Commissioner Mike Serrone	10	10.4	280	Implementation Actions	How does the Foothill campus play into the schools discussion	The City will continue coordinating with Foothill College in the future. The Specific Plan includes an action item to establish a formal relationship to position Foothill's Sunnyvale Center as an institutional hub and resource for workforce training and education. No change recommended.

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

(See Corrected Attachment 9, posted 20230711)

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 339	Google	10	10.5	282	Funding and Financing Strategy	<p><u>Proposed Modification(s):</u>  <i>"Each new development project, except for projects built or occupied by non-profits, low or moderate income households, innovation and creation office and commercial spaces, and/or retail or other active ground floor uses, will contribute toward impact fees, on-site and off-site improvements related to the project, and provide contributions to other required funding sources or allowed alternative mitigations. Where a development impact fee is imposed on a project, the fee shall be based on a nexus study, subject to the Mitigation Fee Act, and cannot be used to compensate the City for existing shortfalls or deficiencies in the Specific Plan. Where a development project is required to pay for capital improvements in the Specific Plan that are not otherwise covered by development impact fees, a developer's contribution shall be limited to the "fair share" contributions for proposed capital improvements that support the development of Moffett Park. A developer's fair share contributions to the Specific Plan's capital improvements shall be limited and proportional to the new demand for infrastructure or municipal services created by a developer's project, based on net new office square footage or residential units. Developers may offset their required impact fees and/or community benefits requirement through City approved delivery of district improvements."</i>                      (Each development should have a fair and proportional responsibility to realizing the vision of the MPSP. Additionally, non-profit or community development projects should not face additional delivery challenges by having to contribute to impact fees or district improvements. Allowing developers to offset fees and community benefits requirements through delivery of district improvements to the City would hasten the realization of the MPSP vision.)</p>	Noted. No recommended change.
# 340	Google	10	10.5	282	Funding and Financing Strategy	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Major infrastructure capacity improvements and amenities that serve the entire district should be funded by entities such as: Public Agencies, Community Facilities Districts, Assessment Districts, and/or the proposed 'Collaborative Entity for Infrastructure.' These entities could then be reimbursed by future developments through Reimbursement Agreements. If these types of improvements are funded by private development projects these costs should be credited against applicable development impact fees or treated as fulfillment of Community Benefits requirements if the development has not already paid these fees.                      (Requiring that a development front major infrastructure costs for the entire district or a portion of the district, with no clear timeline for reimbursement, would most likely make the project financially infeasible. Entities such as public agencies, CFD's or assessment districts can utilize their unique structures to leverage additional funds (e.d. Bonds, State funds, etc.) and/or ensure reimbursement for major infrastructure projects from future and current developments that would benefit from the improvement.)</p>	Noted. No recommended change.
# 341	Jay Paul Company	10	10.5	282	Funding and Financing Strategy	<p>The various infrastructure programs should be City funded infrastructure projects when the benefits are more widely shared with other parts of the community.</p>	<p>The City studied and is now including proposed MPSP impact fees to for water and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements as part of this approval process. Pending discussions with City staff during the Site Master Plan process, developments may construct the required improvement or pay the impact fee. No change recommended.</p>

Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix

+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 342	RJR	10	10.5	282	Funding and Financing Strategy	<p>Economic Feasibility.</p> <p>Creation of the Plan's vibrant new communities and ecological innovation district would be accomplished through the establishment of public easements, creation of ROW widening, open space and landscape improvements undertaken through redevelopment of individual parcels within the Plan Area.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is critical that the zoning and design controls adopted in connection with the Plan facilitate future residential redevelopment of existing sites under current and reasonably anticipated future market conditions.</p> <p>If development of these sites does not "pencil" for property owners, they will not proceed with redevelopment and the associated community benefits and exactions necessary to finance public improvements within the Plan Area would not be achieved.</p> <p><b>Request:</b> We request that the Department evaluate the economic feasibility of residential development within the Plan area based upon typical building typologies incorporating the Draft Plan's detailed form-based density design requirements, horizontal site area restrictions, public opens space obligations, and proposed increases to development impact fee exactions for plan-area development.</p> <p>We further suggest that the Department conduct a workshop to coordinate and share comments specifically amongst potential residential developers within the Draft Plan area and to explore current incentives and barriers to the form of high-density residential development proposed by the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. The summary plan changes memo outlines modifications made to building design standards. New streets and open spaces are necessary for plan implementation. No change recommended due to this comment.</p>
# 343	Silicon Valley @ Home	10	10.6	285	Performance Metrics	<p>Recommend tracking or measure progress towards meeting the affordable housing production goals throughout the 20-year buildout period and the 5-year review/updates.</p>	<p>The Specific Plan identifies key performance metrics to measure progress in implementing the vision for an ecological innovation district (Section 10.6). These metrics include housing units permitted. The City aims to review and measure progress on 5-year basis as described in the Specific Plan. No change recommended.</p>
# 344	Google	10	10.5	285	Performance Metrics	<p><u>Comment:</u> There is a stated performance metric of one residential unit per every 500 square feet of office floor area. This metric should be monitored at a neighborhood level, instead of a district wide level, to ensure that each neighborhood has a vibrant mixed-use character</p>	<p>The Specific Plan includes separate monitoring actions for the Development Reserve (Section 4.8). Development will be monitored at the neighborhood level consistent with this section. Because each neighborhood has a unique character and uses are not allowed uniformly across Moffett Park, the ratio of 1 unit per 500 square feet does not apply at neighborhood scale. No change recommended.</p>
# 345	R+A	10	10.6	285	Performance Metrics	<p>Revise creation and innovation space reference</p>	<p>Revised text: "<b>Performance Metric:</b> Percent of <b>Innovation and Creation space</b> and <del>innovation</del> square footage permitted                      a. Objective: 750,000 net new square feet of <b>Innovation and Creation space</b> and <del>Innovation space</del>                      b. Responsible Department: Community Development                      c. Data Source: Building permit data                      3. Performance Metric: Percent of office and R&amp;D square footage permitted."</p>
# 346	City Staff	App. A	App. A	289	Glossary	<p>Add district parking definition</p>	<p>Add definition: "<b>District Parking:</b> District parking includes a shared parking garage. District parking locations are clustered and serve multiple uses with clear signage, a single payment system, and coordinated parking management."</p>
# 347	City Staff	App. A	App. A	289	Glossary	<p>Add district systems definition</p>	<p>Add definition: "<b>District Systems:</b> District Systems are defined as 'resource-based' systems that are designed to generate or treat resources locally to enhance environmental and economic performance across the life cycle of a development. The systems including microgrids, water reuse, and geothermal, among others. Systems are shared at a plan or neighborhood level and involve multiple property owners and stakeholders."</p>
# 348	SFEI	App. B	App. B	300	Planting Palettes	<p>Update the page breaks in Table 32 so all of the oak savanna/woodland info is on 1 page, not split across 2 pages.</p>	<p>Update table.</p>
<b>Additional staff recommendations post Planning Commission hearing from June 13, 2023</b>							
# 349	Planning Commission	4	4.6	90	Innovation and Creation Space	<p>Expand the list of neighborhood-serving retail to include gallery, commercial kitchens, and other creative uses</p>	<p>The neighborhood-serving retail list has been revised to accommodate the land uses as suggested. Added a new land use "art gallery" and provided a definition in Chapter 19.12.</p>
# 350	Planning Commission	4	4.6	90	Neighborhood-Serving Uses	<p>Expand the list of neighborhood-serving retail to include maker space</p>	<p>The neighborhood-serving retail list in the Zoning Code chapter already includes a land use that includes maker space ("Manufacture, processing, repair, compounding, packaging, assembly or treatment plants or facilities for equipment, materials or products, including production bakeries and food processing activities. (Non-hazardous materials) but added a note stating it is subject to CDD Director approval for compatibility review with adjacent uses. No change to the Plan recommended.</p>
# 351	Staff	4	4.4	82	General Land Use	<p>Remove "FAR" from the last bullet on page 82</p>	<p>Remove reference to FAR from the last bullet on page 82: Residential developments. Residential and mixed-use development within the MP-AC and MP-R have a minimum residential density. There is no residential density minimum for MP-MU. All residential districts do not have a maximum density but are limited through form-based standards including setbacks, lot coverage, height, FAR, and required publicly accessible open spaces.</p>

**Appendix: Proposed Changes Matrix**

**+ Response to Comments on the MPSP Public Draft**

Comment Number	From	Chapter	Section	Page	Topic	Comments	Response
# 352	Staff	2	2.1	25	Relationship to Other Plans	Clarification on the Shoreline Resilience Vision effort	Revise the paragraph under the Sunnyvale Shoreline Resilience Vision: "The Sunnyvale Shoreline Resilience Vision ("Vision") is an ongoing collaborative effort between a group of organizations deeply invested in long term regional resilience and interested in coordinating across their individual planning efforts. This effort is led by Santa Clara Valley Water District (Valley Water) and Google. Stakeholders for this informal, ad-hoc community group includes the City of Sunnyvale, Valley Water, Lockheed Martin, the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, NASA, the US Fish and Wildlife Services, the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, and Google. The area of interest is the shoreline from Stevens Creek to San Tomas Aquino Creek and associated urban areas south to US 101 and SR 237. The group focused on shoreline adaptation, stormwater management, and urban ecology."
# 353	Staff	4	4.4	84	Standards for All development	Replace "parcel" with "project" for consistency with other standards allowing the entire project area as the base for calculating allowed floor area and density	Revise Standard #2 Allowed floor area and density: "Allowed floor area and density are defined by Land Use District in Table 2. Allowed floor area and density <del>is</del> are based on the gross <del>parcel</del> project area."
# 354	Valley Water					Valley Water comments	Potential response to Valley Water comment letter dated June 14, 2023