

**From:** [Hart, Jared](#)  
**To:** [Ruano, Jose](#); [Brilliot, Michael](#)  
**Subject:** Re: GP Designations for DTW  
**Date:** Monday, March 23, 2020 6:36:17 AM

---

Hi Jose -

Thanks for attaching the maps and for coordinating with us. In short, I agree with the approach below for the three sites in question (see my responses below). Michael, please let us know if you have other or differing thoughts on these three sites.

Thanks,

Jared

---

**From:** Ruano, Jose <Jose.Ruano@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 19, 2020 4:08 PM  
**To:** Hart, Jared <Jared.Hart@sanjoseca.gov>; Brilliot, Michael <Michael.Brilliot@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** GP Designations for DTW

Hi Jared and Michael,

I have attached a map of the GP designations we discussed for the DTW proposal. Google has provided a draft proposed GP designation map that is slightly different than what we had discussed. In the attached map I highlight the areas that differ. My questions for you are (from north to south):

1. DTW proposal has a Hotel use for this section of the block. We proposed having a Commercial Downtown GP designation. Google is proposing a Downtown designation. Considering this footprint is within a larger block that we are proposing Downtown, it makes sense to include this as Downtown. Are we ok with this? **That makes sense to me. Designating the whole block Downtown will give some flexibility on the location of the hotel and residential uses on that block.**
2. DTW proposal has a commercial use on this block, therefore we proposed a Commercial Downtown GP designation. Google is proposing a Downtown designation (not sure why, since they do not have a residential option on this site). Should we relay to Google that this should remain Commercial Downtown or are we ok with this site having a Downtown designation? **This should remain as Commercial Downtown, consistent with their proposed land use plan.**
3. DTW proposal has an office/residential use on this site. We have proposed a Downtown Designation. They are proposing Commercial Downtown (may be a mistake on their part, but will clarify). Assuming they are retaining their residential option, we will continue to propose this site as Downtown. **Agreed; seems odd to**

have the larger block designated Downtown and then the small parcel adjacent to Poor House Bistro on the corner designated as Commercial Downtown. I think that until recently they did not own this site and it is currently designated Commercial Downtown; which is why it's probably shown as CD on their land use plan (I don't think they owned the site when they submitted their application).

Thanks,

Jose