

**From:** [Isaac](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** R3 zoning  
**Date:** Sunday, October 3, 2021 1:28:22 PM

---


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

I am not in favor of having a 5-6 story building overlooking my backyard. It will completely change the look and likely the value of my property.

I understand that there is a high demand for residential space in Mountain View. It's not clear to me which residents of city benefit from this plan besides the the owners of the rezoned properties.

I have kids at Cuesta and Graham. I would understand if there is a plan that shows Mountain View is ready for more cars and kids. Our schools are near capacity as it is.

Thank you,

Isaac Weingrod  
 Lane Ave

**From:** [Joel Lachter](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** R3 Rezoning  
**Date:** Saturday, October 23, 2021 10:42:15 PM

---

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

Hello City Council Members:

I hear you are looking at changing the rules for lots currently zoned as R3 in a way that would increase density. Unfortunately, I will not be able to make the November 16 meeting as it is my wife's birthday and she would not appreciate that. However, I do have some thoughts. The way I look at pretty much any development is to ask, "Is this going to make the area more pleasant to walk (or bike)?" Generally, I have been in favor of increased density because in more dense areas there are more people out on the street. However, what seems to be happening in Mountain View is that we get large residential developments without any associated services which just forces all those people into cars making things unpleasant. If you are going to approve four or five or six story buildings, there really should be some integrated retail. Something like the Rose Market development, not that thing proposed for 282 Middlefield.

Thanks,

Joel Lachter

**From:** [David Freese](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Support of R3 Zoning Proposal in North Whisman  
**Date:** Sunday, November 7, 2021 5:18:17 PM

---

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

Hi City Council

I've been a resident of Mountain View for 2.5 years. I live in one of the houses that would be scheduled under an [earlier plan to be rezoned to R3-A](#) on Easy St.

I'm writing to express my support for this rezoning as a part of the housing element.

My wife and I chose to live in the North Whisman area primarily for its location. It allows me to bike to work, her easy access to the freeway, and is extremely close to amenities such as the Steven's Creek Trail, Whisman Park (where we take our dog), and is walkable to Castro Street.

Providing additional homes in this area with easy bike and light-rail access wouldn't harm the character of the neighborhood, but enrich it. Having spent time in the neighborhood, the most vibrant parts are those which are the most dense (i.e. the town homes that provide space for families and residents to interact).

The areas rezoned for R3 under the plan respect the character of the neighborhood, while allowing for additional units to be built. None of the more aggressive changes (R3-D) would be placed next to single family homes. R3-C changes in North Whisman are concentrated in areas with larger apartment complexes, are typically separated from single family areas by a road, and more importantly have fantastic access to Whisman Park.

Thanks,  
David Freese

**From:** [Sabira Alloo Ahuja](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed rezoning of Cuesta park area  
**Date:** Saturday, November 13, 2021 9:13:24 AM

---


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

Dear Council,

We are writing in opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Cuesta Park area. We live adjacent to a current R-3 and are surrounded by several multi family buildings. Zoning changes would make our neighborhood feel increasingly transient, less family friendly and increase traffic and congestion of an already heavily trafficked corridor. We would like to preserve a safe environment for our children and other families in the neighborhood by keeping current zoning.

Thank you,

Sabira & Ashish Ahuja

 Sonia way

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [City Council](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#)  
**Cc:** [Susan Russell](#); [Donna Davies](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** LWV LAMV: Letter to MV Council re Housing Element  
**Date:** Sunday, November 14, 2021 4:05:50 PM  
**Attachments:** [Letter to MV Council re Housing Element.pdf](#)

---

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



November 14, 2021

Mayor Kamei and Members of the City Council  
City of Mountain View  
500 Castro Street  
Mountain View 94041

Re: Council Meeting November 16th, Study Session, Agenda Item – 3.1. – Housing Element Update

Dear Mayor Kamei and Members of the City Council:

The LWV supports a regional housing plan that provides for balanced and equitable housing throughout the region, as well as legislation that facilitates the implementation of regional housing goals. Therefore, we have consistently been an advocate of Regional Housing Needs Allocations and Housing Elements.

As we wrote to the Environmental Planning Commission, we applaud Staff for the comprehensive report explaining the requirements for the Housing Element and pointing out the significant new requirements. Rather than repeat the points we made in our letter to the EPC, we hope Councilmembers will review the LWV letter in the staff report packet and we will stress two areas of particular concern.

We urge the Council to find ways to affirmatively further fair housing. This could include allowing denser housing in the downtown, as this area is well-located near transit and services, as well as looking for opportunity sites on the south side of El Camino Real where there is little affordable housing and not nearly as much diversity as on the northern side of El Camino.

We are also concerned that the city is relying too heavily on housing production in North Bayshore (NBS) to meet its RHNA goals. It appears that Google will be building housing slowly and that most of the anticipated NBS housing will not be built during the Housing Element 2023-2031 cycle. Therefore, the city should have other plans for meeting its RHNA goals.

(Please submit any questions about this letter to Donna Davies at [REDACTED])

Karin Bricker, President LWV of Los Altos Mountain View  
Donna Davies, Co-Chair, Housing Committee

cc: Kimbra McCarthy                      Aarti Shrivastava                      Ellen Yao                      Eric Anderson

**From:** [Vandita Wilson](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Cc:** [Vandita Wilson](#)  
**Subject:** regarding housing  
**Date:** Monday, November 15, 2021 12:09:31 PM

---

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

Dear city council,

My name is Vandita Malviya Wilson, and I and my husband, John M Wilson III have resided at [REDACTED] San Lucas Avenue since April 1994.

I would like to make a few comments about the R3 housing:

We support the general direction of staff's approach to meeting our sixth cycle RHNA allocation. In particular, we concur with the staff's statement on page 14 of the staff report and "do not recommend assuming R3 update densities in the site inventory" for the reasons staff has called out: "the timing of the R3 update project, the uncertainties of future densities, and the fact that many R3 sites would not result in many net new units and could have displacement effects that county the city's housing and equity goals". We also concur with staff that any zoning changes to R3 sites should be done only after robust, fair, and **effective** public outreach. This has not yet happened. R3 zoning discussions must come when we are ready for them, not rushed. Furthermore, we continue to recommend that the established precise and general plan process is the best way to decide what, where, and when significant changes should be made to our city's zoning and land use. The application of R3 zoning will not result in many net new units per site. They could possibly displace current residents permanently.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Take good care - Vandita  
Vandita Malviya Wilson, MBA  
MPP Candidate, Class of 2022 || The Heller School, Brandeis University  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [Lenny's Sonic](#)  
**To:** [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#)  
**Cc:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Schools and Housing (Item 3.1)  
**Date:** Monday, November 15, 2021 2:06:48 PM

---

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

TO: Mountain View City Council

FROM: Lenny Siegel

SUBJECT: Schools and Housing

DATE: November 15, 2021

In the Study Session Memo for the November 16, 2021 discussion of the next iteration of the city's Housing Element, staff discusses the potential impact of the Community Facilities District (CFD) under consideration by the Mountain View Whisman School District (MVWSD). In particular, staff suggests that a CFD would constrain housing development—especially affordable housing development—in much of Mountain View. While I am skeptical that a CFD will actually be implemented, the mere fact that MVWSD is devoting resources to study its formation should remind all parties of the need to plan ahead for school expansion as Mountain View builds more housing.

Historically, some of the opponents of Mountain View's forward-looking approach to housing development have warned of the pressures on our three school districts likely to be created by residential expansion. However, there are significant advantages to having children living, and attending school, near where their parents work. It is better for the children of Mountain View-area workers to be attending school in Mountain View than in Tracy, Modesto, or beyond.

Therefore, the city has been working with our school districts to expand capacity. Now, however, MVWSD is warning of a long-term construction shortfall that could run as high as \$1.5 billion. That is why it is considering a CFD.

If put before the voters, I don't know at this point how I would vote on a CFD. I have read the MVWSD November 2021 White Paper, and it does not contain all the information I would need to make a judgment. Even if one accepts MVWSD's projections for massive enrollment growth, there is no clear justification for the potential billion-dollar property acquisition price-tag, given the move to more compact schools and the school district's currently underutilized real estate. Furthermore, not only was the projection of additional North Bayshore property tax not fully explained, but I could find no estimate of the significant increase in property taxes expected from all the redevelopment occurring within MVWSD's boundaries elsewhere in Mountain View.

Regardless of my personal position, I am skeptical that the CFD proposal would win the two-thirds vote to be enacted. I do not know what MVWSD's polls will show. However, if one combines the base of voters who always vote against tax increases with the numbers likely to



be influenced by a “no” campaign, which I expect to be funded by housing developers, I consider passage unlikely.

Still, I respect MVWSD’s due diligence in considering the financial challenges associated with enrollment growth, and I suggest that the city take additional steps to re-assure the school district that its needs are kept in mind, whether or not MVWSD places the CFD proposal on the ballot next year.

I have two suggestions, but I am sure that there are other possibilities.

First, the city should give MVWSD firm assurances that MVWSD will control the Shorebird Yards school site. I was surprised to learn that the city directed Google to dedicate the land to the city, simply because of the city’s current parkland requirements. If the city can’t figure out a way to credit Google for a dedication to MVWSD, then it should quickly reach an agreement with the school district. It’s my understanding that the current approach has created uncertainty, and that it is one of the factors that has led the school district to consider the CFD.

Second, with all the interest in Sacramento in promoting the construction of housing throughout the state, the city should inform the legislature about the school-funding dilemma. The state wants cities to approve more housing, so it should provide additional funding so the children who end up living in the new housing will have schools in or near their neighborhoods, and also that school-funding measures do not discourage needed housing development.

In summary, while the headlines about school construction funding may exaggerate the challenge, it’s important for the city and our school districts to work together to ensure that adequate land and funding are available to accommodate residential growth.

—

Lenny Siegel



Author: *DISTURBING THE WAR: The Inside Story of the Movement to Get Stanford University out of Southeast Asia - 1965–1975* (See <http://a3mreunion.org>)

**From:** [Lisa Moore](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Housing Element, meeting RHNA allocation  
**Date:** Monday, November 15, 2021 9:41:18 PM

---

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

Dear City Council members,

As the discussion on R3 rezoning is a relatively recent topic without significant local community engagement, it would be premature to look to any speculative R3 rezoning changes as a way of meeting our City's required RHNA allocation. The approved Mountain View General Plan and approved Precise Plans, such as the East Whisman Precise Plan, included strong engagement with and input from our Mountain View residents. R3 rezoning has not had that. We should look to the existing significant new housing plans in North Bayshore and East Whisman, and others, to reach our required RHNA allocation.

The City should consider their constituents, those of us who live and vote here, as key stakeholders in the Mountain View we create for us and future residents. We need to have a partnership and trust the participation of all stakeholders. Let's meet RHNA obligations with what the City has established with the benefit of community engagement. Advocates from outside of Mountain often speak to their points of view. Let's remember those of us who live here.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lisa Moore  
Flynn Avenue  
Mountain View

**From:** [Kelley Ketchmark](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** R3 re-zoning and the housing element  
**Date:** Monday, November 15, 2021 10:09:45 PM

---

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

Dear Mountain View City Council

Regarding the housing element, I agree with staff's statement in the report that they are not recommending factoring in R3 re-zoning, due to the timing of the R3 update project, the uncertainty of future densities, and the fact that many R3 sites would not result in many net new units. (This could displace more residents which defeats the purpose.)

Any zoning changes to R3 sites should be done only after thorough public outreach, which has not happened yet. It should not be rushed as part of the RHNA process. The established precise and general plan process is the best way to decide what, where, and when significant changes should be made to our city's zoning and land use.

thank you,

Kelley