

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 26, 2019 8:37 PM  
**To:** Bradley, Paula  
**Subject:** Re application PL-2018-105 and PL-2018-106 at 1950 Montecito Avenue.

Dear Paula,

Many thanks for sending out the invitation for attending public hearings and for putting comments on development applications PL-2018-105 and PL-2018-106 at 1950 Montecito Avenue. It is really important for to have impact and to know that my voice matters. It is much appreciated.

Please accept my objections to approval of those applications.

1) I am sure the report prepared by Michael Bench, Consulting Arborist date January 15 2018 is not accurate and might be biased in favor of developer.

There is a statement in "Findings of Approval":

"The Heritage Tree Removal Permit to remove 22 Heritage trees (Tree Nos. 103, 104, 105, 107, 113, 119, 121 to 126, 133, 141, 146 to 148, 152, 157, 160, 164, and 166) is conditionally approved based on the conditions contained herein and the following findings per Section 32.35".

I've inspected trees myself today. Only tree 160 can be classified in a Fair/Poor condition because it has not been pruned properly (can be easily fixed). Whereas all other trees are maintained properly and can be hardly classified as Poor or Fair. More importantly trees 152, 157, 124 are native redwoods in excellent condition. Their lifespan allows them to stay at this site for centuries. Their canopy provides valuable necessary shade. Mountain View has announced its plans to become a sustainable city. Shade gives everything to reduce the use of Air Conditioners during summer time. It is completely against the strategies of sustainable city sessions which I personally attended ( I really hope it was not a waste of my time and energy).

Tree 104 is located near the road and gives lots of shade as well.

I think the independent expertise should be invited to evaluate trees removal again. City of Mountain View should also review the whole concept of removing big native trees in favor of new development applications.

2) The idea of replacing existing 34 units with new 33 more expensive units creates a situation when young professionals and families, elderly people are forced to relocate to other areas because housing becomes less and less affordable. Woodgate apartments is a great value for money providing affordable housing for diverse social groups. Most of us work in Mountain View and use bikes or shuttles to get to work. Now we will have to add more vehicles to roads of Mountain View - great addition to ambitious sustainable "City of Mountain View" plans.

3) There are wild habitats on site like family of raccoons and at least one skunk. It is known that wild animals cannot be relocated without special permission from the state.

There are good reasons for this law. Introducing an animal into a territory that is controlled by another animal sets up a conflict. The relocated animal may not be able to find food, water or shelter at its new home, and you may remove it from offspring that need care, or from a mate or family group. Relocating animals also can lead to the spread of disease to other wildlife populations.

There are also few squirrels and multiple bird nests. Birds return here on a seasonal basis.

All above-mentioned concerns are really important to me I really hope they will be taken into account during tomorrow's hearings and by approval committee.

Please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Thank you!

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]