

**From:** [Sanmay Ved](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** 685 E Middlefield Project by Prometheus  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 14, 2023 4:09:33 PM

---

Hello Phillip,

With respect to the stated project, the developer says that the project will contain two new 8-story multi-family apartment buildings that will contain 716 units. Assuming 2.79 residents per unit, the number of residents this project would be 2,000 residents. Keeping in view Mountain View's plan of having 3 acres of park space for every 1,000 residents, this project must contain 6 acres of park space. However, the developer is allocating a measly 0.36 acres of park space.

Can the city please ensure that this project contains 6 acres of park space?

Thank you.

-Regards,  
Sanmay

**From:** [Shuo Shen](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#); [Hicks, Alison](#)  
**Subject:** Public Park Space on the Prometheus Project (675/685 E. Middlefield)  
**Date:** Thursday, February 16, 2023 8:48:47 AM  
**Attachments:** [image.png](#)

---

Hi Phillip, Alison,

This is Shuo. I'm a resident on Pyramid Way. Our unit is right next to the Pyramid Park. I received the invitation to the hearing of the prometheus project plan on 675/685 E. Middlefield. And I would like to share my thoughts in writing as I can't attend the meeting today.

The plan mentions a 0.36-acre park for 850 (716 + 144) residential units plus office buildings. The size of the park looks very small for the number of units. As a comparison, when Pulte Radius was planned, it had the [2.76-acre](#) Pyramid park for [200 units](#). The Pulte plan had 30 times more park space than the new Prometheus plan on a sqft per unit basis.

I would really appreciate it if you could forward our concern to the meeting and discuss whether there's more room for public park space for each unit. Otherwise, I'm afraid the project would put huge pressure on the neighboring Pyramid Park. As it stands, the Pyramid Park is already overly crowded during daily peak hours, imposing safety concerns to the playing children and noise issues to the neighboring units.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Cheers,  
Shuo

**From:** [Mandy Lau](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** 675 and 685 E Middlefield Project Feedback  
**Date:** Friday, February 17, 2023 9:56:00 PM

---

Hi Phillip - I am a property owner of the Whisman neighborhood and was made aware of the above development couple weeks ago. I have significant concerns of the proposed development plan:

1. Density and resident to park ratio - in the precise plan (p.21), it calls for 3 acre of park per 1000 residents. This development aims to have 1500-2000 residents and yet only offers 0.36 acre? I understand the developer argues the 3 acre refers to wider park MV offers such as in Shoreline. But this is contrary to our understanding when the precise plan was approved. What this development is doing is creating high density housing in a residential area where park is already limited. This is very concerning. This concern is shared among many home owners in my neighborhoods.

I highly urge the development reduce the unit by more than 50% or only focus on office development.

2. Traffic - With potential additional 1500 residents, you are creating significant traffic along Middlefield and Ferguson. This does not even consider the Google Master plan development on the other side of Middlefield. What we will experience is HUGE congestion in Middlefield and 237 corners. It is environmentally unfriendly and unsafe. I witnessed several accidents on the Middlefield and 237 HWY junction given the confusing traffic light.

I also object the backroad going out to Ferguson. That exit should not be allowed to minimize traffic onto Ferguson.

3. Safety - In our small neighborhoods - we already experienced increased crime rate, especially of stealing packages and those thieves just ran off. Mountain View is one of the most expensive and supposedly safe suburbs. As you invite more residents, we will see crime rates increase, making this once attractive neighborhood unsafe.

4. Building Height - the developer said they already lowered the building height below what's allowed. But that should not be the benchmark. The developer should consider the look and feel of the surrounding buildings. The Revela appointment is only 4 story high. The development should at least reduce the height by half to match the nearby buildings and maintain that character.

5. Retail - In the Precise plan, there was a request any new development must have a

good retail and residential ratio. What I see is more residential units and NO retail, not even a grocery store. This is a huge concern

I highly ask the committee to re-evaluate this plan with the existing residents nearby in mind. Imagine you are the ones living in this neighborhood and will soon be seeing an influx of residents coming in, causing traffic, safety issue.

The economy is still fragile, the Google master plan is still in planning. We do not understand why there is such a rush to building 800+ units when we are in a recession.

I sincerely hope the developer will reconsider and focus more on office building and retail as opposed to high-density housing.

Sincerely,

Mandy

<https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=32005&fbclid=IwAR2MbFY2625EV-cOoIKFKMiupVcF7E4TEr6wdk2Fb1PaxpziN8KXXylehFU>

**From:** [Shapiro, Rebecca](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: 675/685 East Middlefield  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 1, 2023 4:36:15 PM

---

Phillip - Forwarding this to you as an FYI re: public comment for the project. I've already let Pam know this was a topic we addressed at DRC, so there's no need for you to do any further followup.

Get [Outlook](#) for iOS

---

**From:** Pamela Baird [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 1, 2023 12:59 PM  
**To:** Shapiro, Rebecca <Rebecca.Shapiro@mountainview.gov>  
**Subject:** 675/685 East Middlefield

Hello Rebecca-

In scrolling around the city calendar I realized that this afternoon the DRC will be reviewing a significant new project. I apologize for sending this last minute. I hope that you receive this in time!

I probably will not be able to attend, as I have other plans. If I did have time to attend I would request that more attention be paid to the "non-public" sides of the parking structure. It appears that no decorative treatments are planned for the sides next to the light rail tracks and the nearby apartments.

This will create a huge "eyesore" for the adjacent properties. Please request that the structure has the decorative panels be placed on all four sides.

thanks-

***Pamela Baird***

Downtown Committee- chair

**From:** [John Wynn](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Oppose to Dev Proposal  
**Date:** Saturday, December 23, 2023 8:02:45 PM

---

Hi Mr. Brennan,

Thanks for the quick reply and hope your holidays are merry and peaceful.

I believe it's at 675 E. Middlefield Rd, already nearby a large apartment building complex w/ its own parking spaces.

Do you know when the dev proj. was propose and the steps to counter?

Warm regards,  
J.W.

---

**From:** Brennan, Phillip <Phillip.Brennan@mountainview.gov>  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 23, 2023 6:57 AM  
**To:** John Wynn <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: Oppose to Dev Proposal

Hello Mr. Wynn:

Thank you for your email. Can you please clarify what development project you're opposing (address or project #)? Knowing this information will help me to answer your question regarding how to formally oppose the project proposal.


Thank you in advance for your reply-  
Phillip B.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** John Wynn <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 23, 2023 5:09:20 AM  
**To:** Brennan, Phillip <Phillip.Brennan@mountainview.gov>  
**Subject:** Oppose to Dev Proposal

---



Hi Mr. Brennan,

If one is oppose to a dev proposal project, specifically in MV, how can one vote and/or state points against it?

Thanks,  
John

**From:** [Shapiro, Rebecca](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** RE: To Attn: Rebecca Shapiro/Development committee  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 21, 2024 2:21:45 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Hello Ms. Friedman –

Thank you for reaching out with your question re: unit mix in the Prometheus project, and to expand on some of the comments you shared at the DRC meeting.

I have CC'ed Phillip Brennan on this email. Phillips is City project planner for this development, and is the best source of information on specific project components such as the unit mix.

Cheers,



**Rebecca Shapiro**

**Deputy Zoning Administrator**

Community Development Department | Planning Division

650-903-6306 | [MountainView.gov](http://MountainView.gov)

[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [YouTube](#) | [AskMV](#)

---

**From:** Leslie Friedman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2024 1:00 PM  
**To:** , Planning Division <[Planning.Division@mountainview.gov](mailto:Planning.Division@mountainview.gov)>  
**Subject:** To Attn: Rebecca Shapiro/Development committee

TO: Rebecca Shapiro, Deputy Zoning Administrator

Hello, I attended the January meeting in City Hall with your committee and the individuals representing Prometheus. At the meeting, I did not hear what kind of apartments were going to be built either in the market value apartment building or in the building reserved for moderate or low income renters.

Are these apartments one bedrooms, studios, two bedrooms? I apologize if this was announced at another meeting.

These options will have a great impact on all aspects of the buildings. The future of the half-acre-plus-a-bit park, for example, can be predicted depending on how many thousand individuals - adult, juvenile, or canine - might be using it.



A half acre might help by creating a small open space, but people of all ages will need a bigger space actually to be able to play or dodge the doggie-ness or sit and enjoy the surroundings. I recognize that Prometheus enlarged the area of the proposed open space. However, half an acre for thousands of residents is not a big space.

Areas around trees which are not killed will be precious space but 3000 residents or more will need to use other parks or school yards. Knowing the kind of apartments would make a difference.

Is this for studio apartments or apartments in which a family could live?

I understand that Prometheus wants an office building as well. Good morning, it is the 21st century.

At some point, soon I hope, Mountain View needs to recognize that the world has changed in a

very big way. Destroying trees which are life saving elements of our world, planning for offices

which will welcome a third of the employees maybe twice a week, what is this? Prometheus and

other builders need to think about what reason they have to continue doing what they accomplished

well in the 1980s.

Thank you for your kind attention,  
Leslie Friedman

P.S. I have heard the strange claim that "redwood trees use too much water."  
Compared to hundreds of apartments with plumbing, the trees are quite economic in their use of water over their lifetimes of hundreds of years.

## Brennan, Phillip

---

**From:** NA <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 20, 2024 11:02 PM  
**To:** Brennan, Phillip  
**Subject:** 675-685 E Middlefield

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

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

Hi Mr. Brennan,

I believe our heritage trees are vital assets. Not only do they increase oxygen and remove pollutants, but they also slow the buildup of greenhouse gases and provide shelter, shade, and beauty to our City. I'm writing to request that you prevent the destruction of the heritage trees at 675 E Middlefield. These beautiful assets to our City cannot be replaced.

-Nancy Achter, MV Resident

**From:** [Shannon Wilkowski](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** PL-2023-259 & PL-2022-260  
**Date:** Friday, September 20, 2024 1:50:39 PM

---

Dear Mr. Brennan,  
I would like to advocate AGAINST the removal of heritage trees associated with the potential project on Ferguson Dr related to application numbers PL-2023-259 & PL-2022-260. I believe Prometheus could work harder to save large trees.  
Thank you,  
Shannon Wilkowski  
(Eldora Dr)

## Brennan, Phillip

---

**From:** Terri Goldberg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2024 11:13 AM  
**To:** Brennan, Phillip  
**Subject:** Save the trees

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

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

Dear Mr. Brennan,

My plea is one of many asking you as a decision-maker to spare as many trees as possible on Ferguson St. in Mountain View. Our urban forest is critically important in so many "unseen ways." Namely: habitat for birds who keep insect population down, converting CO2 to oxygen, providing shade, adding beauty and greenery to our environment. In my view whatever development is planned can be altered to preserve those trees. Too many times trees are sacrificed for concrete. Let's find a solution to SAVE THOSE TREES!

Sincerely yours,

Terri Goldberg Mountain View resident since 1962 Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Sanmay Ved](#)  
**To:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov); [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** Increased Park Allocation for 685 E Middlefield Project by Prometheus  
**Date:** Thursday, November 14, 2024 9:18:31 AM

---

Dear City of Mountain View,

I am writing to express concerns regarding the proposed park space allocation for the 685 E Middlefield Project by Prometheus

The project includes new 8-story multi-family apartment buildings with 836 units. Based on an estimated occupancy of 2.39 residents per unit, this translates to approximately 2,000 residents.

Mountain View's General Plan aims for 3 acres of park space per 1,000 residents. Applying this standard, the development should ideally include 6 acres of park space. However, the current proposal allocates only 0.52 acres.

To put this into perspective, Radius at Whisman Station, a 198-home community, has access to Pyramid Park, which is between 2.75 and 3 acres.

Insufficient park space within new developments can lead to:

- **Overcrowding:** Strain on existing parks in surrounding areas.
- **Reduced Quality of Life:** Limited access to green spaces for recreation and relaxation for new residents.
- **Inequity in Access:** Disproportionate impact on the well-being of the new residents of the new community.

I urge the city to review the park allocation for [Project Name] and ensure it aligns with Mountain View's General Plan and the needs of its growing population. A minimum of 6 acres of park space should be included within this development to ensure adequate access for its residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

Sanmay



November 19, 2024

Re: November 20, 2024, Agenda Item 5.2 – 675-685 E Middlefield Road

Dear Chair Dempsey and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission:

The League of Women Voters (LWW) supports actions that increase the stock of affordable housing and integrate units designed for lower income families in apartment buildings.

The League appreciates that the application provides more than the minimal number of below-market-rate (BMR) units, BMR units with multiple bedrooms, and units at deep levels of affordability. At the same time, we are concerned that the BMR units are proposed for a building that is separate from the market-rate units. The LWW is also concerned that there are significantly fewer parking spaces allotted to the BMR units than to those in the other two apartment buildings and the BMR units would not have equal access to the amenities that are available to the market rate units.

The League supports staff's recommendations that the BMR units be completed before the market rate units. If that is not possible, then the market-rate buildings should include the BMR units. We also recommend that the residents of BMR units have equal access to all amenities and parking in the project.

In addition, the League suggests the City take the eighteen additional BMR units in the project rather than the \$12 million to meet the developer's remaining 2% BMR requirement given the immediate housing needs in Mountain View.

Please send any questions about this letter to Kevin Ma, Co-Chair of the Housing Committee, at [housing@lwvlamv.org](mailto:housing@lwvlamv.org).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Katie Zoglin". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping tail on the "n".

Katie Zoglin  
President  
Los Altos-Mountain View Area LWW

C: Phillip Brennan  
Rebecca Shapiro  
Amber Blizinski  
Christian Murdock



# Requested Revision to COAs

**110. BMR, ALTERNATIVE MITIGATION:** The applicant/developer shall provide one hundred and fifty (150) BMR units (approximately eighteen percent (18%)) off-site in a stand-alone building located on a parcel within the project site, of which half (fifty percent (50%)) of the units shall be two (2) and three (3) bedroom units. The weighted average of the units in the stand-alone BMR building (per the applicant's alternative mitigation proposal) will be fifty percent (50%) AMI, and the units shall remain affordable in perpetuity. The approved Alternative Mitigation does not absolve the applicant from complying with the Below Market Rate Program Administrative Guidelines and process unless otherwise explicitly specified. In addition to the 150 BMR units, the applicant/developer shall provide \$12 million in supplemental funding (not earmarked for the project) to achieve equivalency for the required twenty percent (20%) (168 BMR units) off-site BMR unit delivery per the City's BMR Administrative Guidelines. The \$12 million shall be provided to the City prior to the commencement of construction of the BMR building but in no event later than Certificate of Occupancy for the first market-rate building ~~issuance of the first grading or building permit for the project (for either the residential or nonresidential development)~~. **(PROJECT-SPECIFIC CONDITION)**

**111. BMR, ALTERNATIVE MITIGATION DELIVERY OF UNITS:** In accordance with the BMR Administrative Guidelines, the off-site units shall be fully financed, permit-ready, and construction commenced ~~constructed, and delivered~~ prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the first market-rate building in the mixed-use development project. Should the applicant be unable to provide the affordable units through the proposed Alternative Mitigation consistent with the required timing in the BMR Administrative Guidelines, it shall meet the City's fifteen percent (15%) (of total project units) inclusionary requirement, integrating the BMR units with the market-rate development, include a proportionate mix of unit sizes relative to the market-rate units, be equitably distributed throughout the residential development, and meet other requirements consistent with Chapter 36, Article XIV, Divisions 1 and 2, of the City Code and the BMR Housing Program Administrative Guidelines and Directives. **(PROJECT-SPECIFIC CONDITION)**

**From:** [Shuo Shen](#)  
**To:** [Showalter, Pat](#); [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** [Prometheus] Concerns with Park Space  
**Date:** Saturday, November 23, 2024 2:44:38 PM

---

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

Dear City of Mountain View,

I'm a resident near Pyramid Park. I am writing to express concerns about the insufficient park space allocation in the proposed 685 E Middlefield project by Prometheus.

The project plans for 836 units, housing an estimated 2,000 residents (based on 2.39 residents per unit). However, the proposal allocates only 0.52 acres of park space, which is inadequate to support the needs of such a large community.

The existing Pyramid Park, located near the development site, is already experiencing significant overflow, leading to noise and parking issues. Adding more residents without sufficient new park space will exacerbate these problems, further reducing the quality of life for both new and existing residents.

Insufficient park space in new developments can lead to:

- Overcrowding in already overburdened parks.
- Reduced quality of life due to limited recreational green spaces.
- Increased noise and traffic congestion near current parks, affecting the surrounding neighborhoods.

I urge the city to reevaluate the park allocation for this project and ensure sufficient green space is included to meet the needs of its residents and alleviate pressure on existing parks.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Shuo



**From:** [Shuo Shen](#)  
**To:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Subject:** Re: [Prometheus] Concerns with Park Space  
**Date:** Saturday, November 23, 2024 4:43:06 PM

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



As you can see, on a typical Saturday afternoon, the park is crowded. There's a lot of traffic and noise and it is not very pleasant to the residents next to the park.

Having a new construction with minimal park space will make this problem even worse.

Shuo

On Sat, Nov 23, 2024 at 2:43 PM Shuo Shen <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear City of Mountain View,

I'm a resident near Pyramid Park. I am writing to express concerns about the insufficient park space allocation in the proposed 685 E Middlefield project by Prometheus.

The project plans for 836 units, housing an estimated 2,000 residents (based on 2.39 residents per unit). However, the proposal allocates only 0.52 acres of park space, which is inadequate to support the needs

of such a large community.

The existing Pyramid Park, located near the development site, is already experiencing significant overflow, leading to noise and parking issues. Adding more residents without sufficient new park space will exacerbate these problems, further reducing the quality of life for both new and existing residents.

Insufficient park space in new developments can lead to:

- Overcrowding in already overburdened parks.
- Reduced quality of life due to limited recreational green spaces.
- Increased noise and traffic congestion near current parks, affecting the surrounding neighborhoods.

I urge the city to reevaluate the park allocation for this project and ensure sufficient green space is included to meet the needs of its residents and alleviate pressure on existing parks.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Shuo

**From:** [Mandy Lau](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#); [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov)  
**Subject:** 685 East Middlefield development  
**Date:** Sunday, November 24, 2024 8:58:33 PM

---

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

Dear Mr. Brennan and EPC committee,

I am a resident of the Whisman Park area and like to express my concern of the new development on 685 East Middlefield especially the ratio of number of residents relative to park space.

The current proposal estimates close to 2,000 residents but the park space is a mere 0.52 acres. This is drastically lower than the Mountain View requirement of 3 acres per 1,000 residents. I understand your potential push back is that the 3 acres include space in shoreline park etc. But this is not reasonable because our daily living is in our "immediate neighborhood".

The current proposal is posting HUGE traffic, safety and wellbeing concern for the residents in the Whisman district area.

I share this concern with many residents in the neighborhood. I ask for your reconsideration of your proposal to "reduce" the density of your development AND add more park space in the immediate area.

Sincerely,  
Mandy

**From:** [Mandy Lau](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#); [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov)  
**Cc:** [, City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 685 East Middlefield development  
**Date:** Saturday, December 7, 2024 1:20:34 PM

---

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

Hi all - I received a notice that there is another public hearing on 12/17. In the notice it looks like the above plan received a conditional approval subject to the "Alternative Mitigation Plan". Can you share what the mitigation plan is?

As mentioned below many of owners in the Radius community are very concerned about the lack of Park Space, congestion, safety and overall wellbeing of the neighborhood once this massive project is launched.

We sincerely hope you can scale back on the density.

Mandy

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

On Sunday, November 24, 2024, 8:58 PM, Mandy Lau <[msmslau@yahoo.com](mailto:msmslau@yahoo.com)> wrote:

**From:** [Raihan Saleh](#)  
**To:** [Brennan, Phillip](#)  
**Cc:** [Shree Dharasker](#)  
**Subject:** Application No. PL-6535 685 E. Middlefield Road  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 10, 2024 11:32:08 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

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

Hi Phillip,

The Santa Clara Valley Water District (Valley Water) has received mailed in notice for the 11/20/2024 City of Mountain View Environmental Planning Commission Meeting to discuss the 675-685 E. Middlefield Road Mixed-Use Development Project (Project), received on 11/18/2024.

Valley Water staff has reviewed the documentation provided for this Project, and have no comments.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

**RAIHAN SALEH**

Pronouns: she/her

ASSISTANT ENGINEER II

Community Projects Review Unit

Tel. (408) 630-2693

Santa Clara Valley Water District is now known as:



Clean Water • Healthy Environment • Flood Protection

5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose CA 95118

[www.valleywater.org](http://www.valleywater.org)