

From: Rosemary G

Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 7:31 PM

To: epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: Agenda item 5.1 for Public Hearing on Oct. 20th: Consideration of Development Permit for 282 E. Middlefield

Public Hearing for Consideration of a Planned Unit Development Permit, Planned Community Permit, and Development Review Permit to Construct a Five-Story, 91-Unit Residential Condominium Development with One Level of Underground Parking, Including a State Density Bonus Request, Provisional Use Permit for Rooftop Amenities, Heritage Tree Removal Permit for the Removal of Six Heritage Trees, and Vesting Tentative Map to Create 91 Condominium Lots and One Common Lot at 282 East Middlefield Road

To Mountain View Environmental Planning Commission,

I am a homeowner on Flynn Avenue, across the street from the proposed development. I think one of the misunderstandings about this proposed development is the address - Middlefield. It wouldn't just border Middlefield. It runs all the way through the block to Flynn Avenue, which is a very different kind of neighborhood. Flynn is a small neighborhood of 1 and 2-story homes. As a representative of long term homeowners in this neighborhood, I am shocked at DeNardi's proposal! 91 units and 5 stories, crammed into a little over one acre of land! The elevation drawings look like someone dropped a Shopping Mall into the middle of our quiet neighborhood. We have financially invested in our properties, which would suffer from such an inappropriate development. We have made our homes here, many of us planning to enjoy our retirement here - we would be faced with lack of privacy, greater noise, congestion, horrible parking problems. The rights of long term residents should be considered over an excessive developer's plan.

I have read the Staff Report published on Friday, Oct. 15th, with the Draft Resolution No. Series 2021, denying the 282 E. Middlefield proposal as submitted. The Planning Division has done a great job highlighting all the areas that are not in compliance. And DeNardi's plan exceeds our East Whisman Precise Plan requirements, which was created to respect our neighborhood character.

I respectfully request the members of the Environmental Planning Commission to accept the recommendation of the Staff Report and DENY this development as submitted. DeNardi shows NO respect for our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Gorz and Norman Vachowiak

From: sdg

Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 10:06 PM

To: epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: Proposed Development at 282 E. Middlefield Rd.

After years of input between the city of Mountain View and the residents of the area adjacent to East Whisman, an agreement was reached for development of the Village Center Character Area in the EWPP, which would include "neighborhood-serving and pedestrian-oriented retail and services as well as housing".

Now DeNardi Wang developers want to squeeze in a monolith of five stories, plus an amenity level, 91 units. Hardly a village-type building.

As the EPC report points out this development is wrong on so many points.

Because of the height it is totally out of character with the existing neighborhood of two-story buildings.

It looms over and encroaches on nearby single-family housing, and thus the roof-top amenity area is a terrible idea.

Parking is already in short supply on Flynn Ave., and no doubt residents of this building would exacerbate the situation. The so-called nearby transit is just barely worth the name. The light rail and the community bus are good ideas, not fully useful.

Thus we are totally against this development.

Wasson Quan and Sandra DiGiulio

From: Dmitri Bannikov

Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 11:36 PM

To: epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: 282 east Middlefield Rd development

Hi Sir/Madam,

Our biggest concern is about parking. Residents of 91 units are going to have about ~180 cars (2 cars per unit) and proposed single level parking is not nearly enough to hold that many cars.

In addition, 5 story building clearly does not fit the neighborhood.

Dmitri Bannikov

From: Matthew Dodder

Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 2:28 AM

To: Penollar, Krisha <Krisha.Penollar@mountainview.gov>; epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: 282 East Middlefield Road

Dear City of Mountain View Environmental Planning Commission,

I am appalled that the current plan for a high-density condominium project is being considered by the City of Mountain View for the 1.15 acre **282 East Middlefield Road location**. Are you seriously blind to the damage this will cause to the neighborhood in which it is proposed? How can you believe a 5-story structure is appropriate in a neighborhood of one and two-story single family homes?

CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD

I live on Flynn Avenue, which is beside this lot and love this quiet neighborhood. No homes are taller than two stories and most are single family dwellings. Even local businesses across Middlefield Avenue and North Whisman Avenue honor this standard. **THERE ARE NO BUILDINGS OF COMPARABLE HEIGHT IN THIS AREA**, and to break with this pattern will cast a shadow both literally and figuratively on this residential neighborhood. The horrendous Ameswell project on the corner of Moffett and Hwy 101 is the height we are talking... can you imagine how a building this tall beside your own home? Can you imagine the continuous noise that will result from the construction of this project?

LOCAL WILDLIFE

I object to the removal of the 6 heritage trees as well, which currently support the woodsy nature of this small community and support bird life such as the **Red-breasted Nuthatch** which is not commonly found in Mountain View. Has the city even considered this project's impact on the local wildlife, especially birds? Have you adopted bird-safe design features—common features in larger buildings that help prevent bird-strikes and or help maintain valuable tree canopy? A structure as tall as the one proposed **MUST** employ design standards to limit its impact on local wildlife. What about the flood of new vehicles that will utilize our street? If memory serves, many of these new residents will come with more than one car, forcing them to park on an already crowded street.

YOU CAN DO BETTER

I am **STRONGLY OPPOSED** to this plan and wish to voice my concerns during the meeting. The project will destroy the character of this neighborhood if it is allowed to go forward, bringing a minimum of 91 new residents to this quiet street. Impact the tree canopy, impact wildlife and add more vehicles to the Wagon Wheel community. I am utterly disappointed in the City for even considering this colossal project! I would prefer this location be turned into a public green space than this enormous condominium project. Was that ever considered?

IT'S YOUR DECISION

Dense-living structures of this height are a blight on the character of residential streets like Flynn Avenue. Minimally, the scope of this project should be limited to **TWO STORIES MAXIMUM** if it is to get the support of my family, and I expect the other homeowners in the local "Wagon Wheel" neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Matthew Dodder
Executive Director
Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society

From: Karen Heggie

Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 8:27 AM

To: epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: DeNardi/Wang proposed development at 282 E Middlefield

To members of the Environmental Planning Committee:

I live at Flynn Avenue, Mt. View, in a townhome complex directly across from the proposed development at 282 E. Middlefield. I wholeheartedly concur with the thoroughly reviewed recommendation of the Planning Division to deny the developer's application for this project. I also join in the comments of my neighbors who have expressed concerns about this project.

To summarize, this project should be denied because of the following:

The project exceeds the density allowed on the site under both the General Plan and East Whisman Precise Plan, even with the maximum bonus available to them. (It should be noted that hardly anyone rides the VTA Lightrail so the fact that this project is near a transportation system is meaningless.)

Many of the waivers requested by the developer are not in compliance as noted by the Planning Division staff.

The 5 story building with 91 units is not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and will tower over the already existing residences.

The proposed parking is insufficient for the number of units proposed.

Parking space on Flynn Avenue is already limited and there is no allowed parking on Middlefield. It would be tempting for residents of the project on the Flynn side to park on Flynn given the parking space allotment in the project.

The increase in traffic will negatively impact our neighborhood. In a meeting with members of the neighborhood, the developers indicated that they plan to hire a "traffic expert" to do a traffic study. It is of concern that this has not already been done and we have no idea whether this expert will be doing the study based on existing traffic or whether this expert will be taking into consideration the other proposed developments along Middlefield and in the area.

I agree with the Planning Division staff that the proposed rooftop deck is incompatible with the adjacent neighborhood due to its location and scale.

The plans reflect that a great deal of time and resources have been invested in this proposed project and yet we have just recently been notified about it. I question why neighborhood input was not solicited earlier.

This project application needs to be denied. If the developers want to submit a new application, this application should be for a greatly scaled-back project.

Sincerely,

Karen Heggie

From: Irene Bautista
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 12:21 AM
To: epc@mountainview.gov
Subject: 5 Story 91 units at Flynn avenue

Dear members of the Environmental Planning Committee

My name is Irene Bautista, I live at Flynn Ave. at the back of the proposed building to be built at Flynn Avenue. I am in favor for the improvement of this community but not a 5 story building .

It seems it does not fit to a 1 and 2 story housing area. One thing its going to be 91 unit complex, a lot of people, need a lot of parking area. I know they are going to have parking garage but how many parking area per unit Some house in this area had 3 cars it depends how many people live in the house. One time I had to put my garbage container on the side of the park car. I can imagine the people in the 5 story is looking what am I doing in my house and in my yard. Its nice if they are going to built a 1 story building around the existing house.

Thank you very much for considering my concern about the propose building. I am not for 5 story or 4 story or even 3 story building in this area.

Sincerely
Irene Bautista

From: Roy Timmerman

Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 12:44 PM

To: City Council <City.Council@mountainview.gov>; epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: 282 E. Middlefield Project

Greetings,

We oppose this project because of the following points: 1) massing 2) privacy 3) parking 4) even the state backs the staff report 5) the original East Whisman Precise Plan limited density in the “village center” exactly to prevent this type of massive development.

We urge you to oppose this project, we will remember who supported this at re-election time.

Best Regards,

Roy Timmerman

Chris Fritz

From: Kevin Ma

Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 12:45 PM

To: epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: On 282 E Middlefield and Future Projects (Item 5)

Dear EPC,

While it is unfortunate in this case that the project as presented to you today is incompatible with the existing zoning code, it does present an example of what kinds of the developments the city could be having if standards were loosened up. Inherently, we remain in a situation where we continue to need more housing at all income levels, and that a vacant lot is not in character for a "Village Center Character Area." After all, retail is most likely to succeed if there's a large population around it for much of the day.

On FAR in general, AB478 has mandated 2022 onwards that FAR must be a minimum of 1 for 3-7 units, 1.25 for 8-10 units. While the Village Center is meant to be mixed-use and thus affects what's covered under FAR, it is a reminder that given the land costs in the area, there does need to be flexibility in height and massing for housing developments to succeed, perhaps with much higher FAR and du/ac than previously imagined.

Sincerely,
Kevin Ma

From: Kelly Dodder

Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 12:47 PM

To: Penollar, Krisha <Krisha.Penollar@mountainview.gov>; epc@mountainview.gov

Subject: New Development at 282 East Middlefield Road

Dear City of Mountain View Environmental Planning Commission,

I vehemently oppose the current plan for a high-density condominium project is being considered by the City of Mountain View for the 1.15 acre **282 East Middlefield Road location** for several reasons.

First of all the project will detrimentally change the character of this neighborhood. It would bring a minimum of 91 new residents to this quiet street. I am upset about the increased congestion in our neighborhood. The parking is already hard to find on the street. Many of these new residents will likely come with more than one car, forcing them to park on an already crowded street. In addition to the limited parking and impact on traffic flow, I worry about the impact on the tree canopy and wildlife. I am shocked and disappointed in the City for considering this project! I would prefer this location be turned into a public green space. Was that ever considered?

MORE SPECIFICS:

I live on Flynn Avenue, which is beside this lot and love this quiet neighborhood. No homes are taller than two stories and most are single family dwellings. Even local businesses across Middlefield Avenue and North Whisman Avenue honor this standard. **THERE ARE NO BUILDINGS OF COMPARABLE HEIGHT IN THIS AREA**, and to break with this pattern will cast a shadow both literally and figuratively on this residential neighborhood. The Ameswell project on the corner of Moffett and Hwy 101 is the height we are talking... can you imagine how a building this tall beside your own home? Can you imagine the continuous noise that will result from the construction of this project?

I also object to the removal of the 6 heritage trees, which currently support the woodsy nature of this small community and support bird life such as the **Red-breasted Nuthatch** which is not commonly found in Mountain View. Has the city even considered this project's impact on the local wildlife?

Dense-living structures of this height are not welcome in small neighborhood streets like Flynn Avenue. The scope of this project needs to be reduced. It should be limited to TWO STORIES MAXIMUM if it is to get the support of my family and I expect the other homeowners in the local "Wagon Wheel" neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Kelly Dodder

From: Maria Venturini
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 3:28 PM
To: epc@mountainview.gov
Subject: 282 East Middlefield Road - Do Not Support Waiver

Good Evening Planners,

I am amazed that the 282 East Middlefield Road proposal has made it so far as to reach your chambers. It has exceeded maximum density and is way oversized for the neighborhood. The building would be higher than the heritage trees currently on the lot, and would be visible, mushrooming above the neighborhood, from as far away as the corner of Whisman and Fairchild. The developer's request for a waiver should be denied at all costs.

Regards,
Maria Venturini