

---

**From:** Manuel Salazar  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:07 PM  
**To:** Kamei, Ellen; Ramos, Emily Ann; Ramirez, Lucas; Showalter, Pat; Hicks, Alison; Clark, Chris; McAlister, John  
**Cc:** , City Clerk; , Planning Division  
**Subject:** SVH Letter RE - Item 8.2 R3 Zoning District Update  
**Attachments:** SVH Letter RE - SV@Home Recommendations on the R3 Zoning District Update.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

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

Dear Mayor Kamei and City Council Members,

On behalf of SV@Home, we appreciate the City's continued efforts to advance the R3 Zoning District Update. The progress made to date demonstrates a serious commitment to meeting Mountain View's housing goals.

However, we believe that the current framework needs to go further to support the level of housing production required under the Housing Element and needed for the City and all its residents to thrive.

### Positive Steps We Support

We acknowledge and support the following components of staff's proposal:

- **Inclusion of additional infill and adjacent sites**—such as condominiums, townhouses, and small sites—expands eligibility and reflects a more flexible zoning approach.
- **Designation of Option 1 (75–110 du/acre) zoning** in key locations such as Del Medio, Continental/Dale, Evelyn/Calderon, and Central Park Apartments. These higher densities are appropriate and feasible in these areas.

### Key Areas for Strengthening

However, despite these improvements, several of our previous recommendations remain unaddressed or insufficiently incorporated. We feel that these omissions undermine the policy's ability to support production, especially of affordable housing. These include:

- **No feasibility analysis accompanies the zoning tiers.** Without clarity on how density options translate into buildable projects, particularly on smaller or constrained sites, it is difficult to assess whether this framework will deliver the intended outcomes.
- **Additional Opportunities:** Key study areas—such as parcels near mobile home parks, R2-adjacent sites, low-lot coverage redevelopment parcels, and sites near the Downtown Transit Center—should be included to fully align with the RHNA potential of this Housing Element program.
- **Tenant protections are not integrated** into the zoning framework. We have *consistently advocated that increased development potential be paired with anti-displacement measures*, including right-to-return provisions, enhanced relocation assistance, and a permanent replacement ordinance for rent-stabilized units.

## Our Recommendations

The City's Housing Element calls for expanded capacity in multifamily districts. While the R3 update represents progress, it lacks the scale, clarity, and coordination necessary to fully realize that goal.

We recommend the following actions to strengthen the framework:

1. **Conduct and release a feasibility analysis** to confirm that the proposed density tiers are workable and financially viable within 18 months, serving as an opportunity to examine the performance of R3 zoning in achieving City goals.
2. **Include the additional study areas** identified in our prior letter, including sites adjacent to mobile homes, R2 parcels, and the Downtown Transit Center.
3. **Codify and align tenant protections** with zoning changes, ensuring vulnerable households are not displaced as redevelopment occurs.

## Final Thoughts

Zoning is more than a regulatory tool—it is a policy signal. A bolder, more integrated approach is needed to align R3 zoning with Mountain View's housing goals. We urge the Council to take this opportunity to strengthen the framework and ensure it enables—not restricts—the housing the City needs for all its residents to thrive.

SV@Home remains committed to supporting the City in this effort and looks forward to continued partnership.

Sincerely,



Regina Celestin Williams  
Executive Director

Manuel Salazar  
Housing Planning and Production Associate  
SV@Home  
Pronouns: He/Him



**Silicon Valley Is Home. Join our Houser Movement. [Become a member!](#)**  
[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

**Board of Directors**

Aubrey Merriman, *Chair*  
*LifeMoves*  
Nevada Merriman, *Vice Chair*  
*MidPen Housing Corporation*

Randy Tsuda, *Treasurer*  
*Alta Housing*

Pilar Lorenzana, *Secretary*  
*Silicon Valley Community*  
*Foundation*

Steven Yang  
*Northern CA LIIF*

Candice Gonzalez  
*Sand Hill Property Company*  
Chad Bojorquez  
*Destination: Home*

Maria Noel Fernandez  
*Working Partnerships USA*

Alison Brunner  
*Law Foundation of Silicon*  
*Valley*

Victor Vasquez  
*SOMOS Mayfair*

Julie Mahowald  
*Housing Trust Silicon Valley*

Wendi Baker  
*Harmonie Park Development*

Staff Regina Celestin Williams  
*Executive Director*

**Via Email**

June 24, 2025  
City of Mountain View  
500 Castro Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041

**Subject: SV@Home Recommendations on the R3 Zoning District Update**

Dear Mayor Kamei and City Council Members,

On behalf of SV@Home, we appreciate the City's continued efforts to advance the R3 Zoning District Update. The progress made to date demonstrates a serious commitment to meeting Mountain View's housing goals.

However, we believe that the current framework needs to go further to support the level of housing production required under the Housing Element and needed for the City and all its residents to thrive.

**Positive Steps We Support**

We acknowledge and support the following components of staff's proposal:

- **Inclusion of additional infill and adjacent sites**—such as condominiums, townhouses, and small sites—expands eligibility and reflects a more flexible zoning approach.
- **Designation of Option 1 (75–110 du/acre) zoning** in key locations such as Del Medio, Continental/Dale, Evelyn/Calderon, and Central Park Apartments. These higher densities are appropriate and feasible in these areas.

**Key Areas for Strengthening**

However, despite these improvements, several of our previous recommendations remain unaddressed or insufficiently incorporated. We feel that these omissions undermine the policy's ability to support production, especially of affordable housing. These include:

- **No feasibility analysis accompanies the zoning tiers.** Without clarity on how density options translate into buildable projects, particularly on smaller or constrained sites, it is difficult to assess whether this framework will deliver the intended outcomes.
- **Additional Opportunities:** Key study areas—such as parcels near mobile home parks, R2-adjacent sites, low-lot coverage redevelopment parcels, and sites near the Downtown Transit Center—should be included to fully align with the RHNA potential of this Housing Element program.
- **Tenant protections are not integrated** into the zoning framework. We have *consistently advocated that increased development potential be paired with anti-displacement measures*, including right-to-return provisions, enhanced relocation assistance, and a permanent replacement ordinance for rent-stabilized units.

June 24, 2025

RE: SV@Home Recommendations on the R3 Zoning District Update

Page 2 of 2

### **Our Recommendations**

The City's Housing Element calls for expanded capacity in multifamily districts. While the R3 update represents progress, it lacks the scale, clarity, and coordination necessary to fully realize that goal.

We recommend the following actions to strengthen the framework:

1. **Conduct and release a feasibility analysis** to confirm that the proposed density tiers are workable and financially viable within 18 months, serving as an opportunity to examine the performance of R3 zoning in achieving City goals.
2. **Include the additional study areas** identified in our prior letter, including sites adjacent to mobile homes, R2 parcels, and the Downtown Transit Center.
3. **Codify and align tenant protections** with zoning changes, ensuring vulnerable households are not displaced as redevelopment occurs.

### **Final Thoughts**

Zoning is more than a regulatory tool—it is a policy signal. A bolder, more integrated approach is needed to align R3 zoning with Mountain View's housing goals. We urge the Council to take this opportunity to strengthen the framework and ensure it enables—not restricts—the housing the City needs for all its residents to thrive.

SV@Home remains committed to supporting the City in this effort and looks forward to continued partnership.

Sincerely,



Regina Celestin Williams  
Executive Director

*Silicon Valley @ Home is a nonprofit advocacy organization that supports housing and affordable housing development throughout Santa Clara County. SV@Home works with a broad coalition of strategic partners to address the urgent housing needs of the diverse residents across all our communities. We advocate for solutions including increasing production of homes at all income levels, especially affordable housing; preserving existing affordable housing; and protecting our community's most vulnerable residents from displacement.*



---

**From:** Ali Sapirman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:34 PM  
**To:** City Council  
**Cc:** , City Clerk; , Planning Division; Corey Smith  
**Subject:** HAC Comment Letter on 8.2 R3 Rezoning  
**Attachments:** HAC Comment Letter on Item 8.2\_ R3 Rezoning update.pdf

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

Dear Mayor Kamei, Council, and staff,

Please see the attached comment letter on item 8.2 R3 Rezoning. Please reach out with questions or concerns.

In solidarity,

--

**Ali Sapirman** | Pronouns: They/Them

Advocacy & Policy Manager | Housing Action Coalition



To opt out of all HAC emails, respond to this email with "unsubscribe all".



June 23, 2025

Dear Mayor Kamei, Council, and City Staff,

**RE: Strengthening the R3 Zoning Update to Accelerate Housing Production in Mountain View**

The Housing Action Coalition shares and supports many of the comments submitted by our partners at SV@Home, and we offer the following perspective with an added focus on maximizing housing production opportunities in the R3 Zoning District.

We commend Mountain View for its continued work on the R3 Zoning District Update. These reforms are essential for achieving the housing production goals outlined in the City's Housing Element.

We support several important proposals in the staff recommendation:

- Expanding eligible sites to include townhomes, condominiums, and small infill parcels increases flexibility and development potential.
- Applying Option 1 zoning (75–110 du/acre) in strategic areas like Del Medio, Continental/Dale, Evelyn/Calderon, and the Central Park Apartments corridor is an appropriate and necessary step to enable mid-rise, transit-oriented housing.

To better align with the City's housing targets, we recommend the following improvements:

- **Feasibility Analysis:** Evaluate whether proposed density tiers are financially viable—particularly on constrained sites—so they translate into actual housing projects.
- **Expand Eligible Areas:** Include additional sites near mobile home parks, R2 parcels, low-lot coverage properties, and the Downtown Transit Center to fully utilize R3's capacity.
- **Integrate Tenant Protections:** Ensure redevelopment is coupled with right-to-return, relocation support, and protections for rent-stabilized units to prevent displacement.

**Conclusion**

Zoning is a key lever for meeting Mountain View's ambitious housing targets. By advancing a more feasible, inclusive, and production-oriented R3 framework, the City can create more homes for people at all income levels while protecting existing residents.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Cynthia", is written over a light blue rectangular background.



555 Montgomery Street  
Suite 720  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
[info@housingactioncoalition.org](mailto:info@housingactioncoalition.org)  
[housingactioncoalition.org](http://housingactioncoalition.org)

**Corey Smith**, *Executive Director*  
Housing Action Coalition (HAC)

*Ali Sapirman*

**Ali Sapirman**, *Policy & Advocacy Manager*  
Housing Action Coalition (HAC)

---

**From:** David F Watson  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 7:52 PM  
**To:** Kamei, Ellen; Clark, Chris; McAlister, John; Ramirez, Lucas; Hicks, Alison; Showalter, Pat; Ramos, Emily Ann  
**Cc:** City Council; McCarthy, Kimbra  
**Subject:** 2025.06.24 Item 8.2 R3 Reconsideration  
**Attachments:** 2025.06.24 Item 8.2 R3 Reconsideration.pdf

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

Dear Mayor Kamei and City Councilmembers,

We favor applying Option 1 (R3-D2) to all R3 Change Areas. As we explain below, we believe this would lead to an actual project height of 5–6 stories, which is reasonable to achieve the goals of the R3 Zoning District Update. Furthermore, given that the present agenda item will determine CEQA clearance but not the actual rezoning, it is to the city’s advantage to pursue a more ambitious plan. We support the Council's decision to analyze the full potential of the R3 change areas. Since this vote sets the ceiling for environmental review and not the final zoning, it is fiscally and procedurally wise to study the impacts of Option 1 now. This foresight provides the city with maximum flexibility for future decisions and prevents the costly delays that would be caused by needing to amend the environmental review later on. This is a sign of responsible, forward-looking governance

The March staff memo described Option 1 (R3-D2) as six stories and Option 2A (R3-D1) as four stories. R3 currently has a three-story height limit; adding just one more story does not seem to provide enough incentive for redevelopment, given the high costs of construction and financing.

While the state density bonus in combination with Option 1 could legally allow 8-9 story buildings, current development trends indicate that most developers would not exceed 5-6 stories given the higher building costs; the slow nature of building code changes and the high cost of construction makes this a safe assumption to hold. Requiring developers to invoke the density bonus on Option 2A in order to reach the 5-6 story mark functionally directs them to use the density bonus’ waivers and concessions against city standards, negating the effort invested in the existing standards as well as future standards contemplated in the Council Workplan.

The Council faces a clear choice on how future housing gets built. Adopting the lower base density of Option 2A would ensure that most viable projects *must* use the State Density Bonus, forcing the city to accept waivers from our own local design standards. In contrast, Option 1 provides a realistic path for developers to build 5-6 story projects that can conform to the city's vision and rules. This vote is a choice between housing guided by Mountain View's standards or housing shaped by state law concessions.

Choosing Option 2A now would also mean environmental review would cover a smaller number of units. If the council chose to increase the number of units later, this might necessitate EIR amendments, which would delay this project further.

Best Regards,  
David Watson  
On behalf of Mountain View YIMBY