

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Deepank Gupta
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2016 9:28 AM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning; Denis, Melinda
Subject: Concerns regarding development proposal for 129 Flynn Ave.

Hi Eric, Melinda,

I wish to share my concerns regarding the development proposal for 129 Flynn Avenue. Please take these into consideration before the approval for the development proposal.

1. In the current proposal, 8 units are being planned on this property. The property is better suited for 6 units and too many units will lessen the appeal of the neighbourhood. Also the units are too close to existing homes potentially creating a fire hazard.
2. In the proposal, the cars will be entering and leaving from Flynn. Can you please request the development to allow cars in and out of Middlefield since the property extends from Flynn to Middlefield.
3. Foundations for nearby homes could be significantly compromised due to the digging of underground parking garage. As a neighboring home owner, I would request you to require the builder to take the necessary precautions to avoid the damage to the foundation of neighboring complexes.

Thanks & Regards,
Deepank Gupta

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Sia Bartell
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 10:56 AM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: 186 E Middlefield/129 Flynn Project

Eric/Melinda,

Writing to express our deep concern over a few matters pertaining to the 186 E Middlefield/129 Flynn Project

The building is still way too high, with the attic and high underground parking, it appears to be almost a story higher than the surrounding buildings. This makes it appear as a three-level complex, does not fit in with the neighborhood. As homeowners living next door, at 123 Flynn, the building will block out our our sunlight and view. We ask that you get rid of the attics and lower the parking garage, to minimize the height of the massive buildings.

We also ask that you require the builder to route the traffic out of Middlefield, not Flynn, as he owns the full length of the property, and many parents with young kids on our street are very concerned with the additional cars on Flynn ave.

Furthermore, we have been advised by an architect residing in our complex, that the underground parking garage as planned will impact our foundation and cause our units to lean, likely condemning them. Is this true? What is the process for evaluating if this will happen? Does this happen later in the development review process? Please advise. Also, please include a stipulation that the builder is required to dig in a manner that will not impact the foundation of surrounding units.

Thank you
Best regards,
Aspasia Bartell and Pascal Clark
Middlefield Meadows Homeowners

--
Aspasia Bartell

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: William George
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 8:25 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Cc: Denis, Melinda
Subject: Development at 129 Flynn Ave, Mountain View

Dear Sirs,

I am a resident at

I would like to voice my concern regarding the proposed development on 129 Flynn Ave. I would prefer that the driveway would be located on Middlefield rather than Flynn because the increased traffic on Flynn endangers the children and pedestrians on Flynn.

According to local architects, the property is better suited for 6 units rather than 8. Also, the architects after reviewing the plans determined that underground digging of the parking garage may compromise the integrity of foundation in the properties next door.

Please give consideration of these concerns. Thank you.

Sincerely,

William George

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Luis Mederos
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 7:28 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning; Denis, Melinda
Subject: 129 Flynn Ave development concerns

Greetings

After researching the proposed development on 129 Flynn that straddles both Flynn and Middlefield, we have several concerns about it.

Specifically:

1. It appears that there will only be access from the Flynn side. Flynn is a quiet street that many residents use to walk and take strolls with their children. Having the proposed unit / vehicles would add a significant amount of traffic. We propose and request that the access in/out of the property should be through Middlefield which has capacity to handle the traffic without completely altering the character of the street, whereas it would alter the character of Flynn Avenue.
2. The proposed number of units seems excessive (8 units) for the proposed size. We propose that the property is more suited for 6 units; otherwise the construction will be tall in contrast to properties around it.

Thank you in advance.

-- Luis Mederos

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: David Chan <
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 11:07 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning; r
Subject: Our concerns on 129 Flynn Ave housing project development proposal

Hi,

I am expressing my concern on the housing development proposal for 129 Flynn Ave.

My home is very close to the housing project. As I set through meetings, I am getting more concerns on how this housing project will affect my life and my living conditions in this area. The potential issues of creating underground parking garage will significantly compromise the foundations of surrounding houses nearby.

I am requesting to have the development allow cars in and out of Middlefield Road. The new property owner owns the property from Flynn to Middlefield Road. Cars should be allowed to enter and exit on Middlefield Road.

In addition, I am requesting the city should require the builder to take the most precautions to avoid any damage to the foundation of nearby complexes.

Thanks,

David Chan

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Susan Mann <
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 6:05 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning; Denis, Melinda
Subject: Concerned about development at 126 Flynn Ave.

Hello, Eric and Melinda -

I have lived on Flynn Ave. (Middlefield Meadows) for over 30 years now. I am very concerned that the new proposal for 8 units to be built at 126 Flynn, will increase traffic too much for neighborhood, it is already at its limit. There is also mis-leading info on the sign posted at 126 Flynn, it implies cars may be coming in/out of M.field, which is simply not the case, as I understand it, it is all to be on Flynn Ave. Other concerns are the fact that development will be taller than current 2-story surrounding properties (due to underground garage).

And I've also heard the excavation for the underground garages may affect neighboring properties' foundations, is this true? This is unimaginable.

Thank you,

Susan Mann

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Steven Levine
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 7:10 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Housing Development Proposed at 129 Flynn Avenue

4/25/2016

Re: Housing Development Proposed at 129 Flynn Avenue/186 Middlefield Road, Mountain View, CA

Dear Mr. Anderson,

This is to let you know about our strong opposition to the proposed housing development at the site of 129 Flynn Avenue, Mountain View, CA. The development that is being proposed for this site is a multilevel 8 unit housing complex with underground parking.

This proposed project is clearly being jammed into too small a space and is not appropriate. The site currently has only a small single family home situated on a small lot. The project will negatively affect the quality of life for its immediate neighbors and further add to an already overcrowded area. The address is said to be listed as 186 Middlefield Road, but the flow of traffic in and out is to be on Flynn Avenue. This will significantly add to street traffic. The project will negatively change the nature of the residential area as originally designed.

Please do not allow this badly thought out overdeveloped project to proceed.

Respectfully,
Steven Levine and Mindy Nguyen

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Violeta Diaz
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 8:52 AM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning; Denis, Melinda
Subject: Housing development proposal for 129 Flynn Ave.

I will not be able to attend the meeting on April 27, but I do want to voice some of my concerns about the proposed development:

1. The units currently planned may lessen the appeal of the neighborhood due to being too many.
2. The high underground parking will push the units far above others on the block.
3. The proposed units will be too close to existing homes, presenting a potential fire hazard.
4. Since the new owner owns the property from Middlefield to Flynn, it would be preferable to have cars come in and out from both streets, rather than to concentrate it only on Flynn Ave.
5. Last, but not least, we have been advised by architects in the neighborhood that DIGGING FOR THE UNDERGROUND PARKING GARAGE COULD SIGNIFICANTLY COMPROMISE OUR FOUNDATIONS.

Thank you for your attention to this message.

Violeta Diaz

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Wasson Quan
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 8:03 PM
To: Melinda Denis; Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Development on 129 Flynn Ave

Dear Ms. Denis and Mr. Anderson

We are concerned by the proposed development slated for the 129 Flynn property between Middlefield and Flynn Ave for the following reasons:

- 1) Street traffic has steadily increased over the years and the demographics of Flynn Ave has changed substantially. There are many more children in the area.
- 2) The ingress and egress to the development should be on Middlefield and not on Flynn Ave. The Flynn Ave entrance/exit to the new development will add additional traffic to the growing traffic problem on Flynn Ave.
- 4) Flynn Ave is also used for parking by many residents residing on Flynn Ave which adds to the congestion and also reduces visibility for residents leaving their residences as they have to turn on to Flynn.
- 5) There was a death of a motorcyclist (> 10 years) on Flynn Ave even when there was less traffic.
- 6) The removal of the heritage trees is very upsetting and unacceptable to us and not in concert with keeping our green environment

In summary, we the homeowners of the Rock Creek community feel strongly that the proposed development be scaled down in the number of units and the ingress and egress be located on Middlefield Ave.

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Wasson Quan | Julie Stephenson |
| Mountain View, CA | Mountain View CA 94043 |
| Doug Gor | Barbara Sato |
| Mountain View CA | Mountain View CA |
| Norm Vachowiak | Rich Wallace |
| Mountain View CA | Mountain View CA |
| Juliet Lundy | Celine Hsieh |
| Mountain View CA 94043 | Mountain View CA 94043 |
| Dunagan Pearson | Jennie Liu |
| Mountain View CA | Mountain View CA |
| Karen Heggie | Kathy Taylor |

Mountain View CA

Mountain View CA

Lev Kantorovskiy

Mountain View CA 94043

Stephanie Kemp

Mountain View CA 94043

Nicky Sherwood

Mountain View CA 94043

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Zhenhua Luo <
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2016 9:58 AM
To: Denis, Melinda; Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Negative impact of development 129 Flynn Avenue Mountain View

Dear Melinda and Eric,

As you may well be aware, a development proposal for new construction is underway in our village, Mountain View, adjoining our building 129 Flynn Avenue. This local change will have substantial negative impact on our environment and quality of life on several grounds, as follows:

Inclusion of an underground parking garage:

(a) The proposed first floor will be at an elevation some three (3) feet above that of our building on account of ventilation requirements. Current city regulations limit the height of a new fence to the order of six (6) feet only. Hence our privacy would be an issue. It may be that the developer will propose a tree-plantation program to counter this exposure, but then this approach would significantly block sunlight, air flow, and view.

(b) On a technical level, we have to be very vigilant for any detrimental impact (e.g., local settlement, cracking) that may precipitate in our building during their construction, or thereafter, thus undermining the integrity of our premises.

Privacy and Environmental Impact

All buildings in this residential area are two floors, similar height and no underground parking. However, this proposal with additional underground parking is designed much higher than our neighborhood's buildings, which will strongly impact our privacy. It would be great if this coming construction could copy the style of the neighborhood by designing attached or detached parking garages on the ground.

Moreover, the proposal may set a precedent in the future with similar/"copycat" developments to proceed in the absence of prior consultation with adjacent residents. We have a wonderful neighborhood community and environment here; We should not allow it be taken over by this proposal that will evidently ruin its unique charm and characteristics

Zoning Regulations

The developer intends to construct eight (8) units in this proposal. Based on our local City Zoning Code R3-2, we have determined the size of the land permits the construction of only six (6) units thus exposing a clear violation in this case.

LEED and Green Issues

The proposal incorporates the removal of six (6) heritage trees which is an excessive quantity based on lot size. In view of the current universal obligation of enhancing greenery and air quality, protection of heritage trees should be every local resident's responsibility.

In summary, I trust I have your consent in blocking this proposal in its tracks with the aim of maintaining the delectable residential neighborhood that we have all been accustomed to and vehemently wish to protect.

Sincerely,

Zhenhua Luo, Yingjiong He, Grace He & Andrew He

Mountain View

California 94043

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Yingyu Wan <
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2016 10:14 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning; Denis, Melinda
Subject: DEEP concerns about development 129 Flynn Avenue and 186. Middlefield Road Mountain View

Dear Mr. Eric Anderson and Ms. Melinda Denis,

We are sharing our DEEP concerns about the development plan at 129 Flynn Avenue. The plan will put life risk for the neighbors and negatively impact the environment.

First of all, we don't have underground parking in neighbors. The foundation of all building is very shallow. Digging a huge hole for underground parking will inevitably affect the foundation, which can potentially cause crack, and eventually crash of the buildings. This may not be obvious in the first few years, because the impact on soil will take effect slowly. But it could happen after a few years. Who will take the responsibility to protect the life and property of neighbors?

Second, the drive exit to Flynn avenue will increase the traffic on the road significantly, and potentially increase the risk to the life of neighbors. As we know, the lot from Flynn avenue to Middlefield road is owned by the same owner. The question is why not open the drive exit to Middlefield road?

Third, our local city zoning code is R3-2. Based on the lot size of the plan, only up to SIX units are permitted for construction. But the plan has EIGHT units, which is a clear violation.

Last but not least, the proposal incorporates removal of six heritage trees which is an excessive quantity based on the lot size. In view of the current universal obligation of enhancing greenery and air quality, protection of heritage trees should be every local resident's responsibility.

In summary, we hope you will agree with us on the above points. Imagine that you live in our community. Will you have the same concerns? We are asking to block the proposal to protect the environment, the neighbor life and property.

Sincerely,
Sean and Jing

Mountain View

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Brent Scopinich
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2016 7:31 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning; Denis, Melinda
Subject: negative impact of development 129 Flynn Avenue and 186. Middlefield Road Mountain View

Dear Mr. Eric Anderson & Ms. Melinda Denis:

As you may well be aware, a development proposal for new construction is underway in our village, Mountain View, adjoining our building 129 Flynn Avenue. This local change will have substantial negative impact on our environment and quality of life on several grounds, as follows:

Inclusion of an underground parking garage:

(a) The proposed first floor will be at an elevation some three (3) feet above that of our building on account of ventilation requirements. Current city regulations limit the height of a new fence to the order of six (6) feet only. Hence our privacy would be an issue. It may be that the developer will propose a tree-plantation program to counter this exposure, but then this approach would significantly block sunlight, air flow, and view.

(b) On a technical level, we have to be very vigilant for any detrimental impact (e.g., local settlement, cracking) that may precipitate in our building during their construction, or thereafter, thus undermining the integrity of our premises.

Environmental Impact

All buildings in this residential area are two floors, similar height and no underground parking. The proposal may set a precedent in the future with similar/"copycat" developments to proceed in the absence of prior consultation with adjacent residents. We have a wonderful neighborhood community and environment here; We should not allow it be taken over by this proposal that will evidently ruin its unique charm and characteristics

Zoning Regulations

The developer intends to construct eight (8) units in this proposal. Based on our local City Zoning Code R3-2, we have determined the size of the land permits the construction of only six (6) units thus exposing a clear violation in this case.

LEED and Green Issues

The proposal incorporates the removal of six (6) heritage trees which is an excessive quantity based on lot size. In view of the current universal obligation of enhancing greenery and air quality, protection of heritage trees should be every local resident's responsibility.

In summary, I trust I have your consent in blocking this proposal in its tracks with the aim of maintaining the delectable residential neighborhood that we have all been accustomed to and vehemently wish to protect.

Sincerely,

Brent Scopinich

Mountain View
California 94043

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Xiadan Wang
Sent: Saturday, April 23, 2016 7:28 PM
To: Denis, Melinda; Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Negative impact of development 129 Flynn Avenue and 186. Middlefield Road Mountain View

Dear Mr. Eric Anderson & Ms. Melinda Denis:

As you may well be aware, a development proposal for new construction is underway in our village, Mountain View, adjoining our building 129 Flynn Avenue. This local change will have substantial negative impact on our environment and quality of life on several grounds, as follows:

Inclusion of an underground parking garage:

(a) The proposed first floor will be at an elevation some three (3) feet above that of our building on account of ventilation requirements. Current city regulations limit the height of a new fence to the order of six (6) feet only. Hence our privacy would be an issue. It may be that the developer will propose a tree-plantation program to counter this exposure, but then this approach would significantly block sunlight, air flow, and view.

(b) On a technical level, we have to be very vigilant for any detrimental impact (e.g., local settlement, cracking) that may precipitate in our building during their construction, or thereafter, thus undermining the integrity of our premises.

Environmental Impact

All buildings in this residential area are two floors, similar height and no underground parking. The proposal may set a precedent in the future with similar/"copycat" developments to proceed in the absence of prior consultation with adjacent residents. We have a wonderful neighborhood community and environment here; We should not allow it be taken over by this proposal that will evidently ruin its unique charm and characteristics

Zoning Regulations

The developer intends to construct eight (8) units in this proposal. Based on our local City Zoning Code R3-2, we have determined the size of the land permits the construction of only six (6) units thus exposing a clear violation in this case.

LEED and Green Issues

The proposal incorporates the removal of six (6) heritage trees which is an excessive quantity based on lot size. In view of the current universal obligation of enhancing greenery and air quality, protection of heritage trees should be every local resident's responsibility.

In summary, I trust I have your consent in blocking this proposal in its tracks with the aim of maintaining the delectable residential neighborhood that we have all been accustomed to and vehemently wish to protect.

Sincerely,

Danxia Wang

Mountain View
California 94043

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Kun Huang
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 11:59 AM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Concerns on construction plan on 186 E Middlefield Rd

Dear Mr. Anderson,

We are the homeowners of _____ to the proposed development and we want to express some of our concerns. We would want to hear back from you about these concerns.

1. We realized that the development plan includes underground parking, which is rarely saw in this area. We consulted a friend who is an architecture and she pointed out that the large hole that will be created for underground parking may greatly affect our foundation since the hole will only be about 30 to 40 feet from our buildings. Our building is constructed in early 1970s, we have a serious concern that this underground parking will damage the structure of our building and put our life and property in danger. We hope that it could be change to on the ground parking.
2. If the underground parking is approved, we want to see plans on how to make sure the neighborhood building is not influenced. Also, we want a reduction of the parking ventilation height and attic height. The current plan will make the building much higher than its neighbor, which is a big influence on the harmony of the appearance of the community.
3. Our architecture friend also point out that the zoning code for this property only allows 5-6 units for such a lot size. However, the plan indicates 8 units. Could you explain why there is a violation of zoning code for this construction? We want the construction to be reduce to 6 units because 8 unit in such a compact lot size will have a significant increment on traffic density, noise, etc.
4. From the construction plan, we saw that most of the heritage trees will be taken down. Is there a violation here?

Best,
Kun and Jay

Anderson, Eric - Planning

Subject: FW: Building construction

From: leonid rappoport [1]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 2:58 PM
To: Denis, Melinda
Subject: Building construction

Dear Melinda,

Let me express my opinion about new buildings construction on the Flynn Avenue. Of course, we understand an importance of such construction but some changes should be introduced into existing project.

First of all, it concerns the reduction of amount the apartments, and decrease of cars amount accordingly. Flynn Avenue is very narrow, and it overfilled by cars already. Taking into account a habit of some owners (and guests) to leave their cars on the street, we can imagine the possible consequences.

The accidents occurred already because people from Google use Flynn Avenue also.

Due to same reason, the exit from the underground garage should be developed onto Middlefield road.

Another negative effect in the result of increase the amount of cars, is a problem of air contamination. The wind isn't "working " in Flynn Avenue due to its unique location. We live at Flynn Avenue more than 20 years, and watched the air's stagnation many times.

Actually, the problem could be formulated by thus. What is more important: to provide the developers by the additional millions dollars in the result of excessive density of construction, or to preserve the health and quality of life for tens of people living in vicinity.

Sincerely, Leonid Rappoport ,

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Peggy Prendergast <
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 5:47 AM
To: Denis, Melinda; Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: More concerns with 129 Flynn Ave.

Hello Melinda and Eric,

Thank you for the email about the meeting change for the zoning administration.

In talking to a growing group of concerned neighbors, the impact of digging a large hole so close to our properties is being discussed. Fortunately we have two neighbors that are architects so they are obviously trained in this area. They said such a large hole only 30 to 40 feet from our actual homes can negatively impact our foundation. They stated with even with soil remediation, this could be a huge potential problem to our buildings. My neighbor said her grandparents home had to be demolished because of a similar issue. It tilted so much it became unlivable.

Second, one homeowner pointed out the question of zoning. Is 129 Flynn R2 or R3? She says it is R2 which then calls into question the number of units that are allowed to be built. Can you please clarify?

Third more homeowners continue to be concerned over the height. While we are aware there will not be a third story, the height still overshadows the rest of the buildings on Flynn by a significant amount.

Lastly, in our first meeting with the architect we were told that entrances and exits could not be built in and out of Middlefield because that side of the property had a different owner. We now know this is not true. DeNardi Group owns the property from Flynn to Middlefield. We would like the architect to reconsider entrance and exit from Middlefield.

You are still welcome to visit the site with me so I can point out exactly what we are referring to in terms of height, distance and size. I will make myself available any time.

Best,

Peggy Prendergast

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Kun Huang <
Sent: Saturday, April 02, 2016 3:58 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Concern about the height and numbers of units for construction on 186 Middlefield

Dear Mr. Anderson,

We are the homeowners of [redacted] to the proposed development and we want to express some of our concerns about the current proposed 8 unit development.

First of all, we appreciate that our concerns about the original plan of 3 stories has been addressed. However, we think that 8 units will be too crowded for such a small lot size. It is going to influence the life quality of the people who will live here and our neighbours. Moreover, we were informed that all 8 families will be driving in and out of Flynn Ave. The entrance will be right next to our window. We have a very strong concern that at least 16 cars in and out everyday will be very disturbing to our quality of life.

We hope that you can understand our concerns. We would greatly appreciate that the city zoning committee approve 6 units instead of 8 units. In addition, we would like more space/yardage between our homes and the new development.

We are brand new homeowners of this property - we purchased our condo in October, just 6 months ago. One of the major reasons we choose to settle down in this part of Mountain View is the nice environment and quiet, pleasant neighborhood. We paid a lot of extra money for that willingly in the purchase of our home. We think it is a great place to live for the past 6 months, and we are pretty sure that our neighbors enjoy Flynn Avenue as much as we do. We would love to see the new development accommodate more families but we also want to make sure that this neighborhood is a pleasant place to live for everyone.

We are looking forward for your response.

Best Regards,
Kun and Jay

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Nina Nguyen
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 7:33 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: 186 E Middlefield Rd and Fynn Avenue

Dear Eric,

I am writing to you as a resident of _____ and my concerns for the project at 186 E Middlefield Rd. The project will be parallel to my home and will obstruct the view from our front yard and from our second story window.

As a homeowner of this property of approximately 11 years, I do not look forward to this new construction as we are currently able to see the redwood trees and far into the distance. I am concerned that the construction and height of this new property will obstruct the view and change the skyline of our property.

I understand there will be a meeting tomorrow and plan to attend to represent the neighborhood.

Thank you and kind regards,

Nina Nguyen

Anderson, Eric - Planning

Subject: FW: Urgent!! 186 E Middlefield Development Project

From: ;
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 4:21 AM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Re: Urgent!! 186 E Middlefield Development Project

Dear Eric Anderson,

Writing again to reiterate our deep concern over the dimensions of the 186 E. Middlefield development project. I cannot attend tomorrow's meeting.

Our unit borders the proposed development. Again, we are very concerned with having these units so close to the property line and the 3 story height of the development, as this combination will block sunlight and obstruct our view.

Also, from the proposed project development sign posted on Flynn Ave, it appears as if the underground garage is not indeed underground, but is adding another level? Can you please confirm if this is true? Any building with more than 2 stories will block sunlight from our unit.

Given the size of the property, we also feel that 6 units are more appropriate than 8.

Please convey our concerns to the DRC and to the council before the vote .

Sincerely,
Aspasia Bartell and Pascal Clark
Middlefield Meadows Homeowners

Mountain View, CA 94043

Anderson, Eric - Planning

Subject: FW: Invitation to visit our neighborhood on Flynn Ave.

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2016 1:21 PM

To: Denis, Melinda

Subject: Invitation to visit our neighborhood on Flynn Ave.

Hello Melinda,

One behalf of my neighbors and I, we would like to invite you and your 2 colleagues to visit our condo complexes and the area around the proposed development on 186 Middlefield before the March 16th DRC meeting.

We will accommodate your schedule. We feel it is very important that all of you get a sense of our street and why we feel so strongly that 3 stories and 8 units are just too much for such a small property. We believe once you walk around, see the redwood groves and observe the height of the current buildings all of you will understand why we are very worried about the plans as they are now.

I understand it can be very frustrating for Bill Maston to keep making changes for one year but we all will live with this development for the rest of our lives. Many of my neighbors just bought in the last two year.

Our message and request to Bill has been consistent - please keep the development to two stories like all the other buildings on Flynn and trim the number of units to 5 or 6.

Also we are afraid the name of the development is misleading. Since the project is on Flynn is there any way to change the development of the project to Flynn Ave instead of Middlefield?

Please kindly forward this email to your colleagues if you don't mind. I do not have their email addresses.

We look forward to meeting you.

Best,
Peggy Prendergast
Homeowner

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Lisa Moore
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2016 7:45 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Development at 186 Middlefield

Hello Eric,

It might not be possible for me to attend, so I wanted to share with you that, as president of the Country Village Homeowners Association located next door to the proposed development, we are very concerned with the height of the proposed development. Three stories is totally out of character with the neighborhood. Also, the developer has not responded to the neighborhood's request to meet again to discuss what they have planned to take to the DRC, now scheduled for tomorrow.

Many thanks,

Lisa Moore
Recorder, WWNA
President, Country Village Homeowners Association

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Vladimir Bassin <
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2016 9:21 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Development on Flynn Ave.

Hello Mr. Anderson,

I would like to bring you my opinion regarding 3-storey development on Flynn Ave. As I said at the presentation of this project, I like this project, but I strongly oppose to the 3-storey buildings. There are two major reasons to oppose:

1. There are no 3-storey buildings in the whole street and according to my understanding it does not fit to the street view.
2. 3-storey buildings will destroy the view from our windows and will violate our privacy. It will dramatically decrease the value of our properties.

Best regards,
Vladimir Bassin.

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Sia Bartell
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2016 8:44 PM
To: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Urgent!! 186 E Middlefield Development Project

Dear Eric Anderson,

We are writing to convey our deep concern over the dimensions of the 186 E Middlefield Development Project.

As residents of Middlefield Meadows, our unit is one of those sharing the border with the proposed development. After seeing the building plans, we strongly feel that 8 units is too dense for the size of the property.

We are concerned that the building would be too close. Having these units so close to our property line will block sunlight and obstruct our view, especially considering the proposed 3 story height of the construction. Given the size of the property, we feel 6 units would be more appropriate than 8.

Please convey our concerns to the council before the vote.

Sincerely,

Aspasia Bartell and Pascal Clark
Middlefield Meadows Homeowners

123 Flynn Ave, Unit C
Mountain View, CA 94043

(206) 779-5634

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Lisa Matichak <
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 1:07 PM
To: Denis, Melinda; David Sabalvaro
Cc: Anderson, Eric - Planning
Subject: Input from the Wagon Wheel Neighborhood Assn. on 186 E. Middlefield

Dear members of the DRC,

186 E Middlefield is within the boundaries of the Wagon Wheel Neighborhood Association (WWNA) in the Northeastern part of Mountain View. The Wagon Wheel Neighborhood Association comprises just over 1,000 homes. We are a very active neighborhood association not only in terms of proposed development in the area, but also in terms of social events, CERT and more.

The WWNA held two meetings with the architect to discuss the proposed development prior to the first DRC meeting. In addition, we were present at the first DRC meeting and shared our input. We were very pleased to hear the DRC concerns at that meeting since they aligned well with our concerns.

The applicant does not appear to have responded to the input from the DRC and the WWNA. Specifically:

- The proposed development still looks like one monolithic house rather than individual units, and is still out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood.
- The third stories still exist despite direction to remove the third stories as they change the character of the neighborhood.
- The mass of this proposed development is too much for this site and this neighborhood. It needs to be reduced.
- The roofs still span multiple units rather than individual roofs for each unit.
- The courtyard areas are still very busy with trellises, planters and more, and are still very confining.
- The front entrance is still not recognizable nor inviting.

We are a bit puzzled as to why this proposed development is before the DRC again when so little has changed. Significant changes are needed prior to the next DRC meeting.

Thank you for hearing the concerns of the neighborhood.

If one of you could please forward this email to the third member of the DRC, we would appreciate it. We do not have their email address.

On behalf of the WWNA,

Lisa Matichak, President
Kelley Ketchmark, Vice President
Gary Rosen, Treasurer
Lisa Moore, Recorder
Matt Footer, Board member at large
Scott Haber, Board member at large
Gabrielle Heilek, Board member at large

Anderson, Eric - Planning

Subject:

FW: Voice from Residents Living in
CA

Mountain View,

Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 4:23 PM

To: Anderson, Eric - Planning

Subject: Voice from Residents Living in 114 East Middlefield Road, Unit C, Mountain View, CA

Dear Eric,

This is Zhenhua Luo, Yingjiong He and Grace He living in Mountain View, CA.

We've been living here for 1.5 years. Our home is directly on the boundary of the future development.

One of the reasons we moved here is the beautiful and quiet neighborhood – three one-story houses with many beautiful redwood trees. Everyday we are enjoying rural landscape view without any visual blocking.

However, ever since the architect showed us the future development plan, our peaceful life gets totally changed. Now we are so worried about our living quality strongly impacted.

First of all, instead of current one-story house, there will be three-level buildings built in the neighborhood. With additional basement parking level, it will be totally four levels next to our two-level houses. To us they are not environmental friendly, since they will highly block the sunlight, and also give us high pressure mentally. To the whole Flynn Avenue, they are not visually friendly – the extreme height will destroy the harmony of the overall street view.

Secondly, we are quite worried about the density of the future construction. Per current plan eight families will move to this small lot. That will increase the traffic load heavily, increase the sound pollution, as well as reduce the green coverage a lot. In our mind, six homes are the maximum load. Eight families are way too much for this small lot.

We totally understand that on city's perspective it is important to provide as much living space as possible. However, in the meantime, please care about our existing residents' feeling and living quality. Please don't decrease our life quality too much; don't remove too many green areas from us; don't destroy the beautiful and harmonious memory for the kids growing up here.

Again we wish you could listen to our voice. We don't want too high density – six units is a reasonable occupancy we can accept; we don't want too high buildings – two stories is a comfortable height for us. All in one, we are expecting a friendly, harmonious and peaceful neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Zhenhua Luo

Yingjiong He

Grace He

Anderson, Eric - Planning

Subject: FW: Strong concerns about the development plan at 186 E Middlefield Road

From: Yingyu Wan [mailto:~]

Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 10:41 PM

To: Anderson, Eric - Planning

Subject: Strong concerns about the development plan at 186 E Middlefield Road

Hello Eric,

Happy Holiday!

We are Sean and Jing who are living in building just next to our home.

..... New buildings at 186 E Middlefield will be

We want to show our strong will of being against the current plan. Especially on:

1. We do hope the third story would be removed.
2. We do have concern on high landscape which will be standing between 114E and 118E.

We are against these two because they will greatly reduce sunshine in our house and backyard. And these high density landscape, will impact wind flow of our house.

The height of three stories building will shade us from sunshine. My wife is pregnant now and we moved in around 3 years ago. The main reason we choose this home because the sunshine is so beautiful and it would be great if our child can live here with the sunshine. We do want to give our baby a sunny childhood, for both physical health and mental health.

Also, we all know that this area is suffered from TCE pollution. According to the information from EPA, it is VERY IMPORTANT to keep smooth wind flow of our home during the day. The high landscape is just like a big wall which will definitely impact the necessary wind flow.

We believe that we are not the only family has these concerns. Our neighbors and we had some serious discussion after we saw the proposal. We all being worried about our live quality now.

Please considering our concerns.

Really appreciate your time.

Sincerely,

Sean and Jing

Anderson, Eric - Planning

From: Lisa Matichak
Sent: Sunday, November 01, 2015 6:41 PM
To: dsabalvaro@studios.com; Denis, Melinda
Cc: Anderson, Eric - Planning; Plambaeck, Scott
Subject: Input from neighborhood on 186 E Middlefield

Dear members of the DRC,

The 1,000+ homes that are part of the Wagon Wheel Neighborhood Association (WWNA) would like to share our input on the proposed development at 186 E Middlefield as it falls within the boundaries of our neighborhood association. The majority of the members of the WWNA are not supportive of the current plans and would like some changes made. There is a great deal of development occurring in the Whisman area and we want to make sure that the new development adds to the character and livability of the area, and not detract from it.

We have had two meetings with the architect of this proposed development. While we appreciate that a couple of our concerns have been addressed, such as removing the balconies on the third story, the most important concerns have not been addressed.

Here are our top concerns

- The massing of the buildings is out of character with the rest of the neighborhood and makes the buildings stand out too much. The massing needs to be reduced.
- The massing is exacerbated by the units not being more separate and distinct. The current plans look like one large building.
- The third story needs to be removed. The buildings on either side of the proposed development are 1 and 2 story homes.
- High quality materials need to be used.



We appreciate your support in addressing these concerns.

If one of you could please forward this email to Linda Poncini, we would appreciate it.

On behalf of the WWNA,

Lisa Matichak, President
Kelley Ketchmark, Vice President
Gary Rosen, Treasurer
Lisa Moore, Recorder
Matt Footer, Board member at large
Scott Haber, Board member at large
Gabrielle Heilek, Board member at large