

**Hughes, Sam**

---

**From:** Hala Alshahwany [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 13, 2025 11:03 AM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam; Pancholi, Diana  
**Subject:** 555 Middlefield Project Resubmital

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

Hello Sam and Diana,

Thank you for meeting me and my fellow CPD residents yesterday afternoon to review Avalon's new submitted plans for 555 Middlefield project. Below is a summary of our discussion and list of items we await to receive from you. Please note that CPD community members are blind copied on this email.

\* New plans include similar building sections A, B and C, and same total number of units, but the unit distribution, building heights, parking garages and spaces are different than plans approved back in May 2022.

- Section A facing Middlefield, 4 stories of units and above ground garage, with a fifth floor for amenities, rooftop pool and deck.
- Section B, 4 stories facing Moffett and 3 stories facing CPD, with some ground level parking spaces (no garage).
- Section C facing CPD, 4-5 story buildings, and 5 story garage building facing Hwy 85 and containing 508 parking spaces.

\* A designated Park (3.4 acre) is still planned on CPD between B and C buildings.

\* Landscape plan was not available, other than the additional redwood trees facing Moffett that will be protected in front of section B.

\* Avalon submitted new application last month April 8th. The city has 30 days to review application completeness (currently in progress), then city staff has 60 days to do compliance review (including safety and emergency compliance). After that the project goes to zoning administration then city council for approval. (Note no city design or environmental planning reviews or public meetings are required for this project because it invokes SB330)

\* Our (and CPD community) main concerns are:

- Significant increase of parking spaces (therefore traffic) in garage C from 412 (according to my old notes) to now 508 spaces. Access to fire engines and medical emergency vehicles to building C is greatly challenged by the narrow, dead-end street with the tree island at the end of CPD. Amount of parking and traffic on the street will increase many folds impacting residents safety.

**We asked Diana and Sam to provide contacts of fire department officials, so the community can hold a meeting with them addressing safety and emergency access concerns.**

- We also asked for **landscape and tree removal information to ensure that protected redwood trees in area A and elsewhere will still be protected. Additionally we inquired about the highway green**

**canopy status as garage C is no longer an underground structure and should not require removal of bordering trees.**

- Finally we asked for the **phasing of the project** (sequence of section building).

Thank you again for your time and assistance, especially since we're unable to meet with the developer or review the plans on the city's website. We await getting the requested information from you.

Best,  
Hala

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Sayo Nomura [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 13, 2025 10:19 PM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam; Pancholi, Diana  
**Cc:** Hala Alshahwany; Diane Gazzano; Leona Chu; Christopher Peri  
**Subject:** Re: Block C Parking Entrance at 555 W Middlefield Rd

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

Below is a message from my husband, Chris, who was unable to attend yesterday.

---

My name is Christopher Peri. I have a Ph.D. from UC Berkeley in Arch. My focus during my masters was spatial cognition.

It's based on the understandings of my research as well as my current work in VR/AR that I understand quite well the impact on proportions for both interior and exterior structures, especially height to widths. In this case, the current plan of a 5 story building facing a narrow road will be imposing on the surrounding area. Further, the current architectural language of the end of Cypress point is 2 stories. I do understand that growth does mean change, however, I think a 60+ facade on a narrow road across from set back 2 stories homes is inappropriate.

My recommendation to increase the setback of the street facing facade and to limit the building height to 4 stories for the street facing facade. The rest of the building footprint that is not adjacent to the street could continue to be 5 stories.

Thank you very much,  
Christopher Peri

On Tue, May 13, 2025 at 10:13 PM Sayo Nomura [REDACTED] wrote:

Thank you, Sam and Diana, for meeting with us yesterday.

As a follow-up, here is a summary of the key points I raised during our discussion, which I also intend to bring to the attention of the Fire Department.

### **1. Fire Code Violations (CFC & NFPA Standards)**

#### **A. Fire Truck Access Obstruction (CFC Section 503.2.1)**

The California Fire Code requires fire access roads to be at least **20 feet wide** for emergency vehicles. Placing the entrance at the end of a narrow dead-end street increases congestion and limits fire truck maneuverability, potentially delaying emergency response.

#### **B. Dead-End Turnaround Space (CFC Section 503.2.5 & NFPA 1 Section 18.2.3.5.4)**

Dead-end streets longer than **150 feet** must include an approved turnaround space for fire trucks. The new entrance location reduces the available turnaround space, potentially violating fire safety requirements.

#### **C. Ladder Truck Access (CFC Appendix D)**

For buildings taller than three stories, fire access roads should be at least **26 feet wide** to allow ladder truck deployment.

If vehicle congestion narrows the fire lane, firefighters may not be able to deploy ladders for upper-floor rescues.

## **2. Emergency Evacuation & Safety Risks**

### **A. Increased Evacuation Time (CBC Section 1026.6)**

Five-story residential buildings require an efficient emergency evacuation plan.

Locating the entrance at a dead-end street creates a bottleneck that could delay evacuation during fires, earthquakes, or medical emergencies.

### **B. Ambulance and First Responder Delays**

Emergency responders require unobstructed access.

Congestion at a single, confined entrance may prevent ambulances from reaching residents in time - endangering lives.

## **3. Traffic Congestion & Pedestrian Safety Risks**

### **A. Traffic Bottlenecks at the Dead-End**

The original entrance location in the middle of Block C allowed smoother circulation.

The revised location forces all traffic through a narrow, dead-end road, greatly increasing congestion.

### **B. Increased Pedestrian Accident Risk**

The new entrance design directs more vehicle traffic across pedestrian walkways and bicycle lanes.

Limited visibility and sharp turns increase the risk of pedestrian collisions.

## **4. Requested Actions**

In light of these concerns, I respectfully request the following:

- (As Diana mentioned) A formal review by the Mountain View Fire Department to determine whether the entrance relocation complies with CFC and NFPA safety standards.
- A **revised traffic impact study** to assess how the change will affect congestion, emergency access, and pedestrian safety.
- **Consideration of restoring the Block C parking entrance to its original location** before the eucalyptus trees, in the middle section of the block, to support safer and more efficient access.

The relocation of the Block C parking entrance to the far-right dead-end street poses serious fire safety, emergency evacuation, and traffic risks. I respectfully ask the City of Mountain View, the Fire Department, and the California Department of Transportation to closely review these hazards and ensure full compliance with safety regulations before this proposal moves forward.

These concerns are supported by multiple code requirements and real-world risk factors documented in current urban planning and fire safety literature.

Thank you again for your time and attention to this matter.

Best regards,  
Sayo Nomura

  
Mountain View 94043

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Daniel Shane [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 6, 2025 5:53 PM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam  
**Subject:** 555 W Middlefield Redesign Application

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

Dear Mr. Sam Hughes, Senior Planner, Community Development Department, City of Mountain View, Hala Alshahwany forwarded your email and her response to you about the redesign and submittal of 555 Middlefield project. After reading your message, I have questions and a comment. (1) What is specifically meant by the entitlement hearing? (2) Can the land dedication and community benefits be revisited? (3) As in all formal application processes, the City claims they "encourage" applicants to hold community meetings. This is much too weak. I think community early engagement (CEE) process should be a requirement under city housing development polices, standards or codes. I have submitted four recommendation to the City Council for consideration and the reasons why they are needed. Recommendation No. 2 is a requirement for CEE.

One key overarching recommendation is to change city policy to promote better and smarter housing developments, comply with important city goals and initiatives such as environmental sustainability and climate change actions, ensure the Formal Planning Application and Submittal Checklist for housing and commercial developments addresses the following requirements:

(1) the developer shall ensure the project plan design aligns with the city goals and initiatives for greater environmental sustainability, energy sustainability, climate change actions, urban forestry and biodiversity, and public health. I think most cities have these stated goals and supporting policies already in the books. If not, they should. These recommendations are not Mountain View centric. They are applicable to many, if not most, cities nationwide

(2) the developer shall employ the community early engagement (CEE) process. There may be confusion about the meaning of CEE. This concept means the developer engages the community before they make large financial investments in engineering and design work on the project. A tour of the project site with the community members will enlighten the developer to community issues, concerns, and ideas for mitigating impacts to the community before the project plan and designs are drafted. Hopefully, many of these can be incorporated early into the planning and design phase. (3) the developer shall consider the integration of the surrounding natural environment, urban forests, trees, vegetation, and highway vegetation barriers (HVBs) into the footprint of the development early in the design phase. It is also important that the integrity of the existing natural urban forest ecosystem is protected from the threat of rapid urban deforestation due to development in the SF Bay Area and the irreplaceable losses of these important natural resources and its effects on the environment, climate, and public health.

(4) the developer in collaboration with the city shall consider private lands with important urban natural resources (i.e., tree canopies, forests, streams, wildlife habitat) as a community benefit as are currently

lands to be used for small public parks. In Mountain View, it is common for developers to deed, as a matter of codified policy, a land parcel to the city for a small grass covered public park (no parking requirements) as a condition of project approval. The land must have significant benefits to the community. There are multiple benefits derived from natural urban forestry such as improving air quality, buffering highway noise levels, air pollution barriers, natural biodiversity, wildlife habitat, nesting for birds, stormwater runoff control, green spaces for cooling, reduction of urban heat island effects, groundwater and surface water recharge, mental and spiritual recharge, potential recreational uses, natural ecosystem and bio- laboratories for study and research, and more. I would like to meet with to discuss these recommendations. Please confirm receipt of my email. Please schedule a brief meeting to discuss these important community concerns and potential solutions and practical remedies that benefits housing needs, environment, climate, and public health. Sincerely, Daniel Shane, [REDACTED]

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Daniel Shane [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 29, 2025 4:20 PM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam  
**Cc:** Sayo Nomura; Christopher Peri and Sayo Palomino; Terrie Rayl; Pancholi, Diana  
**Subject:** Fw: 555 Middlefield Project

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

Dear Sam.

The preservation of hundreds of mature tall trees and dense canopy forming a linear barrier between Highway 85 and the homes in our neighbor would provide much greater benefits to the community than a small public park. These benefits include cleaner air quality, air pollution abatement, less human exposures to toxic airborne pollutants and contaminants, carbon sequestration, highway noise reduction, a natural forest ecosystem, wildlife habitat, bird resting/nesting, moderation of urban heat island effects, achieving climate change action goals, biodiversity and urban forestry goals, urban tree canopy goals, hydrologic and water recharge goals, replenishing aquifers and stream flows, and more.

On the other hand, public parks and turf grass fields add chemical pesticides and fertilizers which runoff into our streams and the San Francisco Bay adding harmful chemical loads to an already heavily burdened wetland ecosystem and ocean fisheries, add no benefits or negative outcomes for actions to be taken to increase biodiversity and urban forestry. Grass lawns are virtual dead zones in terms of greater biodiversity as envisioned in the draft City of Mountain View Biodiversity and Urban Forestry Plan. The cost of care and maintenance for natural urban forested areas are much less than public parks.

I recommend the City issue a moratorium on the removal of highway vegetation barriers (HVBs) that currently protect residents from exposures to high levels of noise and vehicle tailpipe emissions. The science is clear that HVBs can mitigate the harmful exposures to toxic airborne particulates and gaseous fumes from cars and trucks on our highways.

Sincerely,

Daniel Shane  
[REDACTED]

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Diane Gazzano [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 14, 2025 3:47 PM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam  
**Cc:** Pancholi, Diana; Hala Alshahwany; Leona Chu; Sayo Nomura  
**Subject:** 555 Middlefield Project

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

Sam,

Thank you for meeting with us on May 12, concerning the 555 Middlefield project. One factor I am interested in, that we did not have the opportunity to review, was the location of the park in relation to the parking garage, and if the parking garage will be visible from Cypress Point Drive.

Would it be possible to send me the section of the plan which shows the location of the park and surrounding structures. If the plans show the shadows the structures near the park will create at various times of the day that would be helpful.

Also, does the plan show any parking for the park? Where is this parking and how many spaces are dedicated to parking for the park.

Thank you,

Diane Gazzano

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Kristine Keller [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 26, 2025 2:13 PM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam  
**Cc:** Sayo Nomura; Pancholi, Diana; Hala Alshahwany; Diane Gazzano; Leona Chu; Bill and Twila Walsh; Terrie Rayl; Cc: Denley Rafferty; Murthy, Anish; Christopher Peri  
**Subject:** Re: 555 Middlefield Project

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

Hi Sam,

I would like to second Sayo's concerns listed below, and ask for your input on these important issues.

I am a former resident of 555 Middlefield who moved away partially due to this upcoming project and the mishandling of renovations by Avalon (working without permits, etc which we brought to the town's attention and the town had to intervene and hold them accountable). I'm very concerned with Avalon's plans and apparent lack of concern for community well-being and safety, as demonstrated by their current plans/application and previous illegal operations with their renovation work (showing their work ethic and willingness to break laws to get their goals accomplished).

Please update us as best you can. This application is extremely concerning for our community with its inclusion of multiple safety issues.

Thank you so much for taking a close look at all of this and connecting with us with more information.

Take good care,  
Kristine Keller

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Sayo Nomura [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 3, 2025 12:22 AM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam  
**Cc:** Pancholi, Diana; Hala Alshahwany; Diane Gazzano; Leona Chu; Bill and Twila Walsh; Terrie Rayl; Cc: Denley Rafferty; Murthy, Anish; Christopher Peri  
**Subject:** Re: 555 Middlefield Project

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

Hello Sam,

Thank you for your response. To clarify what may not have been clear, my concern is not limited to the Fire Code and Building Code. What worries me is that this project proposes very high density on a narrow dead-end street.

In addition to compliance with the Fire and Building Codes, I am also concerned about whether the project meets regulations related to long and narrow dead-end streets as well as street connectivity standards. With the significant increase in vehicles expected to use Cypress Point Drive, the risks of congestion (especially during commute hours), blocked emergency access, and accidents will inevitably rise.

The entrance has now been moved all the way into the dead end. If there is an accident, residents of CPD would not be able to drive out. For these security and safety reasons, I sincerely hope that the review process will consider not only Fire and Building Codes but also the density implications of a dead-end street. If there are any recent updates on these matters, I would be grateful to learn about them.

I will follow up with additional comments regarding Fire and Building Code compliance once I have completed my review.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Best regards,  
Sayo Nomura

On Wed, Oct 1, 2025 at 4:31 PM Hughes, Sam <[Sam.Hughes@mountainview.gov](mailto:Sam.Hughes@mountainview.gov)> wrote:

Hi Sayo,

Thank you for your question. I'm coordinating with Public Works and the applicant and will prepare a response in the coming days.

Also, you raised a question about Fire Code and Security Codes. Do you mean Fire and Building Code?

Best,



**Sam Hughes**

**Senior Planner**

Community Development Department

650-903-6199 | [MountainView.gov](http://MountainView.gov)

[LinkedIn](#) | [X \(formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [AskMV](#)

---

**From:** Sayo Nomura [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 7:35 PM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam <[Sam.Hughes@mountainview.gov](mailto:Sam.Hughes@mountainview.gov)>; Pancholi, Diana <[diana.pancholi@mountainview.gov](mailto:diana.pancholi@mountainview.gov)>  
**Cc:** Hala Alshahwany [REDACTED]; Diane Gazzano [REDACTED]; Leona Chu [REDACTED]; Bill and Twila Walsh [REDACTED]; Terrie Rayl [REDACTED]; Cc: Denley Rafferty [REDACTED]; Murthy, Anish <[anish.murthy@mountainview.gov](mailto:anish.murthy@mountainview.gov)>; Christopher Peri [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 555 Middlefield Project

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

**(This email also includes, as BCC, people who might be interested in this topic.)**

Hello Sam and Diana,

I am not sure where to ask, but I have the following questions. I would appreciate it if someone could advise us on the appropriate department or agency to contact.

We have observed how the recent traffic counts were conducted. On the first day, the counter loops were placed right at the entrance of Cypress Point Drive, which recorded all incoming vehicles. However, from the second day onward, the counters were moved to a location past two entrances on both sides. As a result, vehicles using four driveways, including two 555 W. Middlefield apartment entrances, a school entrance, and one CPLake condos entrance, were not counted. Therefore, I believe the traffic data collected after the first day is not accurate and does not reflect the true traffic volume in the area.

After the apartments are built, there will be an increase of at least 1,000 trips per day (500 vehicles × 2 drives) just from Block C alone, and even more when including deliveries and other traffic on CPD. Street parking will likely become fully occupied, pushing those who currently park on the street further into the neighborhood. This will, in turn, make accidents more likely on this narrow street.

**Q1. I would like to know if this traffic count is related to the 555 W. Middlefield Rd project, and if so, why the method used from the second day onward resulted in fewer vehicles being recorded.**

Above all, what concerns us is **the density of Block C** and **the heavy traffic** it will generate. We are also concerned that even if accidents occur after the apartments are built, Avalon may not take responsibility.

**Q2. I would greatly appreciate it if you could share any updates on the fire code and security code requirements for this project.**

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sayo Nomura

CPD resident

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Sayo Nomura [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 18, 2025 3:58 PM  
**To:** City Council  
**Cc:** Hughes, Sam; Pancholi, Diana  
**Subject:** Submission of Community Petition - 555 W. Middlefield Road (Block C)  
**Attachments:** CPD Community Petition cover letter.pdf; Cypress Point Drive Residents' Petition – Request to Reevaluate the 555 W. Middlefield Project (Avalon Block C) (Responses) - Form Responses.pdf; Community Petition G form.png

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

Mountain View City Council

### **Submission of Community Petition and Comments Regarding 555 W. Middlefield Road (Block C)**

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

On behalf of the residents of Cypress Point Drive and the surrounding neighborhood, we are submitting the attached 28 signatures and written comments regarding the revised development proposal for 555 W. Middlefield Road (Avalon Block C).

These comments represent substantial evidence of public concern, including safety, emergency access, traffic impacts, environmental issues, and ongoing quality-of-life problems directly tied to both the project and Avalon's historical management of the property.

#### **1. Public Safety and Fire Code Concerns**

Many residents strongly believe that the proposal to place a 510-space parking structure at the dead-end of a narrow, substandard street poses a serious safety hazard.

Concerns include:

- Evacuation feasibility during a fire, earthquake, or other emergency
- Congestion and gridlock caused by funneling all traffic through a single point of access and egress.

These are potentially significant safety impacts, and the community requests that the City not minimize or overlook them.

#### **2. Traffic Increase and Need for Updated Analysis**

Residents have consistently reported that traffic has increased dramatically since 2022, particularly after the end of the State's COVID-19 emergency order.

Several comments request that:

- Any traffic evaluation conducted between 2020–2022 be redone
- The true impact of 1,000+ additional daily vehicle trips from Block C be properly analyzed
- Cumulative impacts involving the Adult School, CP Woods, and street parking be evaluated

### **3. Documented History of Safety Violations and Poor Management by Avalon**

Multiple residents submitted personal accounts describing:

- Improper asbestos abatement during renovations
- Dangerous hallway and unit construction practices
- Repeated fire code violations
- Long-unaddressed hazards on the property
- More than 11 vehicle wheel thefts in 2024 despite “private security”
- Worker misconduct and lack of oversight
- Ongoing distress, unsafe conditions, and lack of accountability

These experiences raise serious questions about Avalon’s ability to safely manage even the current property, let alone a significantly expanded one.

### **4. Request for Thorough Review Before Any Approval**

Given the significant changes in conditions since 2022, residents respectfully request:

- A full and updated traffic and safety analysis
- A transparent review of emergency access feasibility
- Proper consideration of CEQA exceptions, including “unusual circumstances,” “cumulative impacts,” and “substantial public concern”

Our community is not just opposing housing. We are asking for safe and responsible development that does not jeopardize the lives of residents, schoolchildren, cyclists, or future tenants.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns. We respectfully ask the City Council to fully evaluate the issues raised by residents before making any determinations regarding the Urban Infill Exemption or project approval.

Sincerely,  
CPD Residents  
Mountain View, CA

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Travis Keep [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 1, 2026 11:20 AM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam  
**Subject:** Concerns about the 555 Middlefield project

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

Hi Sam:

My wife and I live in Cypress Point Woods, the condominiums between Central Ave and Cypress Point adjacent to the 555 Middlefield project.

Existing residents must walk through our private property to access the Stevens Creek Trail. They could also wait at the Middlefield and Moffett stoplight, but most just walk through our property to reach the trail.

With the 97 condominium units and the 323 new apartment units, we are concerned about increased foot traffic through our property to access Stevens Creek Trail.

Please require the developers to fund the construction of a sidewalk on the south side of Middlefield that goes over the Hwy 85 bridge, allowing residents to access the Stevens Creek Trail without walking through our property.

Also, please require the developers to add at least 1.5 parking spaces per unit.  $323 + 97 = 420$  new units, so the developers must be required to add parking for 630 vehicles. We residents are very concerned about all these newcomers parking their cars on Cypress Point and Central Ave. These are two very busy streets. Parked cars lining these streets pose a safety hazard for pedestrians and cyclists. Requiring less than 1 parking space per unit seems short-sighted. Most households have at least one car, and some have two.

In summary, we want the developers to provide a sidewalk on the south side of Middlefield that crosses the Hwy 85 bridge, and we want them to build parking for 630 new vehicles. Thank you for your consideration.

- Travis Keep

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Sayo Nomura [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 7, 2026 1:32 AM  
**To:** City Council; Hughes, Sam; Pancholi, Diana  
**Cc:** Diane Gazzano; Hala Alshahwany; Leona Chu; Bill and Twila Walsh; Terrie Rayl; Twila Loft\*; Christopher Peri  
**Subject:** 555 Middlefield Road Project

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

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

After reviewing the video of Administrative Zoning Hearing held on March 4th, I want to express my concerns regarding the determination that the 555 West Middlefield project qualifies for a CEQA exemption.

In particular, I question whether this project truly meets the criteria for exemption given the unusual circumstances of Cypress Point Drive. This street is a long dead-end road with a single point of access, and the proposed relocation of the Block C parking entrance appears likely to concentrate additional traffic at the end of the street.

These conditions raise several concerns that may warrant further environmental review, including:

- **Increased traffic concentration on a long dead-end street**
- **Potential impacts on emergency vehicle access and maneuverability**
- **Changes in circulation patterns due to the relocation of the Block C entrance**
- **Whether the 2022 traffic analysis adequately reflects the current project design**

I believe the **2022 traffic analysis does not fully reflect current post-COVID traffic patterns, nor does it account for the expected increase in traffic resulting from new construction near the intersection of Moffett Boulevard and Cypress Point Drive.**

Under CEQA Guidelines §15300.2(c), a categorical exemption may not apply where unusual circumstances create a reasonable possibility of significant environmental impacts. The unique conditions of Cypress Point Drive — particularly its length, single access point, and the concentration of project traffic at the end of the street — may constitute such unusual circumstances.

**Given the unique configuration of Cypress Point Drive as a long dead-end street, a more current traffic and safety analysis may be necessary to ensure that emergency access and neighborhood safety are adequately protected.**

**If the impact on traffic is expected to be minimal, I respectfully request that an updated and accurate traffic study be conducted and shared with the community to demonstrate that the project can be implemented safely.**

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the City Council carefully consider whether the use of a CEQA exemption is appropriate for this project and whether additional environmental review may be warranted.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Sayo Nomura  
Cypress Point resident

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Diane Gazzano [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 8, 2026 7:52 PM  
**To:** City Council; Hughes, Sam; Pancholi, Diana; Sayo Nomura  
**Cc:** Hala Alshahwany; Leona Chu; Bill and Twila Walsh; Terrie Rayl; Twila Loft\*; Christopher Peri  
**Subject:** Re: 555 Middlefield Road Project

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

On Saturday, March 7, 2026 at 01:33:04 AM PST, Sayo Nomura [REDACTED] wrote:

Nice letter Sayo. If anyone is up to requesting meetings with City Council members, I am all in. The new plans are on the City website now with all the information. I wonder how many of the City Council members even look at it. The meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 24.

The VOICE also had an article about 555 with a place to add comments. I am planning to write a comment.

[Developer poised to add 300+ new homes to Mountain View apartment complex - Mountain View Voice](#)

Diane

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Blizinski, Amber  
**Sent:** Monday, March 16, 2026 8:45 AM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam  
**Cc:** Schroeder, George  
**Subject:** Fw: Draft Staff Report for the Proposed 555 W Middlefield Development

---

**From:** Daniel Shane [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 15, 2026 2:13 PM  
**To:** Blizinski, Amber <amber.blizinski@mountainview.gov>  
**Subject:** Draft Staff Report for the Proposed 555 W Middlefield Development

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

Dear Ms. Blizinski,

Please read my response to a statement made in the Draft Staff Report concerning AvalonBay's proposed 555 W Middlefield Road Infill Project. The public Hearing is on March 24, 2026 at 1830.

This statement is a misrepresentation of significant potential hazard following the removal of an effective natural highway vegetation barrier between the freeway and our residential neighborhood. This issue matters to us and beyond this specific project. It sets a dangerous precedent and the threat to public health is real and long-term. Exposures to auto emissions has been linked to cancer, respiratory diseases, Alzheimer's and Dementia.

Human exposures to environmental contaminants such as particulate matter, heavy metals, and volatile organic vapors from auto and truck emissions are a leading cause of chronic disease in Santa Clara County. Natural highway vegetation barriers on private and public lands can be highly effective in reducing exposures. Most effective barriers exist on private lands where 90% of urban forestry is located in most of the Bay Area cities including the City of Mountain View.

I would like to know why the City did not catch this false statement on their own. Please look into this for our community and the protection of our long term health. I need a response as soon as possible considering the short amount of time before the public hearing.

The Draft Staff Report Findings stated this:

The design of the subdivision and its improvements will not cause serious public health problems (Gov. Code Section 66474).

The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements are not likely to cause serious health problems because the project will be consistent with the applicable policies included in the General Plan, as summarized in Finding 1 above, and the City Code and will be subject to standard conditions of approval to protect public health, safety, convenience, and welfare, which include compliance with applicable Building and Fire codes to ensure on-site improvements provide for safe habitation.

The proposed plans, as conditioned, also meet applicable requirements for emergency and solid waste service, and proposed public (off-site) improvements are designed to meet applicable City design standards and City Code intended to manage and avoid public health impacts;

-----  
  
This is an entirely false statement. The removal (clear-cutting) of hundreds of trees that form a barrier between Highway 85 and the residential neighborhood on the fringes of the development site will likely result in much higher human inhalation exposures to hazardous pollutants and contaminants from tailpipe emissions and much greater noise levels.

Additionally, based on the urban forest GIS Map, this linear grove of trees is highly visible on the map. It is a significant remnant nature forest ecosystem that has connectivity with Steven's Creek Parkway and supports its biodiversity.

The removal of this highway vegetation barrier will create a public health hazard. I will testify to this during the public hearing and request the City Council to shelf the project until a health hazard assessment is conducted by the city or county health officials. These exposures will be 24/7 and are unacceptable. Our request for a redesign of the project footprint was previously rejected because AvalonBay stated this would interfere with the construction of the project. We disagreed. AvalonBay showed no evidence to the contrary. The City Council believed AvalonBay on faith and stated that the project had already been delayed for too long. That is not an acceptable, valid, or logical reason to approve this project as designed. The protection of public health and welfare should be the City Council's highest priority. But obviously it is not.

Daniel Shane

Sincerely, Daniel Shane

## Hughes, Sam

---

**From:** Schultz, Michal  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 10:51 AM  
**To:** Hughes, Sam; Schroeder, George; Blizinski, Amber; Murdock, Christian  
**Cc:** Mikhael, Hemali; Gilmore, Christina; , City Clerk  
**Subject:** FW: 555 W Middlefield project

Hello all,

**Please see the email below:** received as Council Correspondence related to a future agenda item.

Thank you,

Michal Schultz (she/her)  
Administrative Assistant  
City of Mountain View  
650-903-6600

---

**From:** Edward Swierk [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 10:44 AM  
**To:** City Council <city.council@mountainview.gov>  
**Subject:** 555 W Middlefield project

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

Dear council members:

Please vote to approve the 555 W Middlefield residential redesign project at the March 24 meeting.

The project adds much-needed housing, improves bike and pedestrian facilities for everyone, and most importantly is actually buildable now.

Edward Swierk  
[REDACTED]  
Mountain View CA [REDACTED]