

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Anderson, Eric B.](#)
Subject: eric.anderson2@mountainview.gov Comment on R3 Multifamily Residential Zoning Update
Date: Friday, August 1, 2025 8:50:28 PM

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

Please do not just rezone R3 areas, targeting the existing higher density areas of the city. Please rezone **all** of Mountain View fairly and help improve the housing situation in the whole region. I am a resident of Mountain View currently, living in one of the areas that is not set for a rezoning. Please reconsider and expand the rezoning to include all of Mountain View and improve housing access for everyone.

Thanks,
Joey

From: [Anderson, Eric B.](#)
To: [Anderson, Eric B.](#)
Subject: FW: R3 building
Date: Friday, November 21, 2025 10:45:17 PM

From: Leslie Friedman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:17 PM
To: City Council <City.Council@mountainview.gov>
Subject: R3 building

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

To: Mountain View City Council members and Mayor, Re: R3 changes
c/o Pam at: City.Council@mountainview.gov

R3 zoning is controversial. I am not sure why it is being redone, but I am sure that the continual urge to build is fed, behind the curtain, by the profits coming from building apartments. I know that the state wants more growth. It appears that the fast take over of AI will reduce human employment. There will be bright computer folks learning how to teach AI, and once the robots are even better than now, there will be still fewer humans here. The human species needs to eat and look for health insurance. The AI just plugs in. Who will live there?

When Sacramento spread the word that we have a housing crisis, some representatives talked about citizens with low to moderate incomes needing apartments or homes that could be within their budgets. However, the developments are not aimed at low to moderate rents. The developers offer very few below market rates. A plan for a 100 unit development in Palo Alto includes 3 below market rates apts. And that is only with the promise of additional floors. That means the percentage of below market value is even less. However, larger and taller developments are not looking at places for moderate incomes. So, I regret to say, a lot of what is being discussed is baloney.

How do the builders/developers convince legislators of all levels? Some say that developers help with campaign funds.

Many local voters are anti-SB79. The R3 plans that I have heard at Council meetings have similarities, except the focus on transit locales. The R3 plans will change Mountain View into a high rise, urban setting. It will also chase out owners of single family dwellings or condos, if they are financially able to relocate. Why would someone move? Because having a high rise next door or nearby will drop the home's property value. It also takes away privacy, sunlight, quiet, and air, but when the dwelling's value drops – owners cannot sell it for enough to cover a move. The City and the State are very anti-single family homes. Why is that?

Because their hearts are happy when they can house more needy individuals and families? I

don't think so. The developments are not focusing on those individuals and families. The profits are high. It is not aimed at low-moderate incomes; the very few spaces at below market rate demonstrates that truth.

Mountain View's new apartments will have no places to park cars. This will cut down on driving, a good health effort. It is a rule that everyone works, goes to school, goes to a grocery store within walking distance from the R3 apartments. Will the train cooperate by having the stops for schools? New schools will need to replace the current ones. The builders will remember to put in weight lifting gyms to get shoppers ready for walking back from the grocery. If a grocery is within a half mile from the apartments, everyone could drop in to the grocery daily. There is a little math which the state senators ignored: a half mile walk to schools or grocery stores, turns into one mile on the way back.

Carrying grocery bags, and maybe carrying or leading children there and back with full bags; this is reality.

Another look at reality: Mountain View will be aged-ly cleaned from most individuals over 40 or 45 who do not want to ride a bike in traffic. Since I have never once seen a cyclist stop for a stop sign, perhaps the City will provide insurance for bicycle injuries.

Thank you for your kind attention to my thoughts.

Respectfully yours.

Leslie Friedman

Leslie Friedman, Ph.D., History, Stanford University

Dancer: "with her strong technique and capacity for expression she was simply a joy to watch!"—*The Times, London*

Author: *The Dancer's Garden*, "I love it. It is a perfect book, in conception and execution....a marvelous writer..." Diana Ketcham, *House & Garden*, Editor; Books Editor, *The Oakland Tribune* (ret)

"There is so much delight and poetry and wisdom to be found in the garden and in this book!" Sharon Abe, CA Academy of Sciences (ret)

The Story of Our Butterflies: Mourning Cloaks in Mountain View, "This is a wonderful book. I look forward to sharing it with the rest of our staff here." Joe Melisi, Center for Biological Diversity, (national conservation organization)

"Leslie Friedman is an historian, a dancer and choreographer, and now a perceptive writer about nature...in a second splendid work she takes wing into the world of butterflies...One is grateful for this delightful book, so well written and illustrated." Peter Stansky, Author, Historian, Prof. Stanford