

PC 7-8-2025

Oral
Communications

Written
Communications

From: [Peggy Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [City Attorney's Office](#)
Subject: 2025-06-24 Planning Commission Meeting-ITEM2 Oversized Parking -THANK YOU
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 5:36:53 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear PC Chair Rao, Vice PC Chair Kosolcharoen and Commissioners,

Thank you for taking the extra time needed to come up with a solution that solves the unwanted accumulation of oversized vehicles on public streets but DOES NOT punish/add unreasonable requirements for Cupertino residents who own oversized vehicles and follow our laws.

I am relieved that the original options were not accepted. Requiring resident RV owners to get a permit every time we need to park in front of our homes was not reasonable, nor was only allowing us 2 hours in front of our homes. You took the extra time to work it out.

Thank you!

Peggy Griffin

From: [Nicklaus Meier](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Santosh Rao](#); [Deborah](#)
Subject: RVs parked outside Aloft Cupertino
Date: Monday, June 30, 2025 10:59:19 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom It May Concern,

For the past 18+ months, there have been several RVs parking on Alves Dr. in front of Aloft Cupertino. Our guests do not feel safe and this is an eyesore. We are worried that if nothing is done about this, these small problems can become bigger problems as we have seen in other Bay Area cities. We have gotten several bad reviews as well due to this. Two of them are linked below. Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Check out this review of Aloft Cupertino on Google Maps
<https://goo.gl/maps/ZNRLjzuA5TYbHWKX7>

Check out this review of Aloft Cupertino on Google Maps
<https://goo.gl/maps/9gksn92N9e7PFL3m6>

Nick Meier, CHRM
Chief Revenue Officer

[Shashi Hospitality Group](#)
10200 North De Anza Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014
Cell: 702-810-7275
nmeier@shashigroup.com

[Shashi Hotel Mountain View](#) | [The Nest Hotel Palo Alto](#)
[Aloft Cupertino](#) | [Aloft Sunnyvale](#) | [Aloft San Jose Cupertino](#)

From: [Gill Doyle](#)
To: [Santosh Rao](#); [Tracy Kosolcharoen](#); [David Fung](#); [Seema Lindskog](#); [Steven Scharf](#); [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Emi Sugiyama](#)
Subject: Tessellations eliminating on-campus parking
Date: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 11:56:44 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Tessellations told the City in its March 14 "Project Description" that it wants to eliminate a parking lot behind the school. That parking lot is said to accommodate 20 staff cars and was key to resolving the parking issue that prompted neighbors here to collect signatures and apply for a permit parking zone around the school. The neighborhood withdrew its application for a permit parking zone when Tessellations was granted its CUP and a Parking Exception that required it to provide 148 parking spaces — 67 of those on campus. (The other 81 were supposed to be at New Life Church.)

Now Tessellations, apparently for aesthetic reasons, wants to eliminate that improvised lot behind the school. It says that it will shuttle those 20 staff members to and from New Life Church though it admits that "for some staff it may be challenging, particularly for those who prefer to have their vehicles on campus for emergency situations — whether it's for . . . a child's emergency, personal health concerns, or scheduled appointments."

This is not a good idea. It's not realistic to think that staff will not want to continue to drive their cars to work. If 20 on-campus parking spots are eliminated, we should expect to see some staff members return to parking their vehicles on the streets around the school. This teacher shuttle idea is nearly as fanciful as the school's no-drive contract with parents, whereby parents will supposedly promise not to let their high school kids drive to school. Both of these schemes — the teacher shuttle idea and the no-drive contract with parents — will result in more all-day parking on the streets around the school. The doubt that Tessellations expresses in its March 14 project description — "For some staff it may be challenging" — shows that Tessellations understands that its teacher shuttle idea is problematic.

Tessellations shouldn't be thinking about eliminating on-campus parking. If it gets permission to add grades 11 and 12, it is actually going to need more on-campus parking for the high school students who will undoubtedly drive to school, despite any contract with parents.

- Gill Doyle (7952 Folkestone Drive)

From: [V Lentfer](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Fwd: Public input for today's Cupertino Planning Commission Agenda Item #2.
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 10:50:41 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: V Lentfer <vlentfer@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 8, 2025 at 3:49 PM
Subject: Public input for today's Cupertino Planning Commission Agenda Item #2.
To: Luke Connolly <LukeC@cupertino.gov>, <piug@cupertino.gov>, <rwang@cupertino.gov>, <citycouncil@cupertino.gov>, <cityclerk@cupertino.gov>
CC: Jim Lentfer <jim.lentfer@gmail.com>, Parimal Kopardekar <Parimal.Kopardekar@gmail.com>

Dear Cupertino officials,

I am a homeowner and I am concerned about urban fire in Cupertino, especially in my area (Baxley Court off of Linda Vista Drive) which was recently designated as a **higher risk fire zone**.

I understand that you are seeking public input on updates to policies to curtail risks from fire hazards. I have 3 main concerns/suggestions:

1.
Having seen the preliminary Evulich Court submittal, it looks like this development will significantly increase fire risk due to the higher density of construction. It seems like this would be a great location to place a new fire station to help protect this neighborhood and the entire community. **Please build a new fire station at the Evulich site prior to construction of the new homes.**
2.
The Evulich Court plan only provides one way in and one way out, which seems like it could lead to potential evacuation and firefighting problems for a new development. We are retired and have many elderly neighbors who are in the immediate vicinity of the new development which elevates our concern. **Please provide multiple accesses from the development to Linda Vista Drive.**
3.
We are also concerned about fire protection during the Evulich construction project. My family and I are quite fearful that we could see a repeat of the huge Santana Row inferno of 2002. **Please provide additional fire protection during construction, including the aforementioned fire station.**

Sincerely,

Veronica Lentfer

PC 7-8-2025

Item No.2
Health and
Safety Study
Session

Written
Communications

From: [Peggy Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#); [Piu Ghosh \(she/her\)](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: 2025-07-08 Planning Commission Meeting-ITEM2 Study Session on GP Health and Safety Chapter
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:06:42 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

PLEASE INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING EMAIL AS PART OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR THE ABOVE MEETING AGENDA ITEM.

Dear Planning Commission and Planning Manager Piu Ghosh,

I am glad you are updating this chapter of our General Plan. We are long overdue for an earthquake and as our climate keeps changing, planning for this change is critical.

Regarding Attachment 1-Memo from Placeworks dated June 24, 2025, PAGE 2 of 5
REQUEST: Can you please provide a copy of the “Local Hazard Mitigation Plan” BEFORE tomorrow’s meeting so we can review it?

- **Senate Bill 2140:** Allows for the incorporation of the **Local Hazard Mitigation Plan** into the Safety Element, which can increase eligibility for State and federal disaster relief funding.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Peggy Griffin

From: [Peggy Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: 2025-07-08 Planning Commission Meeting-ITEM2 GP Health and Safety update
Date: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 4:38:55 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

PLEASE INCLUDE THIS EMAIL AS PART OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION FOR THE ABOVE MEETING AGENDA ITEM.

Dear Planning Commission and Staff,

I request that when the Health and Safety chapter of the General Plan is updated that you consider the following:

1. Financial burdens to homeowners

- a. If no modifications are being done to a home, do not require homes to be retrofitted/upgraded.
- b. DO NOT add annual or periodic inspections to homes.

2. Emergency Preparedness and Response

- a. Identify key facilities that should have battery backup capabilities and move towards providing that capability.
- b. Healthcare-encourage healthcare providers into our city.

3. Water pressure

- a. Please add water pressure requirements for all areas. Be precise!
 - i. In the Linda Vista area, I've been told that some residents have had to install water pumps because of the lack of adequate water pressure for daily needs, much less in a fire situation! With added density this problem will increase.
 - ii. Require the added density to provide the added water pressure.

4. Fire support/fire stations

- a. Provide the amount of fire stations required based on the max density of each area.
 - i. If an additional fire station is needed please specify the detailed requirements needed.
- b. In high fire areas, please specify
 - i. Max density
 - ii. Building materials to be used or prohibited for new development.

5. Hazardous Waste and Materials

Identify sites that must have an environmental site assessment.

- a.
 - i. These should include sites near/adjacent to current/old gas stations, current/old tanks, current/old dry cleaners.

6. Flood and Inundation Hazards

- a. DO NOT allow non-residential uses in floodplains unless they are just parks, open spaces, recreational uses.
 - i. Avoid any businesses, healthcare offices, emergency services, public health facilities, schools/daycares.

7. Climate Change Resilience

- a. Encourage lighter colored roofs on homes (discount on permits?).
- b. Trees-identify trees that are more beneficial to our environment/air quality/shade and discourage less “useful” trees.

Sincerely,
Peggy Griffin

PC 7-8-2025

Item No.3
Municipal
Code
Amendment

Written
Communications

From: [Peggy Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Gian Martire](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: 2025-07-08 Planning Commission Meeting-ITEM3 - Muni Code updates for ADUs
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:16:30 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

PLEASE INCLUDE THIS EMAIL AND ANY ATTACHMENTS AS PART OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR THE ABOVE MEETING AGENDA ITEM.

Dear Planning Commission and Staff,

I thank the staff, commissions and council for continuing to uphold our laws in spite of the multitude of laws passed by our state legislators who have made and continue to make planning, safety and preservation of neighborhood characteristics, retail and services non-existent. Thank you for continuing to try to make things better or minimize harm. It matters and I, for one, appreciate your efforts!

That said...here are my questions below.

In Attachment 1-Draft Resolution, Page 8 of 15, Red-lined muni code

Q1: This table doesn't include duplexes yet it mentions them in the table. Does this need to be corrected or reworded?

Table 19.112.030A: Site Development Regulations for Streamlined Accessory Dwelling Units and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units Associated with Single-Family Residential Uses **and Duplexes**

		Conversion of space within principal dwelling unit or accessory structures	New Construction Attached or Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit ≤ 800 s.f.
1.	Size of living space, exclusive of decks		
	a. Minimum size	150 s.f.	
	b. Maximum size	No size limitation as long as the unit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is wholly within the space of a proposed or existing single-family dwelling or the existing space of an accessory structure, and ii. Does not require either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An addition of more than 150 square feet to an existing accessory structure to accommodate ingress and egress only, or • Any addition to an existing single-family dwelling unit. 	800 s.f.
2.	Number of Units	Maximum three ADUs per single-family residential lot, and maximum two ADUs per duplex lot , in any combination of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attached ADU, • Conversion of existing space ADU (whether in principal dwelling unit or existing accessory structure), • Detached ADU, or • Junior ADU 	

In Attachment 1-Draft Resolution, Page 10 of 15, Red-lined muni code

Q2: Referring to #4 Maximum Size (of an ADU)...Is this true that the state mandates no limit on the size of a streamlined ADU? Can you explain this during the meeting so everyone can understand/hear it?

4.	Maximum Size	No size limitation	1,200 s.f.
----	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------

In Attachment 1-Draft Resolution, Page 13 of 15, Red-lined muni code

Q3: The list of zoning districts is **MISSING (R1-a) Semi-Rural** in row I of this table.

I.	Structure Design	<p><u>a. Should Shall</u> be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the principal structure.</p> <p><u>b. Shall meet the design standards when located within any one of the following zoning districts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Planned Development (P)</u> • <u>Eichler (R1-e)</u> • <u>Monta Vista Design Guidelines</u> • <u>Residential Hillside (RHS)</u>
----	------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thank you again for your work and efforts.

Sincerely,

Peggy Griffin

From: [James Lloyd](#)
To: [Santosh Rao](#); [Tracy Kosolcharoen](#); [David Fung](#); [Seema Lindsog](#); [Steven Scharf](#); [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Piu Ghosh \(she/her\)](#); [City of Cupertino Planning Dept.](#); [City Attorney's Office](#); [Cupertino City Manager's Office](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: public comment re agenda item 3 for the July 8, 2025 Planning Commission meeting
Date: Monday, July 7, 2025 4:59:59 PM
Attachments: [Cupertino - ADU Ordinance - 7 July 2025.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Cupertino Planning Commission,

The California Housing Defense Fund (“CalHDF”) submits the attached public comment concerning item 3 on the agenda for the July 8, 2025 Planning Commission meeting, a proposed update to the City’s regulations for the development of accessory dwelling units (“ADUs”) and junior accessory dwelling units (“JADUs”).

Sincerely,

James M. Lloyd
Director of Planning and Investigations
California Housing Defense Fund
james@calhdf.org
CalHDF is grant & donation funded
Donate today - <https://calhdf.org/donate/>



Jul 7, 2025

City of Cupertino
10300 Torre Avenue
Cupertino, CA 95014

By email: srao@cupertino.org; Tkosolcharoen@cupertino.gov; dfung@cupertino.gov;
slindskog@cupertino.gov; SScharf@cupertino.gov;
planningcommission@cupertino.gov

CC: piug@cupertino.gov; planning@cupertino.gov; CityAttorney@cupertino.gov;
CityManager@cupertino.gov; CityClerk@Cupertino.gov

Re: Proposed Amendments to the City's ADU Regulations

Dear Cupertino Planning Commission,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") submits this letter as a public comment concerning item 3 on the agenda for the July 8, 2025 Planning Commission meeting, a proposed update to the City's regulations for the development of accessory dwelling units ("ADUs") and junior accessory dwelling units ("JADUs").

CalHDF applauds the City for updating its ADU regulations to keep pace with changes in state law. However, CalHDF writes to flag a few specific legal issues with the ordinance, which the city should address before approving the ordinance.

Background

The law gives local governments authority to enact zoning ordinances that implement a variety of development standards on ADUs. (Gov. Code, § 66314.) The standards in these local ordinances are limited by state law so as not to overly restrict ADU development. (See *id.*) Separately from local ADU ordinances, Government Code section 66323 establishes a narrower set of ADU types that local governments have a ministerial duty to approve. "Notwithstanding Sections 66314 to 66322 ... a local agency shall ministerially approve" these types of ADUs. (*Id.* at subd. (a).) This means that ADUs that satisfy the minimal requirements of section 66323 must be approved regardless of any contrary provisions of the local ADU ordinance. (*Ibid.*) Local governments may not impose their own standards on such ADUs. (Gov. Code, § 66323, subd. (b) ["A local agency shall not impose any objective development or

design standard that is not authorized by this section upon any accessory dwelling unit that meets the requirements of any of paragraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, of subdivision (a).”].) In addition, ADUs that qualify for the protections of Government Code section 66323, like other ADUs, must be processed by local governments within 60 days of a complete permit application submittal. (Gov. Code, § 66317, subd. (a).)

State law also prohibits creating regulations on ADU development not explicitly allowed by state law. Government Code Section 66315 states, “No additional standards, other than those provided in Section 66314, shall be used or imposed, including an owner-occupant requirement, except that a local agency may require that the property may be used for rentals of terms 30 days or longer.”

Required Height Limits

Tables 19.112.030A and 19.112.030B impose a height limit of 18 feet on detached, new construction ADUs developed pursuant to Government Code section 66323 on single and multifamily properties, respectively.

However, Government Code section 66321, subdivision (b)(4)(B) requires cities to allow an additional two feet in height (from 18 to 20 feet) for an ADU to match the roof pitch of the primary dwelling, provided the ADU is within one half mile of a major transit stop or a high-quality transit corridor. Page 14-15 of the January 2025 HCD ADU [Handbook](#) addresses the duty of a local agency to allow the additional two feet of height in these locations.

The City should amend its code to grant the additional two feet of height (from 18 to 20 feet) for ADUs within one half mile of a major transit stop or a high-quality transit corridor.

Non-Objective Design Standards

Table 19.112.040(I) requires that a non-streamlined ADU’s design “Shall be compatible with the architectural style and materials of the principal structure.”

However, cities may impose only “objective standards” on ADUs. (Gov. Code, § 66314, subd. (b)(1); see also Gov. Code, § 66315 [stating local jurisdictions may only impose standards authorized by section 66314].) “Objective standards” are “standards that involve no personal or subjective judgment by a public official and are uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant or proponent and the public official prior to submittal.” (Gov. Code, § 66313, subd. (i).) HCD’s [ADU Handbook](#) (see pages 13, 35, and 45) confirms that, pursuant to state law, only objective standards may be imposed on ADUs.

A rule that requires ADUs to be “compatible with the architectural style and materials of the principal structure” is not an objective standard. The applicant cannot know ex ante and

with certainty under what circumstances the City will judge a design to be appropriately compatible.

The City must amend this section of code to make this design standard objective.



CalHDF applauds the City for amending its code to keep pace with changes to state law. However, the City should make sure that its ADU regulations comply with state law.

CalHDF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation whose mission includes advocating for increased access to housing for Californians at all income levels, including low-income households. You may learn more about CalHDF at www.calhdf.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dylan Casey", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dylan Casey
CalHDF Executive Director

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James M. Lloyd", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

James M. Lloyd
CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations