# PC 6-10-2025

## Oral Communications

## Written Communications

## #138007 Concerns regarding the citywide active transportation plan surveys

<b>Submitted</b>		<b>Received v</b> i	ia Requester	
June 2, 2025 at 4:34 PM		Mail	Xin Wang <xinxwang@gmail.com></xinxwang@gmail.com>	
<b>CCs</b> Citycour			upertino.gov	>, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org>
<b>Status</b>	Type	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Group</b>	Assignee
Open	-	Normal	Planning	Lindsay Nelson

#### Xin Wang June 2, 2025 at 4:34 PM

Dear City Staff, Councilmembers, and Planning Commissioners,

I live in Cupertino. I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the surveys linked on the Citywide Active Transportation Plan webpage, particularly the project survey and the map survey:

#### Citywide Active Transportation Plan Page

I am seeing the city wasting huge amount of money on this kind of things but not benefit anybody. I am wondering anybody ever seriously considered what gain is achieved. Thousands of people (most if not all) will suffer due to this bad planning. But I am confused what drove the city to make wrong decisions again and again? here might be the answer.

In the **project survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/extra-survey</u>), all questions focus exclusively on improving walking and biking in Cupertino. While these are important topics, the survey does not include a single question addressing the needs or experiences of those who drive cars or ride motorcycles—despite being labeled a "transportation" survey. We believe the term "transportation" should encompass all forms of travel, including motor vehicles, which are essential for most residents' daily lives. Excluding drivers from this discussion feels like a form of discrimination and does not reflect the full scope of community transportation needs.</u>

In the **map survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/survey</u>), when respondents indicate dissatisfaction with a roadway, the only improvement option was adding barriers or gaps for bike and pedestrian routes. This approach suggests that the only areas in need of improvement are bike and pedestrian routes, ignoring broader concerns about road quality, traffic flow, lane design or driving safety.

Many residents I've spoken with have found the surveys difficult or irrelevant to complete and have ultimately chosen not to participate. As such, I urge the City not to treat the survey results as a comprehensive or representative reflection of community input when making decisions about future transportation projects.

Please consider designing a more inclusive survey that better captures the full range of transportation experiences and needs in Cupertino. And please put my comments in public record. Thank you!

Support Software by Zendesk

### #138019 An Apple Employee has big concerns regarding the Citywide Active Transportation Surveys

<b>Submitted</b>			<b>Received v</b>	ia Requester
June 2, 2025 at 5:41 PM			Mail	Tao Shui <tshui@apple.com></tshui@apple.com>
<b>CCs</b> Citycour				>, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org>
<b>Status</b>	Туре	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Assignee</b>
Open	-	Normal	Planning	Lindsay Nelson

Tao Shui June 2, 2025 at 5:41 PM

Dear City Staff, Council-members, and Planning Commissioners,

I am a Cupertino resident for more than 15 years. I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the surveys linked on the Citywide Active Transportation Plan webpage, particularly the project survey and the map survey:

#### Citywide Active Transportation Plan Page

In the **project survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/extra-survey</u>), all questions focus exclusively on improving walking and biking in Cupertino. While these are important topics, the survey does not include a single question addressing the needs or experiences of those who drive cars or ride motorcycles—despite being labeled a "transportation" survey. We believe the term "transportation" should encompass all forms of travel, including motor vehicles, which are essential for most residents' daily lives. Excluding drivers from this discussion feels like a form of discrimination and does not reflect the full scope of community transportation needs.</u>

In the **map survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/survey</u>), when respondents indicate dissatisfaction with a roadway, the only improvement option was adding barriers or gaps for bike and pedestrian routes.

I believe this survey and the approach you are taking is severely biased, as it suggests that the only areas in need of improvement are bike and pedestrian routes, ignoring broader concerns about road quality, traffic flow, lane design or driving safety. The vast interest of motorist residents are not taken into account.

Many residents I've spoken with have found the surveys difficult or irrelevant to complete and have ultimately chosen not to participate. As such, I urge the City not to treat the survey results as a comprehensive or representative reflection of community input when making decisions about future transportation projects.

Please consider designing a more inclusive survey that better captures the full range of transportation experiences and needs in Cupertino. And please put my comments in public record. Thank you!

Yours sincerely,

Tao Shui

cupertino.zendesk.com/tickets/138019/print

Support Software by Zendesk

## #138349 Concerns Regarding the Citywide Active Transportation Plan Surveys

Submitted			<b>Received v</b> i	ia Requester
June 5, 2025 at 4:49 PM			Mail	mingrui bao <purple11777@yahoo.com></purple11777@yahoo.com>
<b>CCs</b> Citycour			upertino.gov:	>, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org>
<b>Status</b>	Type	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Assignee</b>
Open	-	Normal	Planning	Lindsay Nelson

mingrui bao June 5, 2025 at 4:49 PM

Dear City Staff, Councilmembers, and Planning Commissioners,

I am a West San Jose resident. I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the surveys linked on the Citywide Active Transportation Plan webpage, particularly the project survey and the map survey: Citywide Active Transportation Plan Page

In the project survey (<u>https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fcupertinoatp.org%2f%23%2fextra-survey&c=E,1,C5an7G9PndEDI\_7Q3HWjg-</u>

cBRE2eCRKJofUK6iUBiCRWStOImcToJDIOH542gTZu1p2X5bCQVsVyx7\_4OdNpg9vvgdgCTs5ESNQR-

<u>pmHT0Jb1s2j5Ow,&typo=1</u>), all questions focus exclusively on improving walking and biking in Cupertino. While these are important topics, the survey does not include a single question addressing the needs or experiences of those who drive cars or ride motorcycles—despite being labeled a "transportation" survey. We believe the term "transportation" should encompass all forms of travel, including motor vehicles, which are essential for most residents' daily lives. Excluding drivers from this discussion feels like a form of discrimination and does not reflect the full scope of community transportation needs.

In the map survey (https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?

a=https%3a%2f%2fcupertinoatp.org%2f%23%2fsurvey&c=E,1,tzFYkIBJtiuh3De5Q8z6\_ODGN0ev-

uDQ3pXIfnBTIhhNo2Ff2SvXI2wgwqwWcLCzBI\_yhKaQZ0UYyjjksvmDwSs8jn7ZVej1cnBIZF4WomWG&typo=1),

when respondents indicate dissatisfaction with a roadway, the only improvement option was adding barriers or gaps for bike and pedestrian routes. This approach suggests that the only areas in need of improvement are bike and pedestrian routes, ignoring broader concerns about road quality, traffic flow, lane design or driving safety. Many residents I've spoken with have found the surveys difficult or irrelevant to complete and have ultimately chosen not to participate. As such, I urge the City not to treat the survey results as a comprehensive or representative reflection of community input when making decisions about future transportation projects. Please consider designing a more inclusive survey that better captures the full range of transportation experiences and needs in Cupertino. And please put my comments in public record. Thank you!

Ming

Support Software by Zendesk

## #138356 Concerns Regarding the Citywide Active Transportation Plan Surveys

Submitted			Received vi	Requester	
June 5, 2025 at 9:17 PM			Mail	Lidanj72 <lidanj72@gmail.com></lidanj72@gmail.com>	
<b>CCs</b> Citycour			upertino.gov	>, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org>	
<b>Status</b> Open	Type -	<b>Priority</b> Normal	<b>Group</b> Planning	<b>Assignee</b> Lindsay Nelson	

#### Lidanj72 June 5, 2025 at 9:17 PM

Dear City Staff, Councilmembers, and Planning Commissioners,

I am a west san jose resident. I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the surveys linked on the Citywide Active Transportation Plan webpage, particularly the project survey and the map survey:

#### Citywide Active Transportation Plan Page

In the **project survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/extra-survey</u>), all questions focus exclusively on improving walking and biking in Cupertino. While these are important topics, the survey does not include a single question addressing the needs or experiences of those who drive cars or ride motorcycles—despite being labeled a "transportation" survey. We believe the term "transportation" should encompass all forms of travel, including motor vehicles, which are essential for most residents' daily lives. Excluding drivers from this discussion feels like a form of discrimination and does not reflect the full scope of community transportation needs.</u>

In the **map survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/survey</u>), when respondents indicate dissatisfaction with a roadway, the only improvement option was adding barriers or gaps for bike and pedestrian routes. This approach suggests that the only areas in need of improvement are bike and pedestrian routes, ignoring broader concerns about road quality, traffic flow, lane design or driving safety.

Many residents I've spoken with have found the surveys difficult or irrelevant to complete and have ultimately chosen not to participate. As such, I urge the City not to treat the survey results as a comprehensive or representative reflection of community input when making decisions about future transportation projects.

Please consider designing a more inclusive survey that better captures the full range of transportation experiences and needs in Cupertino. And please put my comments in public record. Thank you!

Sincerely yours, Lidan Jiang Sent from my iPhone

## #138357 Concerns Regarding the Citywide Active Transportation Plan Survey

<b>Submitted</b>			<b>Received</b>	via Requester
June 5, 2025 at 10:04 PM			Mail	Christine Cheng <huayingnew@yahoo.com></huayingnew@yahoo.com>
<b>CCs</b> Citycouncil <citycouncil@c< td=""><td>upertino.gov</td><td>, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org></td></citycouncil@c<>			upertino.gov	, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org>
<b>Status</b>	Туре	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Group</b>	Assignee
Open	-	Normal	Planning	Lindsay Nelson

Christine Cheng June 5, 2025 at 10:04 PM

Dear City Staff, Councilmembers, and Planning Commissioners,

We've been long time Cupertino residents. We're writing to express serious concerns regarding the surveys linked on the Citywide Active Transportation Plan webpage, particularly the project survey and the map survey: <u>Citywide Active Transportation Plan Page</u>

In the **project survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/extra-survey</u>), all questions focus exclusively on improving walking and biking in Cupertino. While these are important topics, the survey does not include a single question addressing the needs or experiences of those who drive cars or ride motorcycles—despite being labeled a "transportation" survey. We believe the term "transportation" should encompass all forms of travel, including motor vehicles, which are essential for most residents' daily lives. Excluding drivers from this discussion feels like a form of discrimination and does not reflect the full scope of community transportation needs.</u>

In the **map survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/survey</u>), when respondents indicate dissatisfaction with a roadway, the only improvement option was adding barriers or gaps for bike and pedestrian routes. This approach suggests that the only areas in need of improvement are bike and pedestrian routes, ignoring broader concerns about road quality, traffic flow, lane design or driving safety.

Many residents we've spoken with have found the surveys difficult or irrelevant to complete and have ultimately chosen not to participate. As such, we urge the City not to treat the survey results as a comprehensive or representative reflection of community input when making decisions about future transportation projects.

Please consider designing a more inclusive survey that better captures the full range of transportation experiences and needs in Cupertino. And please put my comments in public record. Thank you!

Sincerely yours,

Christine & Isaac

Qing Li June 5, 2025 at 10:15 PM

Dear Mayor Chao and City Council Members,

As a longtime Cupertino resident and parent, I'm writing on behalf of myself and my family to ask you to defund the Active Transportation Program (ATP) and Vision Zero initiatives in their current form and instead direct staff to return with a roadmap of modern technology driven road safety improvements.

While I appreciate the city's efforts to improve safety, I believe we need a more practical and futureready approach—one that focuses on modern, proven technologies rather than changes that disrupt traffic without clear and measurable safety benefits.

Other Bay Area cities are beginning to explore or adopt innovations that improve safety for both pedestrians and drivers. Cupertino should consider doing the same by prioritizing tools such as:

Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPI): Give pedestrians a brief head start at intersections.

High-visibility crosswalks and stop lines: Make crossings more visible and reduce encroachment.

Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE): Discourage speeding through the use of speed cameras in key areas.

Red light cameras: Help prevent dangerous intersection behavior.

Smart/adaptive traffic signals: Adjust timing based on real-time conditions for improved flow and safety.

Al-powered safety analytics: Detect near-misses and risky behavior before accidents happen.

Pedestrian beacons: Increase driver compliance at crossings with simple signal systems.

Automated pedestrian detection at signals: Improve accessibility and ease of use without push buttons.

These technologies offer a data-driven, effective way to improve safety without compromising traffic flow or relying on outdated infrastructure concepts.

I also want to point out that public input processes often attract only a narrow group of specialinterest voices that focus only on a specific agenda. Many residents with busy lives are unable to attend city meetings, and as a result, the broader community's views are not fully represented. I respectfully ask the City Council to defund ATP and Vision Zero in their current form, and instead instruct the transportation department to return with a comprehensive, modern road safety plan based on technology, data, and engineering best practices.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Support Software by Zendesk

## #138358 Concerns Regarding the Citywide Active Transportation Plan Survey

Submitt June 5, 1		10:06 PM	<b>Received</b> Mail	via Requester Adalia Lee <adalialee@gmail.com></adalialee@gmail.com>
<b>CCs</b> Citycour				>, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org>
<b>Status</b> Open	Туре -	<b>Priority</b> Normal	<b>Group</b> Planning	<b>Assignee</b> Lindsay Nelson

Adalia Lee June 5, 2025 at 10:06 PM

Dear City Staff, Councilmembers, and Planning Commissioners,

We've been long time Cupertino residents. We're writing to express serious concerns regarding the surveys linked on the Citywide Active Transportation Plan webpage, particularly the project survey and the map survey: <u>Citywide Active Transportation Plan Page</u>

In the **project survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/extra-survey</u>), all questions focus exclusively on improving walking and biking in Cupertino. While these are important topics, the survey does not include a single question addressing the needs or experiences of those who drive cars or ride motorcycles—despite being labeled a "transportation" survey. We believe the term "transportation" should encompass all forms of travel, including motor vehicles, which are essential for most residents' daily lives. Excluding drivers from this discussion feels like a form of discrimination and does not reflect the full scope of community transportation needs.</u>

In the **map survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/survey</u>), when respondents indicate dissatisfaction with a roadway, the only improvement option was adding barriers or gaps for bike and pedestrian routes. This approach suggests that the only areas in need of improvement are bike and pedestrian routes, ignoring broader concerns about road quality, traffic flow, lane design or driving safety.

Many residents we've spoken with have found the surveys difficult or irrelevant to complete and have ultimately chosen not to participate. As such, we urge the City not to treat the survey results as a comprehensive or representative reflection of community input when making decisions about future transportation projects.

Please consider designing a more inclusive survey that better captures the full range of transportation experiences and needs in Cupertino. And please put my comments in public record. Thank you!

Sincerely yours,

Adalia & Sophia

## #138360 Concerns Regarding the Citywide Active Transportation Plan Surveys

<b>Submitted</b>		<b>Received</b>	via Requester
June 5, 2025 at 10:54 PM		Mail	Wenguang Wang <wenguangwang@mac.com></wenguangwang@mac.com>
<b>Status Typ</b> e	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Assignee</b>
Open -	Normal	Planning	Lindsay Nelson

#### Wenguang Wang June 5, 2025 at 10:54 PM

Dear City Staff, Councilmembers, and Planning Commissioners,

I am a Cupertino area resident. I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the surveys linked on the Citywide Active Transportation Plan webpage, particularly the project survey and the map survey:

#### Citywide Active Transportation Plan Page

In the **project survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/extra-survey</u>), all questions focus exclusively on improving walking and biking in Cupertino. While these are important topics, the survey does not include a single question addressing the needs or experiences of those who drive cars or ride motorcycles—despite being labeled a "transportation" survey. We believe the term "transportation" should encompass all forms of travel, including motor vehicles, which are essential for most residents' daily lives. Excluding drivers from this discussion feels like a form of discrimination and does not reflect the full scope of community transportation needs.</u>

In the **map survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/survey</u>), when respondents indicate dissatisfaction with a roadway, the only improvement option was adding barriers or gaps for bike and pedestrian routes. This approach suggests that the only areas in need of improvement are bike and pedestrian routes, ignoring broader concerns about road quality, traffic flow, lane design or driving safety.

Many residents I've spoken with have found the surveys difficult or irrelevant to complete and have ultimately chosen not to participate. As such, I urge the City not to treat the survey results as a comprehensive or representative reflection of community input when making decisions about future transportation projects.

Please consider designing a more inclusive survey that better captures the full range of transportation experiences and needs in Cupertino. And please put my comments in public record. Thank you!

Sincerely yours, Wenguang Wang

### #138445 Deeply concerned about the Cupertino Transportation Study Survey

<b>Submitted</b>		<b>Received v</b>	ia Requester	
June 7, 2025 at 8:30 PM		Mail	Peng L <pngl8260@gmail.com></pngl8260@gmail.com>	
<b>CCs</b> Citycoun	cil <city< th=""><th>council@c</th><th>cupertino.gov</th><th>&gt;</th></city<>	council@c	cupertino.gov	>
<b>Status</b>	Туре	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Group</b>	Assignee
Open	-	Normal	Planning	Lindsay Nelson
Departm	nent			

Planning

Peng L June 7, 2025 at 8:30 PM

Dear Councilmembers and Planning Commission members,

I'm a local resident, and recently my friends and I have become deeply concerned about the design of the Citywide Transportation Survey. It appears there are serious flaws in the way the survey is structured, making it difficult—or even impossible—for many of us to finish it.

For example, on the project survey page (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/extra-survey</u>), we were only asked about walking and biking experiences. However, many of my neighbors are more interested in improving the driving experience on local roads. Unfortunately, this concern seems to have been overlooked entirely. It feels as though the city did not prioritize gathering feedback from those who drive daily, which excludes a large portion of the community.

Additionally, when reviewing the map survey results (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/survey</u>), I noticed that many comments call for wider barriers on Bollinger Road. Yet none of my friends support that idea. In fact, we found that the survey provided very limited options for expressing dissatisfaction with the current road design—and no opportunity to explain why we hope the road design can be improved. As a result, only those who supported changes like wider barriers could easily complete the survey, while others were effectively silenced.

This has left many of us feeling frustrated and excluded. Some even feel discriminated against by a survey design that doesn't allow for diverse perspectives. We hope the city will consider revising the survey process to be more inclusive and better reflect the full range of resident voices.

Sincerely yours,

Peng

Support Software by Zendesk

## #138457 Concerns Regarding the Citywide Active Transportation Plan Surveys

	<b>Submitted</b> June 8, 2025 at 10:39 PM			via Requester liang xue <liangx99@gmail.com></liangx99@gmail.com>
<b>CCs</b> Citycour	icil <city< th=""><th>council@cu</th><th>upertino.gov:</th><th>&gt;, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org></th></city<>	council@cu	upertino.gov:	>, info@cupertinoATP.org <info@cupertinoatp.org></info@cupertinoatp.org>
<b>Status</b> Open	Type -	<b>Priority</b> Normal	<b>Group</b> Planning	<b>Assignee</b> Lindsay Nelson

liang xue June 8, 2025 at 10:39 PM

Dear City Staff, Councilmembers, and Planning Commissioners,

We do not need more bike lanes. We need more car lanes.

I am a Cupertino resident. I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the surveys linked on the Citywide Active Transportation Plan webpage, particularly the project survey and the map survey:

#### Citywide Active Transportation Plan Page

In the **project survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/extra-survey</u>), all questions focus exclusively on improving walking and biking in Cupertino. While these are important topics, the survey does not include a single question addressing the needs or experiences of those who drive cars or ride motorcycles—despite being labeled a "transportation" survey. We believe the term "transportation" should encompass all forms of travel, including motor vehicles, which are essential for most residents' daily lives. Excluding drivers from this discussion feels like a form of discrimination and does not reflect the full scope of community transportation needs.</u>

In the **map survey** (<u>https://cupertinoatp.org/#/survey</u>), when respondents indicate dissatisfaction with a roadway, the only improvement option was adding barriers or gaps for bike and pedestrian routes. This approach suggests that the only areas in need of improvement are bike and pedestrian routes, ignoring broader concerns about road quality, traffic flow, lane design or driving safety.

Many residents I've spoken with have found the surveys difficult or irrelevant to complete and have ultimately chosen not to participate. As such, I urge the City not to treat the survey results as a comprehensive or representative reflection of community input when making decisions about future transportation projects.

Please consider designing a more inclusive survey that better captures the full range of transportation experiences and needs in Cupertino. And please put my comments in public record. Thank you!

Liang Xue

anning Commission
ave Cupertino
5 9:00:48 AM

>

> Hello,

> Pls. Advise why the setbacks on the new home construction right next to my home 10101 orange ave is less than 3 feet .

>

> Is it something was approved by the city ?

>

> Thank you

> Viktor khan

> 10101 orange ave

> Cupertino ca 95014

> Sent from iPhone

>



#### Sent from iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

#### >

> Here are some > Pics



> Sent from iPhone

>> On Jun 5, 2025, at 7:22 PM, Victor Khan <vitek1971@yahoo.com> wrote:

- >> On Jun 5, 2025, at 7:22 PM, Victor Khan <vitek1971@yahoo.com> wrote:
  >>> Hello ,
  >> Ples. Advise why the setbacks on the new home construction right next to my home 10101 orange ave is less than 3 feet .
  >> Is it something was approved by the city ?
  >> Thank you
  >> Viktor khan
  >> 10101 orange ave
  >> Cupertine ca 95014
  >> Sent from iPhone

Thank you for sending the notice about 1000 South De Anza Blvd. This is the site of the old Mari Kitchen Building.

At 90 feet the building is too tall for the area. This is very close to the city of Cupertino so sensitivity Should be considered when building this structure. I think it is important that the city of San Jose Have outreach about this building to the city of Cupertino and residents of both Cupertino and San Jose as South De Anza Blvd. is shared by both cities. There needs to be some coordination in Construction so that there are not giant high rises from San Jose abutting new three story buildings From Cupertino. This makes for a very disorganized landscape. My husband grew up near South De Anza Blvd. And Prospect in an area that was San Jose and switched to Cupertino in 1976. He attended Monta Vista High School. What high school will these students attend at 1000 South De Anza Blvd?

It is also important to have adequate setback of buildings from De Anza Blvd. There needs to be room For trees and sidewalks.

I'm also concerned about the amount of traffic coming out of this project. The Traders Joes Shopping Center already has too much traffic at the corner of Bollinger and South De Anza Blvd. I am Glad that there will be adequate parking on site the property because this project could have people Parking in the adjacent shopping center parking lots or the Home Depot across the street.

I wish they had put a restaurant back in. We depend on South De Anza Blvd. to provide dining options.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin

Cupertino Resident

From:	Jennifer Griffin
То:	City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Subject:	Fwd: Public Review Draft EIR: 1000 South De Anza Boulevard Residential Project (H23-029 & ER23-232)
Date:	Friday, June 6, 2025 11:09:35 AM

FYI.

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

**Subject:** Public Review Draft EIR: 1000 South De Anza Boulevard Residential Project (H23-029 & ER23-232)

From: City of San José <webrequests@sanjoseca.gov>

Sent: Friday, June 6, 2025, 10:32 AM

To: grenna5000@yahoo.com

CC:

### Public Review Draft EIR: 1000 South De Anza Boulevard Residential Project (H23-029 & ER23-232)

*The Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 1000 South De Anza Boulevard Residential Project is now available online.* 

**Post Date:** 06/06/2025

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project is a Site Development Permit to allow the demolition of an existing single-story commercial structure and the removal of 13 trees for the construction a 97-foot tall, seven-story, 77,660 square foot, 120-unit residential building on a 0.72-gross-acre site. The new residential building would have 5,017 square feet of common open space and a 148-stall parking area with mechanical lifts and eight outdoor guest parking spaces. The building would be 91 feet tall from the top of the grade to the roofline. Sixteen of the units in the building are included as below market rate affordable living spaces.

#### LOCATION

The approximately 0.72-acre project site (APN 372-26-018) is located at 1000 South De Anza Boulevard in San José.

#### ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER

372-26-018

#### PUBLIC RECIRCULATION PERIOD

The Draft EIR will be circulated for public review and comment from June 6, 2025 through July 21, 2025.

The public is welcome to review and comment on the draft documents. Public comments must be submitted to the Environmental Project Manager no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 21, 2025.

Project website: <u>1000 South De Anza Boulevard Residential Project</u> City of San Jose (sanjoseca.gov)

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT MANAGER

Nhu Nguyen 408-535-6894 <u>Nhu.Nguyen@sanjoseca.gov</u>

Having trouble viewing this email? <u>View on the website instead</u>.

Change your eNotification preference.

Unsubscribe from all City of San José eNotifications.

# PC 6-10-2025

Item No.2 SummerHill Homes

# Written Communications

## **#138188 Letter of Support for 20840 Stevens Creek Blvd**

Submitted	Received via	Requester
June 4, 2025 at 12:19 PM	Mail	Andrew Ha <aha@greenbelt.org></aha@greenbelt.org>

#### CCs

Emi Sugiyama <emis@cupertino.gov>, Jordan Grimes <jgrimes@greenbelt.org>, Lin, Austin <alin@shhomes.com>, McNamara, Ryan <rmcnamara@shhomes.com>, Sbull <sbull@shhomes.com>

Status	Туре	Priority	Group	Assignee
Solved	-	Normal	Planning	Lindsay Nelson

Andrew Ha June 4, 2025 at 12:19 PM

To whom this may concern,

My name is Andrew Ha and I'm writing on behalf of Greenbelt Alliance, an organization dedicated to advancing sustainable land use and climate-smart development in the 9 county Bay Area.

We would like to **express our support for the 20840 Stevens Creek Blvd project** (#DP-2024-002), which has now been certified by our Development Endorsement Program. We believe that this project will provide much needed sustainable infill housing to Cupertino and hope that the city's planning commission would agree.

Thank you so much for reviewing this project and we hope to see it break ground soon.

Sincerely, **Andrew Ha** (*he/him*) State and Regional Resilience Associate **Greenbelt Alliance** 827 Broadway Ste 310 | Oakland, CA 94607 Telephone: (415) 543-6771 ext. 322 greenbelt.org | Facebook | Instagram | X



*From Surviving to Thriving:* Greenbelt Alliance's New Strategic Plan Read our vision for the next five years: <u>greenbelt.org/strategic-plan</u>

Support Software by Zendesk



June 4, 2025

RE: Endorsement of 20840 Stevens Creek in Cupertino, CA

Dear Cupertino Planning Commission,

For over 60 years, Greenbelt Alliance has helped create cities and neighborhoods that make the Bay Area a better place to live—healthy



places where people can walk and bike; communities with parks, shops, transportation options; homes that are affordable and resilient to the impacts of climate change. Greenbelt Alliance's Climate SMART—Sustainable, Mixed, Affordable, Resilient, Transit-Oriented—Development Endorsement Program provides support for projects that advance the right kind of development in the right places. By promoting climate-smart development we can create thriving, resilient neighborhoods with ready access to transit and housing choices for all of the Bay Area's people.

## After careful review, Greenbelt Alliance is pleased to endorse the proposed 20840 Stevens Creek project.

#### **Location and Economic Benefits**

In hopes to build more infill housing, the developer SummerHill Homes is proposing a 59-unit townhome neighborhood nearby a plethora of community amenities including shops, parks, schools, and a community college. It is well situated for residents to have access to many of their basic needs. 12 of the units will be deed-restricted, below-market rate housing which will promote affordability and accessibility in the community.

#### Sustainable Development

The project will be an all-electric residential neighborhood, providing solar panels and EV charging capacities within each home. Sustainability is also reflected in their landscaping and water management practices: SummerHill will grow drought tolerant and native plants, include climate sensitive controllers in common areas, and set up biological treatment for stormwater runoff. The development will also be built in an area with minimal fire and flood risks, promoting its overall resilience to climate hazards.

Moreover, the 20840 Stevens Creek project will be moderately connected to public transit. It will be besides multiple VTA bus routes including the 55, 51, Rapid 523, and 23. Residents are also encouraged to bike to nearby amenities, with each garage allotting 2 spaces for bicycles.

According to <u>GreenTRIP</u>—a free online tool created by Transform that models traffic and greenhouse gas impacts of residential projects in California— the 20840 Stevens Creek project development will result in:



- **231 fewer miles** driven every day compared to the Santa Clara County average.
- **12% fewer GHG impacts** every day compared to the Santa Clara County average.
- **3% less parking use** every day compared to the Santa Clara County average.

Greenbelt Alliance believes the 20840 Stevens Creek project will provide much needed SMART, infill housing in Cupertino and we are proud to give this project an endorsement! We hope its approval will inspire higher density development in the city and around the Bay Area.

Sincerely,

Andrew Ha State and Regional Resilience Associate Greenbelt Alliance

## / #136248 Public Comment, May 13th meeting agenda item 3

				Lin, Austin <alin@shhomes.com>, McNamara, Ryan sbull@shhomes.com&gt;</alin@shhomes.com>
Status Solved	Type -	<b>Priority</b> Normal	-	Assignee Lindsay Nelson
<b>Jack Fa</b> Good me		ay 12, 2025 a	at 5:23 AM	
Please f	nd attac	hed corres	pondence fr	rom YIMBY Law regarding the proposal at 20840 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Sincerel	y,			
Jack Fa				
<b>Jack Fa</b> Researc 267-218	h Attorr			
Researce 267-218	ch Attorr -1147			
Researd 267-218	ch Attorr 1147 \BY	ney	chieved in 20	<u>024!</u>
Researce 267-218	ch Attorr 1147 \BY	ney	chieved in 20	<u>024!</u>
Researce 267-218	ch Attorr 1147 \BY	ney	<u>chieved in 2(</u>	<u>024!</u>
Researd 267-218	ch Attorr -1147 NBY <u>ut every</u>	ney <u>thing we ac</u>	<u>chieved in 20</u> 2025 at 1:04 F	
Researc 267-218 III YIA Check o McNama	th Attorr -1147 (BY w ut every ut every ara, Rya	thing we ac	2025 at 1:04 F	

Ryan McNamara Director of Development SummerHill Homes Cartel: (925)244-8706 | B Mobile (925)766-1350

SUMMERHILL HOMES<sup>®®</sup>

## Follow Us:

All subject matter contained in this email is confidential and proprietary to SummerHill Homes LLC and should not be disclosed to any person not listed as an original recipient. SummerHill Homes LLC. All rights reserved.



#### YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416 San Francisco, CA 94114 <u>hello@yimbylaw.org</u>

05/12/2025

City of Cupertino Planning Commission 10300 Torre Ave Cupertino, CA 95014 Via email (planning@cupertino.gov)

Re: May 13, 2025 hearing, agenda item 3

Dear Planning Commission of Cupertino,

We are pleased to submit this letter of support of the proposed Summerhill Homes project at 20840 Stevens Creek Boulevard. YIMBYLaw is a 501(c)3 non-profit corporation, whose mission is to increase the accessibility and affordability of housing in California. The Summerhill Homes project will consist of 59 townhomes, which include 12 below market rate townhomes, on a site designated for residential development in the Cupertino Housing 2023-2031 Housing Element.

Summerhill's proposal is consistent with the Heart of the City specific plan, the Cupertino General Plan, and local zoning ordinances. As your officials have already identified to California's Department of Housing and Community Development that the site is appropriate for residential use and may contribute to the RHNA obligations, it is inarguably beneficial to public welfare that it be used for that purpose.

#### The Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (SB 330) and the City's Housing Element

SummerHill proposes to develop 59 townhome-style condominiums on a portion of the approximately 2.97-acre site at 20840 Stevens Creek Boulevcard. SummerHill submitted an SB 330 Preliminary Application for the project on January 29, 2024. Pursuant to section 65589.5

YIMBY Law, 2261 Market Street STE 10416, San Francisco, CA 94114

1



#### YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416 San Francisco, CA 94114 <u>hello@yimbylaw.org</u>

2

of the Government Code, the project is subject only to the ordinances, policies, and standards adopted and in effect when the Preliminary Application was submitted.

The proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan and zoning ordinance and other applicable objective standards. In addition, the City's subsequently approved 2023–2031 Housing Element identifies the project as a Housing Inventory Site. By designating the site as a Housing Inventory Site, the City selected the site for residential use and determined that residential development of the site would assist the City in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

#### The State Density Bonus Law

SummerHill proposes to provide 12 of the 59 townhome-style condominiums at below market rate prices. By designating at least 10 percent of the units for Moderate Income households, the project qualifies for benefits under the State Density Bonus Law.

Under the State Density Bonus Law, a developer may propose unlimited waivers of development standards that would have the effect of physically precluding construction of a qualifying project at the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted by the Density Bonus Law. SummerHill is entitled to the waivers it has requested, all of which will provide relief from development standards that would physically preclude construction of the project at the density proposed.

Once a project qualifies for a density bonus, State law provides that the City may deny a requested waiver only if it would have a specific, adverse impact upon health or safety, would have an adverse impact on a historic resource, or would be contrary to State or Federal law. In this context, specific adverse impact "means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete."<sup>1</sup> There is no

YIMBY Law, 2261 Market Street STE 10416, San Francisco, CA 94114

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Gov. Code, §§ 65915, subd. (e)(1), 65589.5, subd. (d)(2).



#### YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416 San Francisco, CA 94114 <u>hello@yimbylaw.org</u>

.

3

substantial evidence in the record that any of SummerHill's requested waivers would meet the criteria for City denial.

#### The Housing Accountability Act

The Housing Accountability Act, in Section 65589.5(j)(1)(A)- (B), limits a municipality's ability to deny or condition on lower density a housing development project that complies with objective standards. The City may only disapprove the project or impose conditions on the project that would reduce density if necessary to avoid a "significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete" and there is no feasible method to mitigate or avoid those impacts other than disapproval or development at a lower density.

We have reviewed the project plans, the CEQA document and the various expert reports that have been prepared for the project, and there is not a preponderance of evidence in the record that would justify the City's disapproval of the project or conditioning the project in a manner that would reduce density.

#### Summary

The Legislature has made numerous amendments to California Housing Law in an effort to provide increased clarity and certainty for both municipalities and housing providers. Based on these laws, the project is subject only to the objective standards that were in effect on the date of the Preliminary Application; the project is entitled to the requested waivers under Density Bonus law; with those waivers the project is consistent with applicable objective standards; and the evidence in the record would *not* justify the City's denial of the project or imposition of approval that would reduce density. Disapproval of the project or approval with conditions that would render the project infeasible at the density proposed would contravene State law.

#### YIMBY Law, 2261 Market Street STE 10416, San Francisco, CA 94114



#### YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416 San Francisco, CA 94114 <u>hello@yimbylaw.org</u>

4

It is YIMBY Action's understanding that City staff has processed SummerHill's development application with professionalism and recognition of the City's obligations under State law. We appreciate the staff's cooperation and encourage the Planning Commission and the City Council to continue to uphold the same standard.

I am signing this letter both in my capacity as the Executive Director of YIMBY Law, and as a resident of California who is affected by the shortage of housing in our state. I look forward to seeing this project approved and bought to realization to help change the tides of the housing crisis in the Bay Area.

Sincerely,

Donjo Trauss

Sonja Trauss Executive Director YIMBY Law

From:	Jennifer Griffin
То:	City Council
Cc:	grenna5000@yahoo.com; City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Subject:	SB 330 Project at Staples Shopping Center & LOS Traffic Studies
Date:	Thursday, June 5, 2025 7:37:02 PM

Dear City Council:

I am very concerned about the traffic congestion from the upcoming Staples SB 330 project. This is a very Complicated area already with the current street configurations of Stevens Creek Blvd, Saich Ave, Bandley, the entrances and exits to the adjacent shopping centers. Also, the adjacent SB 330 Project at Panera Bread across Stevens Creek Blvd will have a traffic impact on the area too. It Will affect the same intersections.

Are there going to be LOS studies to determine the traffic impacts on the area and determine The Level of Service for each intersection in the area? Also, because Staples is filing first, will This mean that the traffic issues from the Panera SB 330 Project will be taken into account for the Staples SB 330 Project?

I think VMT is of little real value to determine how the Level of Service in the adjacent intersections To these two projects will be affected. LOS is the true indicator of future traffic trends.

Please make sure that the VMT Traffic Studies are performed. We are losing viable active retail Which is a true loss to the city. We don't want SB 330 to be both a retail crisis for the city As well as a traffic crisis in our city.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin

From:	Jennifer Griffin
То:	City Council
Cc:	grenna5000@yahoo.com; City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Subject:	Re: SB 330 Project at Staples Shopping Center & LOS Traffic Studies
Date:	Thursday, June 5, 2025 8:06:12 PM

Please see the corrected version of my letter to City Council to indicate that LOS Studies should be Performed on the Staples SB 330 Project. Thank you.

Dear City Council:

I am very concerned about the traffic congestion from the upcoming Staples SB 330 project. This is a very complicated area already with the current street configurations of Stevens Creek Blvd, Saich Ave, Bandley, the entrances and exits to the adjacent shopping centers. Also, the adjacent SB 330 Project at Panera Bread across Stevens Creek Blvd will have a traffic impact on the area too. It will affect the same intersections.

Are there going to be LOS studies to determine the traffic impacts on the area and determine The Level of Service for each intersection in the area? Also, because Staples is filing first, will this mean that the traffic issues from the Panera SB 330 Project will be taken into account for the Staples SB 330 Project?

I think VMT is of little real value to determine how the Level of Service in the adjacent intersections to these two projects will be affected. LOS is the true indicator of future traffic trends.

Please make sure that the LOS Traffic Studies are performed. We are losing viable active retail which is a true loss to the city. We don't want SB 330 to be both a retail crisis for the city As well as a traffic crisis in our city.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin

On June 5, 2025, at 7:36 PM, Jennifer Griffin <grenna5000@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear City Council:

I am very concerned about the traffic congestion from the upcoming Staples SB 330 project. This is a very Complicated area already with the current street configurations of Stevens Creek Blvd, Saich Ave, Bandley, the entrances and exits to the adjacent shopping centers. Also, the adjacent SB 330 Project at Panera Bread across Stevens Creek Blvd will have a traffic impact on the area too. It Will affect the same intersections.

Are there going to be LOS studies to determine the traffic impacts on the area and determine The Level of Service for each intersection in the area? Also, because Staples is filing first, will This mean that the traffic issues from the Panera SB 330 Project will be taken into account for the Staples SB 330 Project? I think VMT is of little real value to determine how the Level of Service in the adjacent intersections To these two projects will be affected. LOS is the true indicator of future traffic trends.

Please make sure that the VMT Traffic Studies are performed. We are losing viable active retail Which is a true loss to the city. We don't want SB 330 to be both a retail crisis for the city As well as a traffic crisis in our city.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin

From:	lennifer Griffin
То: (	City Council; City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Cc:	<u>grenna5000@yahoo.com</u>
Subject:	Heritage Oak Tree South of Dish Dash Restaurant and Pizza Hut (By SB 330 Staples Project)
Date:	Fhursday, June 5, 2025 9:02:34 PM

Dear City Council and Planning Commission:

There is a heritage oak tree located just to the south of the Dish Dash Restaurant building And the Pizza Hut Building. The city planted the Valley Oak ten years ago to replace Another Oak Tree in the same location that was perhaps 150 years old. This was When the Dish Dash Building was being remodeled from the Marie Calendars that was There before.

The old oak tree had been on this site when the old house on the property was there. This old House was used as a mortuary and the oak tree was located adjacent to the house. The house Had probably been there since perhaps 1900 and I am assuming the oak was left on the Property as the tree was perhaps from 1860 from observing the huge diameter of the trunk. The tree was clearly observable from the (former) Mervyns parking lot which is adjacent to The east and south side of the oak tree.

This 150 year old heritage oak tree was replaced by the city ten years ago. There is now a large Twenty foot tall Valley Oak in excellent condition. The tree has a large open area around its Perimeter and canopy and nothing is crowding it. It had plenty of space to grow to a Magnificent specimen tree.

I am concerned the proposed SB 330 Staples Condominium Project might be encroaching on this Heritage tree. I cannot tell from the plans where the tree is located, but I have always assumed It was on the Dish Dash property or the Mervyns parking lot property.

Please make sure this oak tree is not crowded or disturbed by this SB 330 Housing project. This is a protected heritage oak tree that is protected by city law. The city has taken great pains And invested money in this tree and it would be an absolute travesty to see one of our city Heritage trees senseless destroyed or harmed by an SB 330 Project or any development for that matter.

I will be attending the June 10, 2025 Planning Commission meeting on this SB 330 Staples Housing Project and will bring up the issues concerning the safety of this tree in this Potential construction zone. This Valley Oak has a good ten years of growing time already And I don't want to see this tree destroyed or damaged by getting housing construction Close to it. Valley Oaks are precious trees to California and this tree is irreplaceable.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin

From: To:	<u>James Lloyd</u> Santosh Rao; Tracy Kosolcharoen; David Fung; Seema Lindskog; Steven Scharf; City of Cupertino Planning
	Commission
Cc:	<u>City Clerk; Piu Ghosh (she/her); City of Cupertino Planning Dept.; Cupertino City Manager"s Office; City</u> <u>Attorney"s Office</u>
Subject:	public comment re item 2 for 6/10/25 Planning Commission meeting
Date:	Friday, June 6, 2025 12:26:49 PM
Attachments:	Cupertino - 20770-20840 Stevens Creek Blvd - HAA Letter.pdf

Dear Cupertino Planning Commission,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") submits the attached public comment re item 2 for 6/10/25 Planning Commission meeting, the proposed 59-unit housing development project at 20770, 20830, and 20840 Stevens Creek Blvd, which includes 6 moderate-income units and 6 median-income units.

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/



Jun 6, 2025

City of Cupertino 10300 Torre Avenue Cupertino, CA 95014

Re: Proposed Housing Development at 20770, 20830, and 20840 Stevens Creek Blvd

By email: <u>srao@cupertino.org</u>; <u>Tkosolcharoen@cupertino.gov</u>; <u>dfung@cupertino.gov</u>; <u>slindskog@cupertino.gov</u>; <u>SScharf@cupertino.gov</u>; <u>planningcommission@cupertino.gov</u>

CC: <u>piug@cupertino.gov</u>; <u>planning@cupertino.gov</u>; <u>CityAttorney@cupertino.gov</u>; <u>CityManager@cupertino.gov</u>; <u>CityClerk@Cupertino.gov</u>

Dear Cupertino Planning Commission,

The California Housing Defense Fund ("CalHDF") submits this letter to remind the City of its obligation to abide by all relevant state housing laws when evaluating the proposed 59-unit housing development project at 20770, 20830, and 20840 Stevens Creek Blvd, which includes 6 moderate-income units and 6 median-income units. These laws include the Housing Accountability Act ("HAA"), the Density Bonus Law ("DBL"), and AB 2097.

The HAA provides the project legal protections. It requires approval of zoning and general plan compliant housing development projects unless findings can be made regarding specific, objective, written health and safety hazards. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5, subd. (j).) The HAA also bars cities from imposing conditions on the approval of such projects that would reduce the project's density unless, again, such written findings are made. (*Ibid.*) As a development with at least two-thirds of its area devoted to residential uses, the project falls within the HAA's ambit, and it complies with local zoning code and the City's general plan. Increased density, concessions, and waivers that a project is entitled to under the DBL (Gov. Code, § 65915) do not render the project noncompliant with the zoning code or general plan, for purposes of the HAA. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5, subd. (j)(3).) The HAA's protections therefore apply, and the City may not reject the project except based on health and safety standards, as outlined above. Furthermore, if the City rejects the project or impairs its feasibility, it must conduct "a thorough analysis of the economic, social, and environmental effects of the action." (*Id.* at subd. (b).)

360 Grand Ave #323, Oakland 94610 www.calhdf.org CalHDF also writes to emphasize that the DBL offers the proposed development certain protections. The City must respect these protections. In addition to granting the increase in residential units allowed by the DBL, the City must not deny the project the proposed waivers and concessions with respect to height, front setback, setback from landscape easement, side setback, rear setback, service access, private outdoor space clearance, building form, lot coverage, parking space size, planter strip, and retail component. If the City were to deny the requested waivers, Government Code section 65915, subdivision (e)(1) requires findings that the waivers would have a specific, adverse impact upon health or safety, and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact. If the City were to deny the requested requested concessions, Government Code section 65915, subdivision (d)(1) requires findings that the concessions would not result in identifiable and actual cost reductions, that the concessions would have a specific, adverse impact on public health or safety, or that the concessions are contrary to state or federal law. The City, if it makes any such findings, bears the burden of proof. (Gov. Code, § 65915, subd. (d)(4).) Of note, the DBL specifically allows for a reduction in required accessory parking in addition to the allowable waivers and concessions. (Id. at subd. (p).) Additionally, the California Court of Appeal has ruled that when an applicant has requested one or more waivers and/or concessions pursuant to the DBL, the City "may not apply any development standard that would physically preclude construction of that project as designed, even if the building includes 'amenities' beyond the bare minimum of building components." (Bankers Hill 150 v. *City of San Diego* (2022) 74 Cal.App.5th 755, 775.)

Additionally, the project is exempt from state environmental review under the Class 32 CEQA categorical exemption (In-Fill Development Projects) pursuant to section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines, as the project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as the applicable zoning designation and regulations; the proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses; the project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species; approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and the site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. Caselaw from the California Court of Appeal affirms that local governments err, and may be sued, when they improperly refuse to grant a project a CEQA exemption or streamlined CEQA review to which it is entitled. (*Hilltop Group, Inc. v. County of San Diego* (2024) 99 Cal.App.5th 890, 911.)

As you are well aware, California remains in the throes of a statewide crisis-level housing shortage. New housing such as this is a public benefit; it will provide badly-needed affordable housing; it will bring increased tax revenue and new customers to local businesses; and it will reduce displacement of existing residents into homelessness. While no one project will solve the statewide housing crisis, the proposed development is a step in the right direction. CalHDF urges the City to approve it, consistent with its obligations under 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 <u>www.calhdf.org</u>.

Sincerely,

Dylan Casey CalHDF Executive Director

James M. Lloyd CalHDF Director of Planning and Investigations

From:	David Rolnick
To:	City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Subject:	Housing Project on Staples/Fontana"s/Pizza Hut Properties
Date:	Sunday, June 8, 2025 8:51:00 PM

Some thoughts on the housing project being proposed for the Staples and former Pizza Hut and Fontana properties:

- 1. There should be a retail component to this development. This may be one of the best areas in the city for retail to work. If we want a walkable pedestrian friendly city, Stevens Creek Blvd. frontage should be retail. If this developer can get away without providing any retail, the message it will send to other developers is that Cupertino does not require retail as part of any new development.
- 2. No Very Low Income (VLI) Housing is being proposed. The Housing plan called for 59 VLI units at this site. Zero are being proposed. If this developer can get away with provide zero units, other developers will try the same tactics.
- 3. Appropriate setbacks for the units on the south end of the property (bordering the homes on Scofield Drive) should be provided.

Thank you.

David Rolnick

From:	Louis Mirante
То:	City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Subject:	Support Letter for Stevens Creek
Date:	Monday, June 9, 2025 2:49:29 PM
Attachments:	Outlook-Logo Desc.png
	Outlook-Text Desc.png
	Outlook-Logo, icon.png
	Outlook-Icon Desc.png
	Outlook-Icon Desc.png
	BAC Support - SummerHill Cupertino.pdf

Hey Cupertino Planning Commission,

Please see the attached letter of support letter from the Bay Area Council for the 59-unit townhome project on Stevens Creek Boulevard you will consider at your meeting tomorrow. If you have any questions about our letter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Best wishes,

Louis



Louis Mirante Vice President of Public Policy, Housing Phone: (510) 908-0537 | Email: Imirante@bayareacouncil.org The Historic Klamath, Pier 9, The Embarcadero, San Francisco

www.bayareacouncil.org





## June 9, 2025

City of Cupertino Cupertino Planning Commission 10300 Torre Avenue Cupertino, CA 95014

## **RE:** Support for SummerHill Homes' 59-Unit Townhome Project at Stevens Creek Boulevard

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of the Bay Area Council, I write to express strong support for the proposed 59unit townhome condominium development by SummerHill Homes at 20770, 20830, and 20840 Stevens Creek Boulevard. This project represents a vital opportunity for Cupertino to advance toward meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets—particularly for moderate-income households—through thoughtful infill development.

The Bay Area Council represents 350 of the largest employers in the Bay Area, including companies, public agencies, and unions. We convene conversations on the most important issues facing the Bay Area and we work to make the Bay Area the best place to work and play. We are deeply committed to building the 3.5 million new homes our state needs to address our existing shortfall and the attendant high housing prices. Our goal is to endorse housing in areas that have important benefits to the region's environment and transportation system, so we are especially supportive of projects close to jobs.

This project is one of the most important projects for meeting our goals we have seen in recent years. The proposal replaces an underutilized retail site with new homes, including 12 deed-restricted affordable ownership units for moderate- and median-income households. These types of for-sale affordable homes are among the most difficult to produce in California, and their inclusion makes this project especially valuable in addressing the city's housing shortfall. The units will count toward Cupertino's RHNA obligations under the 6th Cycle Housing Element, helping ensure the city remains in compliance with state law and avoids consequences for underproduction.

SummerHill's project is consistent with the city's General Plan and the Heart of the City Specific Plan, and makes thoughtful use of the state Density Bonus Law to deliver a feasible and high-quality community that includes open space, landscaping, and public art. This development helps Cupertino make real progress toward its 2023–2031 housing targets by bringing a meaningful number of homes to a central location near jobs, schools, and services. Given the city's ambitious RHNA goals, timely approval of well-located projects like this one is essential.

The Bay Area Council applauds Cupertino for its work to advance housing solutions and urges the Planning Commission to recommend approval of this project. Doing so sends a clear

P. 415.946.8777 www.bayareacouncil.org Bay Area Council The Historic Klamath Pier 9, The Embarcadero San Francisco, CA 94111 Bay Area Council PO Box 5135 Berkeley, CA 94705 Bay Area Council 1215 K Street, Suite 2220 Sacramento, CA 95814



message that the city is serious about building housing for all income levels and meeting its long-term obligations under state housing law.

Sincerely,

Louis Mirante Vice President, Public Policy Bay Area Council

lmirante@bayareacouncil.org

Bay Area Council The Historic Klamath Pier 9, The Embarcadero San Francisco, CA 94111 Bay Area Council PO Box 5135 Berkeley, CA 94705 Bay Area Council 1215 K Street, Suite 2220 Sacramento, CA 95814

ennifer Griffin
ity of Cupertino Planning Commission
ity Council; grenna5000@yahoo.com; City Clerk
etters on Staples SB 330 Project
uesday, June 10, 2025 10:05:02 AM

Dear Planning Commission:

I sent several letters to the Planning Commission about the SB 330 Staples Project site. I had Concerns about the traffic load, the heritage oak tree on the Southern side of Pizza Hut And Dish Dash Restaurant and loss of retail as I shop at the Staples frequently. I don't see Any of my letters in the comments received section. I am particularly concerned about the Potential of another SB 330 going in across Stevens Creek Blvd. at Panera Bread. We need To have LOS service traffic studies before this project is built.

Thank you.

Best regards,

From:	Jennifer Griffin
То:	City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Cc:	grenna5000@yahoo.com; City Council
Subject:	Fwd: Heritage Oak Tree South of Dish Dash Restaurant and Pizza Hut (By SB 330 Staples Project)
Date:	Tuesday, June 10, 2025 10:17:59 AM

FYI. Letter of concern about Oak Tree on the Southern Side of Dish Dash Restaurant and Pizza Hut sent on

------ Original Message ------Subject: Heritage Oak Tree South of Dish Dash Restaurant and Pizza Hut (By SB 330 Staples Project)
From: Jennifer Griffin <grenna5000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 5, 2025, 9:02 PM
To: citycouncil@cupertino.org,planningcommission@cupertino.org
CC: grenna5000@yahoo.com

Dear City Council and Planning Commission:

There is a heritage oak tree located just to the south of the Dish Dash Restaurant building And the Pizza Hut Building. The city planted the Valley Oak ten years ago to replace Another Oak Tree in the same location that was perhaps 150 years old. This was When the Dish Dash Building was being remodeled from the Marie Calendars that was There before.

The old oak tree had been on this site when the old house on the property was there. This old House was used as a mortuary and the oak tree was located adjacent to the house. The house Had probably been there since perhaps 1900 and I am assuming the oak was left on the Property as the tree was perhaps from 1860 from observing the huge diameter of the trunk. The tree was clearly observable from the (former) Mervyns parking lot which is adjacent to The east and south side of the oak tree.

This 150 year old heritage oak tree was replaced by the city ten years ago. There is now a large

Twenty foot tall Valley Oak in excellent condition. The tree has a large open area around its Perimeter and canopy and nothing is crowding it. It had plenty of space to grow to a Magnificent specimen tree.

I am concerned the proposed SB 330 Staples Condominium Project might be encroaching on this

Heritage tree. I cannot tell from the plans where the tree is located, but I have always assumed It was on the Dish Dash property or the Mervyns parking lot property.

Please make sure this oak tree is not crowded or disturbed by this SB 330 Housing project. This is a protected heritage oak tree that is protected by city law. The city has taken great pains

And invested money in this tree and it would be an absolute travesty to see one of our city Heritage trees senseless destroyed or harmed by an SB 330 Project or any development for that matter.

I will be attending the June 10, 2025 Planning Commission meeting on this SB 330 Staples Housing Project and will bring up the issues concerning the safety of this tree in this Potential construction zone. This Valley Oak has a good ten years of growing time already And I don't want to see this tree destroyed or damaged by getting housing construction Close to it. Valley Oaks are precious trees to California and this tree is irreplaceable.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

From:	Jennifer Griffin
То:	City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Cc:	City Council; City Clerk; grenna5000@yahoo.com
Subject:	Fwd: SB 330 Project at Staples Shopping Center & LOS Traffic Studies
Date:	Tuesday, June 10, 2025 10:31:14 AM

Please include this letter from June 5 in the public comments about SB 330 at the

Tuesday, June 10, 2025 Planning Commission meeting on Item Number 2. Thid letter went to City Council as well as

Well as the Planning Commission on June 5 asking that an LOS (Level of Service)Traffic Study be conducted

On the SB 330 Staples Project as the LOS tells the actual degradation of the surrounding Intersections due to increased traffic load from this and other proposed projects. Please include this

Letter in comments on the SB 330 Project for the June 10 Planning Commission meeting.

Thank you.

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

Subject: Re: SB 330 Project at Staples Shopping Center & LOS Traffic Studies

From: Jennifer Griffin <grenna5000@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, June 5, 2025, 8:05 PM

To: citycouncil@cupertino.org

**CC:** grenna5000@yahoo.com,planningcommission@cupertino.org

Please see the corrected version of my letter to City Council to indicate that LOS Studies should be Performed on the Staples SB 330 Project. Thank you.

Dear City Council:

I am very concerned about the traffic congestion from the upcoming Staples SB 330 project. This is a very complicated area already with the current street configurations of Stevens Creek Blvd, Saich Ave, Bandley, the entrances and exits to the adjacent shopping centers. Also, the adjacent SB 330 Project at Panera Bread across Stevens Creek Blvd will have a traffic impact on the area too. It will affect the same intersections.

Are there going to be LOS studies to determine the traffic impacts on the area and determine

The Level of Service for each intersection in the area? Also, because Staples is filing first, will this mean that the traffic issues from the Panera SB 330 Project will be taken into account for the Staples SB 330 Project?

I think VMT is of little real value to determine how the Level of Service in the adjacent intersections to these two projects will be affected. LOS is the true indicator of future traffic trends.

Please make sure that the LOS Traffic Studies are performed. We are losing viable active retail

which is a true loss to the city. We don't want SB 330 to be both a retail crisis for the city As well as a traffic crisis in our city.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin

On June 5, 2025, at 7:36 PM, Jennifer Griffin <grenna5000@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear City Council:

I am very concerned about the traffic congestion from the upcoming Staples SB 330 project. This is a very

Complicated area already with the current street configurations of Stevens Creek Blvd, Saich Ave, Bandley, the entrances and exits to the adjacent shopping centers. Also, the adjacent SB 330

Project at Panera Bread across Stevens Creek Blvd will have a traffic impact on the area too. It Will affect the same intersections.

Are there going to be LOS studies to determine the traffic impacts on the area and determine The Level of Service for each intersection in the area? Also, because Staples is filing first, will This mean that the traffic issues from the Panera SB 330 Project will be taken into account for the

Staples SB 330 Project?

I think VMT is of little real value to determine how the Level of Service in the adjacent intersections

To these two projects will be affected. LOS is the true indicator of future traffic trends.

Please make sure that the VMT Traffic Studies are performed. We are losing viable active retail

Which is a true loss to the city. We don't want SB 330 to be both a retail crisis for the city As well as a traffic crisis in our city.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

From:	Jennifer Griffin
То:	City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Cc:	City Council; grenna5000@yahoo.com; City Clerk
Subject:	Loss of Retail at SB 330 Staples Site on Stevens Creek Blvd.
Date:	Tuesday, June 10, 2025 10:52:21 AM

Dear Planning Commission:

(Please include this as comment on Item Number 2 (SB 330 Staples Project) on the June 10, 2025 Planning Commission Agenda)

SB 330 was supposed to be a "Housing Crisis" bill. It is now apparently becoming a "Retail Crisis" bill because Cupertino is losing so much viable retail down Stevens Creek Blvd. 80,000 square feet of retail is being lost from the collection of SB 330 projects being Proposed on Stevens Creek Blvd.

I shop at the Staples frequently. This store fulfills many needs. It has a Fed Ex office, office Supplies, packing equipment and it sells other items too. It is near De Anza College And also sells computer equipment.

I am very concerned that Cupertino will become a "retail desert" by using SB 330 so much. SB 330 is not a very good housing bill and it should be amended to promote the retention Of retail.

Why is no retail being required at this SB 330 site? I don't want to have to shop outside of Cupertino for supplies and food. When my grandmother lived in Cupertino, you could get everything you needed in Cupertino. When my husband's family grew up in Cupertino, They always shopped in Cupertino. When I first moved to Cupertino, I could get everything I Needed in town. Now we are having to go to other cities or even to Morgan Hill or Santa Cruz to get supplies, food and services.

Thank you.

Best regards,

From:	Jennifer Griffin
To:	City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Cc:	grenna5000@yahoo.com
Subject:	Fwd: Loss of Retail on Stevens Creek Blvd.
Date:	Tuesday, June 10, 2025 11:49:23 AM

FYI. Thank you.

Original Message -----Subject: Loss of Retail on Stevens Creek Blvd.
From: Jennifer Griffin <grenna5000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025, 11:17 AM
To: citycouncil@cupertino.org,cityclerk@cupertino.org
CC: grenna5000@yahoo.com

Dear City Council:

(Please include this comment as public comment for the "Public Comment" section for the June 17, 2025 City Council Meeting.)

I am very concerned that we are losing valuable retail space on Stevens Creek Blvd. due to the ever increasing SB 330 projects being introduced. SB 330 was marketed as A "Housing Crisis" bill, but it is rapidly becoming apparent it is in reality a "Retail Crisis" bill. It is wiping out all retail in easily accessible areas in Cupertino. We will have No place to buy food or medicine or services in this city. It will just be miles of Highrise housing complexes (especially if SB 79 passes) and there will be no place To shop for essentials.

I think the ability to get food and medicine and fuel and medical access should be added To the list of items that CEQA protects.

We should have a Study Session about the issues emerging from SB 330. These May have been unanticipated consequences, but SB 330 was never marketed to all of Us in the state before it was passed and we never got to comment on its downfalls.

Well, we are QAing it now. We are in the field and doing Beta Tests that should have been Performed before it was brought to market as an apparently "flawed" product. One of Its problems is that it is leading to a loss of retail which is a problem for the city.

We need to correct this bill flaw before it is too late and we have no retail left at all In Cupertino.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin
City of Cupertino Planning Commission
grenna5000@yahoo.com
Demolition of Retail Buildings at SB 330 Staples Project
Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:01:42 PM

## Dear Planning Commission:

It might be advisable to not have all the retail buildings at the SB 330 Staples Project Be demolished at the same time. We would wind up with another situation like we Have had at Westport or Vallco/The Rise and El Paseo de Saratoga Shopping Center in West San Jose. You have perfectly good retail buildings taken down to only become Vacant lots.

The El Paseo Shopping Center is particularly worrisome because busy retail was taken down And now the shopping center is just sitting with nothing much in the shopping center and no Hope of anything being built. The examples were the busy Luckys Grocery Store and the Lovely Hallmark Store which were pretty well closed and demolished in like a week.

I would like to see the Staples Store in Cupertino stay on the SB 330 Staples Project site As long as possible since my family and my mother-in-law's family shop there regularily. My friend's family in Los Altos as well as my friend in Santa Clara use the Cupertino Staples. The Los Altos friend was upset that the store would be closing. It is hoped the Staples can be encouraged to relocate elsewhere in Cupertino after Its lease is up in 2026. It would not be good to knock the building down now because the Store has active retail and it has new service where you can return clothing and shoes And other items to the store and they will return them to the manufacturer for you.

My friend in Los Altos uses the Staples for this also as she has an elderly mother to Take care of too. I use the Staples service for my mother also as I purchase clothing and Shoes for her.

The Staples is a wonderful store and I think it should be encouraged to remain in Cupertino And not just knocked down.

The Fontana Restaurant Building is brand new and hardly used. It is beautiful inside and It is a shame to knock it down. Both of my mother-in-laws ate at Fontanas over the years And both were in the new building when it was open a number of years ago. Why are They trying to knock down such a beautiful building built in the lovely Italian Mediterranean Style? Why can't they use it as a Club House for the Condo Buildings or keep this building As a lovely retail building amenity for a nail salon or cafe again like Bobbies? We are going to be losing Panera Bread across the street soon with that SB 330 project Alottas in Los Altos was just Closed. Why do all the nice things In Cupertino get bulldozed?

It doesn't look like this SB 330 Staples townhouse complex will be built all at once so I hope that the Existing retail on site can remain so the site is not just an empty location. It will make Shoppers just drive by Stevens Creek Blvd if it is empty and go shop elsewhere in another city, Especially if the Panera Bread is torn up across the street, not to mention Stevens Creek Blvd.

I see El Paseo de Saratoga and how empty it is and I just drive on by. Even the Red Robims

Closed which is so sad. Its better to go to El Camino in Sunnyvale where they have lots of Restaurants and grocery stores. We live Marie Callendars and Black Bear Diner. We recently Had a family reunion at Black Bear Diner. It was wonderful.

Please preserve retail at SB 330 Staples Project as long as possible. Demolishing all The buildings at once looks so sad and makes no one want to shop or dine in Cupertino.

Thank you.

Best regards,

0 Staples Project

(Please include the following as comments on Item Number 2 at the June 10, 2025 Planning Commission meeting on the SB 330 Staples Project. Thank you.)

Original Message -----Subject: Demolition of Retail Buildings at SB 330 Staples Project
From: Jennifer Griffin <grenna5000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025, 3:01 PM
To: planningcommission@cupertino.org
CC: grenna5000@yahoo.com

Dear Planning Commission:

It might be advisable to not have all the retail buildings at the SB 330 Staples Project Be demolished at the same time. We would wind up with another situation like we Have had at Westport or Vallco/The Rise and El Paseo de Saratoga Shopping Center in West San Jose. You have perfectly good retail buildings taken down to only become Vacant lots.

The El Paseo Shopping Center is particularly worrisome because busy retail was taken down And now the shopping center is just sitting with nothing much in the shopping center and no Hope of anything being built. The examples were the busy Luckys Grocery Store and the Lovely Hallmark Store which were pretty well closed and demolished in like a week.

I would like to see the Staples Store in Cupertino stay on the SB 330 Staples Project site As long as possible since my family and my mother-in-law's family shop there regularily. My friend's family in Los Altos as well as my friend in Santa Clara use the Cupertino Staples. The Los Altos friend was upset that the store would be closing. It is hoped the Staples can be encouraged to relocate elsewhere in Cupertino after Its lease is up in 2026. It would not be good to knock the building down now because the Store has active retail and it has new service where you can return clothing and shoes And other items to the store and they will return them to the manufacturer for you.

My friend in Los Altos uses the Staples for this also as she has an elderly mother to Take care of too. I use the Staples service for my mother also as I purchase clothing and

Shoes for her.

The Staples is a wonderful store and I think it should be encouraged to remain in Cupertino And not just knocked down.

The Fontana Restaurant Building is brand new and hardly used. It is beautiful inside and It is a shame to knock it down. Both of my mother-in-laws ate at Fontanas over the years And both were in the new building when it was open a number of years ago. Why are They trying to knock down such a beautiful building built in the lovely Italian Mediterranean Style? Why can't they use it as a Club House for the Condo Buildings or keep this building As a lovely retail building amenity for a nail salon or cafe again like Bobbies? We are going to be losing

Panera Bread across the street soon with that SB 330 project Alottas in Los Altos was just Closed. Why do all the nice things In Cupertino get bulldozed?

It doesn't look like this SB 330 Staples townhouse complex will be built all at once so I hope that the

Existing retail on site can remain so the site is not just an empty location. It will make Shoppers just drive by Stevens Creek Blvd if it is empty and go shop elsewhere in another city,

Especially if the Panera Bread is torn up across the street, not to mention Stevens Creek Blvd.

I see El Paseo de Saratoga and how empty it is and I just drive on by. Even the Red Robims Closed which is so sad. Its better to go to El Camino in Sunnyvale where they have lots of Restaurants and grocery stores. We live Marie Callendars and Black Bear Diner. We recently Had a family reunion at Black Bear Diner. It was wonderful.

Please preserve retail at SB 330 Staples Project as long as possible. Demolishing all The buildings at once looks so sad and makes no one want to shop or dine in Cupertino.

Thank you.

Best regards,

From:	Rajiv Chamraj
To:	City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Cc:	Vivek Sagdeo; Sherman Wang; Stephanie Yang; Barbara Morrone
Subject:	Proposed development on Stevens Creek Blvd -20840
Date:	Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:58:43 PM

Dear Members,

I live at 20791 Scofield Dr, Cupertino, CA 95014, and the proposed development on Stevens Creek Blvd is on the north side of my property line. The C Street in the proposed development almost touches my property line. The City should ensure that the street terminates where Buildings 7 and 8 end.

This will be helpful for several residents who live on Scofield Drive to maintain a level of privacy and be free from traffic noise.

Best Rajiv Chamraj

From:	Vivek Sagdeo
То:	Rajiv Chamraj; City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Cc:	<u>Sherman Wang; Stephanie Yang; Barbara Morrone</u>
Subject:	Re: Proposed development on Stevens Creek Blvd -20840
Date:	Tuesday, June 10, 2025 4:12:57 PM

## Dear members,

I am also a resident right next to the proposed development. My address is 20821 Scofield Drive. Fron one Fontanna's restaurant we all loved, to a very crowded 59 townhouse community in this 129000 sq ft lot is very drastic transition. More setbacks and lesser crowding will go a long way in keeping Cupertino livable and breathable city we all have come here for..

Thinking about the new residents in these townhouses, they will need decent living too. Planning commission should compare this to communities like De Anza oaks and spacings in there.

Thanks

Vivek

From: Rajiv Chamraj <rajiv.chamraj@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:58 PM

To: planningcommission@cupertino.gov <planningcommission@cupertino.gov>

**Cc:** Vivek Sagdeo <sagdeos@hotmail.com>; Sherman Wang <sherman.wang@gmail.com>; Stephanie Yang <stephanieyang2010@gmail.com>; Barbara Morrone <12bellabarb@gmail.com> **Subject:** Proposed development on Stevens Creek Blvd -20840

Dear Members,

I live at 20791 Scofield Dr, Cupertino, CA 95014, and the proposed development on Stevens Creek Blvd is on the north side of my property line. The C Street in the proposed development almost touches my property line. The City should ensure that the street terminates where Buildings 7 and 8 end.

This will be helpful for several residents who live on Scofield Drive to maintain a level of privacy and be free from traffic noise.

Best Rajiv Chamraj