



**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION**

CITY HALL
10300 TORRE AVENUE • CUPERTINO, CA 95014-3255
TELEPHONE: (408) 777-3308 • FAX: (408) 777-3333
CUPERTINO.ORG

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Meeting: July 2, 2024

Subject

Municipal Code Text, Specific Plan, Below Market Rate Mitigation Manual and Zoning Map Amendments related to implementing the 6th Cycle Housing Element (Application No.(s): MCA-2023-001, SPA-2023-001, CP-2024-002, Z-2024-001, EA-2024-001; Applicant: City of Cupertino; Location: city-wide)

Recommended Action

That the City Council take the following actions for consistency with the 6th Cycle Housing Element, and minor edits for clarity and compliance with State law, as follows:

1. Conduct the first reading of Ordinance No. _____ “An Ordinance of the City Council of the City Of Cupertino Amending Various Chapters in Title 14, Title 17 And Title 19, Including But Not limited to the Addition of Three New Chapters in Title 19, to Implement Policies in the General Plan and for Clarity” (Attachment A) as further described in the staff report; and
2. Adopt Resolution No. _____ approving amendments to the Heart of the City Specific Plan and the Below Market Rate Housing Mitigation Manual to allow implementation of the Housing Element and meet the requirements of State Law (Attachment B); and
3. Conduct the first reading of Ordinance No. ____ “An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Cupertino Rezoning Certain Sites in the City for Conformance with General Plan and Housing Element” (Attachment C) to reflect changes to Priority Housing Sites and other minor changes for internal consistency.

Background

The City Council adopted the 6th Cycle Housing Element,¹ which covers the planning period of 2023 to 2031, on May 14, 2024. The Housing Element is a required element of Cupertino’s General Plan and identifies policies and programs and prospective housing sites to meet the housing needs of the City’s current and future residents at all income levels, through 2031. The 6th Cycle Housing Element anticipates that Cupertino will

¹ Prior iterations of the Draft Housing Element are available online at www.cupertino.org/housingelement

accommodate its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of 4,588 units plus a buffer of approximately 28%, for a total exceeding 5,800 units, on 58 parcels, referred to as Priority Housing Sites. The Priority Housing Sites are located primarily along the City's arterials and major collectors, such as Stevens Creek and DeAnza Boulevards, with a few sites located within established, predominantly single-family neighborhoods (e.g. the Evulich Ct/Linda Vista and Adriana Avenue sites). Over two-thirds of the Priority Housing Sites - 40 properties - have densities of 50 units per acre or more and 15 have densities between 20-35 units per acre, indicative of the transition from a suburban to a more urban community. Only three of the 58 sites allow densities under 20 units per acre. The complete list of Priority Housing Sites is included in Appendix B-4 of the General Plan.

On April 10, 2024, the State of California's Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) informed the City² that the draft Housing Element submitted to HCD on March 28 (prior to adoption), met the statutory requirements of state law, **subject to the completion of rezoning of the sites that are listed in the Housing Element as Priority Housing Sites**. Therefore, the actions taken by the City to rezone the Priority Housing Sites and the associated amendments to the Municipal Code, Heart of the City Specific Plan, and the BMR Mitigation Manual will bring the City into compliance with state law. Compliance with state housing law averts the City's potential loss of land use local control, exposure to litigation, and other regulatory limitations resulting from not having a compliant Housing Element. The rezoning and related actions also ensures internal consistency between policy documents and a seamless implementation of the policies in the Housing Element. Even though the City adopted its Housing Element on May 14, the rezoning of Priority Housing Sites at the densities specified in the Housing Element must be completed in order to come into compliance with state law.

The proposed zoning amendments and development standards have been developed through review of neighboring jurisdiction regulations, consultant advice, input from the community at two workshops, and input from housing developers at a focus group in Fall 2023. The workshops included visual preference surveys, input from community members in both an in-person and virtual format. The focus group was in a virtual environment at which, both not-for-profit and for-profit, developers participated, sharing their perspectives and providing recommendations.

The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed changes at its June 11, 2024 regular meeting. Their recommendations and review, in addition to a description of the new standards and changes to existing standards, is discussed in the report below.

² Available online: www.cupertino.org/housingelement

Discussion

Municipal Code Amendments (see Attachment A)

New Chapters

- *Chapter 19.38 (Multiple-family Residential (R-4) Zones):* Nearly 70% of the 58 parcels that comprise the Housing Priority Sites have a minimum density of 50 units per acre. This increased density required the establishment of new General Plan land use designations (i.e., “High/Very High” and “Very High” density) for residential densities greater than 35 dwelling units per acre. These new land use designations were adopted by the City Council on May 14 as part of the Housing Element adoption. The establishment of new General Plan land use designations for residential development greater than 35 dwelling units per acre has in turn necessitated the establishment of a new zoning designation, R-4, to accommodate development at these higher densities.

R-4 zoned properties would allow buildings up to 5 stories tall, with a maximum height of 70 feet, in accordance with the May 2024 General Plan updates. The City’s General Plan establishes a setback to height ratio (slope line) for properties that abut an arterial (e.g. De Anza and Stevens Creek Boulevards). The General Plan amendments, adopted in conjunction with the adoption of the Housing Element, modified this standard so that proposed housing development projects on Priority Housing Sites do not have to meet the slope line requirement. However, new projects will still have to meet front, rear and side building setbacks as established in the ordinance. Since many of the parcels being zoned R-4 are located along major corridors, the front setback standard is designed to meet the standards adopted in the Heart of the City Specific Plan and other land use plans (e.g. South Saratoga-Sunnyvale Conceptual Zoning Plan) adopted by the City. Additionally, as identified in the Housing Element, the standards establish certain universal design standards that must be incorporated in residential projects to affirmatively further fair housing for people of all ages and abilities. Finally, standards are identified for the maintenance of common open spaces and landscaping.

- *Chapter 19.46 – Townhome (TH) Combining District:* As described in the recently adopted Housing Element, in order to accommodate a variety of housing types on the same property and to encourage the provision of a buffer for existing single-family homes/neighborhoods, some Priority Housing Sites are zoned with the TH Combining District. Historically, the Planned Development (P) zoning district used to act as a combining zoning designation. However, with recent changes to state law requiring the establishment and application of objective standards in housing developments, the Townhome (TH) Combining District is being proposed. A combining district is one that may only be used in conjunction with a base zoning

district designation, to provide flexibility in development standards and compatibility with existing development. As proposed, the TH combining District may only be used in conjunction with either the R-3 or R-4 base zoning district designations.

The TH combining district allows for the same front setbacks as the underlying R-3 or R-4 zoning it is combined with. Therefore, proposed development projects will meet the front setback standards of the R-3 or R-4 zoning district that the TH designation is combined with, for purposes of urban streetscape consistency. In addition, rear and side yard setbacks are established to ensure adequate safety requirements are met and a more gradual transition scale occurs between existing neighborhoods and the higher density development anticipated for the Priority Housing Sites. A few basic design standards are also included as part of the zoning, such as requiring front stoops and entry features facing streets. Private open spaces are required in accordance with the underlying R-3 or R-4 zoning for all properties within the TH Combined District.

- *Chapter 19.50 – Emergency Shelters:* State law (AB 2339) requires the City to allow emergency shelters by right in at least one zoning district. In order to comply with state requirements, existing standards have been consolidated and new standards have been established through inclusion of a new Municipal Code chapter, Chapter 19.50, to allow ministerial review of such facilities, should they be proposed.

Amendments to existing Chapters (see Attachment A)

In order to ensure consistency with state law and the City's adopted Housing Element, changes have been made to various chapters of Title 19 of the Municipal Code, as follows:

- *Chapter 19.08 (Definitions):* Amendments have been made to ensure consistency with state law and to assist with objective application of standards, new definitions or modified definitions have been added for various types of housing addressed by state law that are required to be permitted by the City within certain zoning districts – whether by right (e.g. residential care facilities) or via a discretionary permitting process (e.g. Single Room Occupancy – allowed with CUP in R-4 zoning districts).
- *Chapter 19.12 (Administration):* A minor edit has been made to consolidate requirements and to codify a specific development review process required pursuant to state law (Govt. Code Section 65589.5), for certain projects, identified below. This specific language was presented to HCD staff for their review and HCD has indicated that the proposed language, as written, is acceptable and complies with state housing law:
 - Residential projects proposed on Priority Housing Sites at a minimum density of 20 dwelling units/acre (or if a higher minimum density is required in the General Plan) with a minimum of 20% of the total number of units in the development affordable to lower income households.
 - Low barrier navigation centers and supportive housing with up to 50 units/beds.

- *Chapter 19.16 (Designations and Establishment of Districts):* Amendments have been made establish the new R-4 Residential Zoning District and TH (Townhome) Combining District.
- *Chapter 19.20 (Permitted, Conditional and Excluded uses in Agricultural and Residential Zones) and Chapter 19.76 (Public Building (BA), Quasi-Public Building (BQ), and Transportation (T) Zones):* Changes have been made to comply with state law, for internal consistency and clarity related to the establishment of standards for emergency shelters.
- *Chapter 19.28 (Single Family Residential (R-1) Zones):* Amendments have been made to allow duplexes on corner lots and lots abutting commercial corridors in certain R-1 zoned areas in compliance with Housing Element Strategy HE-1.3.6 (i.e., “missing middle” housing strategy). This would allow the development of up to 2 primary units and 2 accessory dwelling units on these lots, for a maximum of 4 units, through approval of an Administrative Conditional Use Permit. No currently R-1 zoned properties anywhere in the City are proposed to be rezoned through this Code change.
- *Chapter 19.32 (Multiple-family Residential (R-3) Zones):* This chapter has been restructured to address the range of densities and use types that this zoning district applies to – ranging from fourplexes (large single-family house size) to large apartment complexes. No significant changes are proposed for fourplex or similar small-scale developments. However, amendments are proposed to better accommodate mid- and larger-scale apartment developments, allowing for additional building height for certain Priority Housing Sites, amended side and rear setbacks, and private open space requirements which align with Heart of the City requirements, since many of the sites are located along transportation corridors. Additionally, similar to the R-4 zoning district, universal design standards have been incorporated into the development standards. Existing language in the Municipal Code regarding maintenance of common open areas, homeowners’ associations and conditions, covenants and restrictions has been added to this Chapter to ensure these areas are maintained.
- *Chapter 19.80 (Planned Development (P) Zones):* Changes have been made for internal consistency due to the establishment of the Multiple Family Residential (R-4) and the Combining Townhome (TH) zoning districts, and consistency with state law regarding permitted uses in the P zoning district.
- *Chapter 19.124 (Parking):* Amendments have been made to lower the required parking requirements in the R-3 zoning district and establish parking standards for Emergency Shelters and for the new R-4 and TH zoning districts. It should be noted that a recent change to state law does not allow the City to require parking within

Transit Priority Areas, defined as properties within ½ mile of major transit stops (AB2097, Friedman)^{3, 4}. At present, there are five existing and planned major transit stops, by Bay Area Metro, covering most of the area along Stevens Creek Boulevard east of Highway 85.

- *Chapter 19.156 (Development Permits, Conditional Use Permits and Variances)*: Edits have been made to implement a commitment in the Housing Element identified by HCD related to findings for housing developments. This change makes the findings required to approve housing development projects more objective.
- *Chapter 19.168 (Architectural and Site Approval)*: Changes have been made to adopt findings necessary to approve housing development projects that are required to be reviewed pursuant to the by-right process of state law for certain housing developments with a minimum density of 20 units/acre and 20% affordable units for lower income households on Priority Housing Sites.

In addition to the proposed edits in Title 19, edits are also proposed to Chapter 14.15 (Landscape Ordinance), for internal consistency, and to allow implementation of the water efficient landscape requirements for Townhome developments and a minor edit is proposed to Chapter 17.08 (Standard Environmental Protection Requirements) to correct an error.

Specific Plan Amendments

Proposed amendments to the Heart of the City Specific Plan are limited solely to text and map edits necessary for consistency with the required rezoning for Priority Housing Sites (see Attachment B).

Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Mitigation Manual

Amendments to the BMR Housing Mitigation Manual are solely to update the BMR program to be consistent with the recently adopted Housing Element. The BMR program would be amended to require that the threshold at which an in-lieu of fee is paid would be reduced from six units to four units. Therefore, new residential projects consisting of five or more units would have to provide BMR units in their proposed developments. (See Attachment B).

Zoning Map Amendment

Amendments are proposed to maintain internal consistency between the General Plan Land Use Map and the Zoning Map and to reflect the zoning for the Priority Housing Sites. The Priority Housing Sites are also labeled on the map for ease of identification.

³ Online at: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB2097.

⁴ Major transit stops are defined in state law. See online at: [Transit Priority Areas \(2021\) | Transit Priority Areas \(2021\) | Metropolitan Transportation Commission \(ca.gov\)](#)

Other minor edits have been made to the various colors and labels on the map for improved clarification and consistency, which do not change applicable development standards or zoning for any properties (*See Attachment C*).

Planning Commission Review and Recommendation

On June 11, 2024, the Planning Commission reviewed the proposed amendments to the Municipal Code, Heart of the City Specific Plan, BMR Housing Mitigation Manual and the Zoning Map. The Planning Commission did not make a recommendation related to the Municipal Code Text Amendments and adopted Resolution No. 24-XXX and 24-XXX recommending adoption of the amendments to the Heart of the City Specific Plan, BMR Housing Mitigation Manual and the Zoning Map, both with a 4-0 vote (Fung absent).

The following topics were a part of the motions that failed to pass as they relate to the Municipal Code Amendments. Staff's comments are in italics following the topic.

1. Townhome (TH) Combining District

- a. Height: Increase height limit to 35 feet. There was no consensus on this item at the Planning Commission. Two of the commissioners were not agreeable to this change and wished to retain the staff's recommendation. *No changes have been made to staff's recommendation for the following reasons. The General Plan actions taken by Council in May 2024 established the heights allowed on various properties. Many of the sites that allow the TH combining district are located within and/or abut single-family neighborhoods. In order to allow structures that are compatible with the adjoining lower-density residential developments and to retain compliance with the General Plan, staff recommended a height limitation of 30 feet for townhomes. Townhomes with lower plate heights (reducing the mass of the structures) could be designed to fit within the proposed height limits and/or affordable housing units may be provided to utilize State Density Bonus law in order to waive this development standard.*
- b. Lot Coverage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR): Eliminate lot coverage as a development standard and increase FAR to 100% or more. There was no consensus on this item. Two of the commissioners were not agreeable to this change and wished to retain the staff's recommendation. *Staff is recommending retaining the proposed lot coverage standard and increasing the FAR standard to 85% for the following reasons.*
 - *Eliminating the lot coverage standard could allow developments to occur with limited areas for landscaping. This would be contrary to many of the City's policies related to urban heat island effect, sustainability, and maintaining an urban tree canopy. Staff recommends retaining the lot coverage standard to ensure that there continue to be opportunities to plant trees that can attain a substantial stature at maturity and will be in a more appropriate scale for projects that are more urban in nature.*

- *Increasing the FAR to 100% or more would allow substantially larger homes to be built in the TH combining district. While compatible, townhomes are distinct from single-family homes by offering a smaller, more affordable home ownership option. At 100% FAR, these units could be larger than homes permitted in the R1-5 single-family zoning district. Having a 80-90% FAR would allow a mix of unit sizes which would be more of a typical townhome scale than allowing a 100-110% FAR. As such, staff recommends an 85% FAR. This change has been incorporated into Attachment A.*
 - c. Corrections and Minor Revisions to Section 19.46.040, 19.46.060 and 19.46.070: Corrections and minor revisions proposed by a developer. *These changes have already been incorporated in Attachment A.*
2. Single Family (R1) Zones: Duplex Developments:
- a. Front setback in R1-a zones for duplex developments: Require a front setback of 30 feet to match the setback required per the underlying zoning district. There was general consensus from the Commissioners on this item. *This change has already been incorporated in Attachment A. An amendment has also been made to require the front setback of the underlying zoning to be required in all R-1 zones. For example, in some parts of the City, a 25-foot front setback is required. This amendment would ensure that front setbacks in all zoning districts are maintained.*
 - b. “Rental”: Eliminate the word “rental” from this section. There was general consensus on this change from the Commissioners. *This change has already been incorporated in Attachment A.*
 - c. Parking requirements: Change the parking standards for duplexes built in the R-1 zoning district consistent with Housing Element Strategy HE-1.3.6 (“missing middle”) from 1.5 spaces enclosed (i.e., garage) and 1.5 spaces open per unit (for a total of 6 spaces) to 1 enclosed space and 1 open space per unit (for a total of 4 spaces). There was no consensus on this item. Two of the commissioners were not agreeable to this change and wished to make no changes to the parking standards for duplex development. *No changes have been made. If desired, the Council could amend Section 19.124.040(A) to allow 4 spaces total for duplexes constructed in the R-1 zoning district. This would be consistent with the parking standard for single-family homes, where 4 spaces are required.*

The following is a list of other items discussed by the Planning Commission that were not made as part of the motions voted on:

1. R-4 Zoning District: Number of stories: Eliminate the number of stories allowed, five, to provide flexibility in construction within a 70-foot maximum building height standard. There was no consensus from the Commission on this item in their discussion and this was not part of any of the motions considered by the Commission.

No changes have been made on this issue. Staff's recommendation on allowing 5- story structures (within 70 feet) is based on construction types, building forms, activation of the ground floor, visual preference studies that occurred as part of the outreach in Fall 2023, and feedback from the focus group with developers. If desired, the Council could amend Section 19.38.070(B) to eliminate the 5-story limitation to simplify the standard and allow greater flexibility in development.

2. Definitions: Duplex: A question was asked about the proposed 200 square-foot difference standard to define "comparable" sized units. There was minimal discussion on this item, no consensus from the Commission on this item in their discussion, and this was not part of any of the motions considered by the Commission. *The existing definition of a duplex defines them as developments with attached or detached primary units of "comparable size," which is a subjective standard, and unenforceable under the Housing Accountability Act (HAA). The proposed 200 square-foot standard is an objective standard to define "comparable" sized units, which would allow one of the two units to be larger by approximately one-bedroom and one-bathroom. However, incorporating the 200 square-foot standard into the definition of duplex may create legal non-conforming structures within the R-2 district. Without any objective standard there is the potential that Strategy HE-1.3.6 (Missing Middle) will result in the development of very large single-family homes with attached ADUs, which is already allowed in the R-1 zoning district rather than units that are more comparable to each other and affordable. No changes were made to Attachment A related to this. If desired, the Council could eliminate this proposed standard in Section 19.08.030.*
3. R-1 zoning district: Duplex Developments: FAR standard proposed in Chapter 19.28. A question was asked about the origin of the proposed 55% FAR standard for duplexes in R-1 zoning districts that would be allowed per Strategy HE-1.3.6. There was little discussion and no consensus reached by the Commission on this issue and it was not a part of any of the motions considered by the Commission. *No changes have been made on this issue for the following reasons. The proposed 55% FAR is based on a survey of neighboring jurisdictions R2 FAR standards. Duplexes are intended to be two comparable units in the structure and form that closely resembles a single family home. It should also be noted that there is no FAR limitation for R-2 development. With a 40% lot coverage, two story duplexes could be upwards of 80% FAR – significantly larger than single family homes. As a result, having a much larger or no FAR standard could generate building forms and massing that would not be compatible with the neighborhood form.*

Additionally, when the policy to allow missing middle forms of development within single-family neighborhoods was proposed, there were many concerned citizens that contacted the City about its implementation. Establishment of clear standards that are in scale with single family development, which allows development slightly greater than single family development would encourage the acceptance and development of such developments. If the Council desires, it could amend Section 19.28.040(K) to change or eliminate the FAR standard in this provision

to allow more flexibility and much greater development potential on these sites, which could act as an incentive to develop duplexes on these sites.

Comments from Housing Advocacy Group

The City received a letter from a Housing Advocacy group dated June 18, 2024 (See Attachment D) encouraging changes to several new and existing standards. The letter suggests that these changes would facilitate housing development and provide flexibility to promote affordable homes for all income levels. Several of the issues raised by the group were already discussed at the Planning Commission meeting and have been discussed in the staff report above. The following items were not brought up during the Planning Commission's discussion but are presented here for the Council's consideration. No changes have been made to the standards in Attachment A as it relates to the following items

The letter suggests that several existing R-2 zoning standards should be amended including floor area ratio, comparable size of duplex units, lot coverage, side yard setbacks and parking standards. Implementation of HE-1.3.6 (Missing Middle Strategy) specifies that duplex development would be allowed on certain R-1 zoned lots utilizing existing R-2 development standards. Therefore, while this policy does not contemplate any changes to existing R-2 zoning standards, standards for development of duplexes in the R-1 zoning district could be considered without affecting the zoning standards for all duplex property within the City. As a result, this discussion is limited to development standards for duplexes in R-1 zoning districts on certain lots.

1. Zoning standards for duplexes. Parking, floor area standards and definition of duplex units in the R-1 zoning district have been discussed under the "Planning Commission Review and Recommendation" section, above. This section addresses the remaining issues in the letter related to duplexes in R-1 zoning districts.
 - a. Reduce sideyard setbacks: Consider amending the sideyard setback for duplexes in the R-1 district constructed under Strategy HE-1.3.6 to be 5-feet minimum for a total of ten feet for the first floor, for interior lots, consistent with the minimum first floor setback requirements of the R-1 district. Corner lots would be required to have a minimum 12-foot setback on the street side property line, also consistent with the R-1 district. If desired, Council may amend Section 19.28.040(K) to allow this change.
 - b. Expand Lot Coverage: Consider amending the existing 40% lot coverage. While the letter does not have a proposal for what lot coverage should be amended to, if the Council desires, it could consider imposing a limitation consistent with that in the R-1 zoning district, in conjunction with an FAR standard, to ensure that

structures do not become too out of scale within neighborhoods in Section 19.28.040(K).

2. R-3 zoning district:

- a. Eliminate story restrictions. If the Council desires to eliminate the story restrictions, it could do so in Section 19.36.070(A). It should be noted that where affordable housing is provided or incorporated into development, state density bonus law allows waivers to increase height limits beyond those permitted under the General Plan or zoning.
 - b. Increase height standards to 35 feet. Height standards are established through the General Plan and no changes are contemplated to heights within existing neighborhoods at this time. The maximum height limit within neighborhoods is 30 feet. Many existing apartment complexes are located within lower-density residential neighborhoods. Where affordable housing is provided or incorporated into development, state density bonus law allows waivers to increase height limits to beyond those permitted under the General Plan or zoning.
 - c. Eliminate or expand lot coverage. The proposed lot coverage standards considered by the Planning Commission were: 40% for projects with four or fewer units (large single family home sized development, with no FAR standard), and 55% for project with five units or more (mid- to large- apartment size development, with no FAR standard). The proposed standard allows increased coverage for larger apartment complex style projects while maintaining the existing 40% coverage standard for smaller, single-family scale, tri-plex and fourplex developments. However, if desired, the Council could increase the existing lot coverage in the R-3 zoning district from 40% to 50% for all properties, similar to single family zoning districts, in Section 19.36.070. This amended lot coverage could make the standard uniform for all housing types. Staff does not recommend eliminating the lot coverage standard since an FAR standard does not currently exist for R3 development.
3. Parking standards: Staff is contemplating preparing a comprehensive update to the minimum parking standards for different types of residential and non-residential parking at a later time. These changes are not required for implementation of the Housing Element. Additional changes have not been proposed beyond those already incorporated in the proposed ordinance.

Next Steps

The Planning Commission's recommendation will be presented to the City Council for final action in July 2024. In addition to the zoning changes presented at this meeting, ongoing Housing Element implementation work will continue with the preparation of

Objective Design Standards for multi-family and mixed-use development which will be presented to the Commission for its review and recommendation later in 2024.

Sustainability Impact

None

Fiscal Impact

None

California Environmental Quality Act

On February 3, 2023, the California Housing Defense Fund and Yes in My Backyard (YIMBY) filed a lawsuit due to the City missing the January 31, 2023 deadline for adoption of the 6th Cycle Housing Element. In January 2024, the City entered into a stipulated judgment to settle the lawsuit. As a result, pursuant to Government Code Section 65759 *et seq.*, any actions that the City takes to adopt a compliant housing element, including rezoning actions to implement the Housing Element, are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In lieu of CEQA compliance, Government Code section 65759 requires that an environmental assessment (EA) in the form of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) be prepared and adopted as part of the General Plan. The EA was prepared and adopted as Appendix G of the General Plan on May 14, 2024.

Prepared by: Piu Ghosh, Planning Manager

Luke Connolly, Assistant Director of Community Development

Reviewed by: Benjamin Fu, Director of Community Development

Christopher Jensen, City Attorney

Approved for Submission by: Pamela Wu, City Manager

Attachments:

A – Draft Ordinance – Municipal Code Amendments

B – Draft Resolution – Heart of the City Specific Plan and BMR Mitigation Manual Amendments

C – Draft Ordinance – Zoning Map Amendments

D – Letter from Cupertino For All dated June 18, 2024