## CC 07-1-2025

# Oral Communications

Written Comments

From: Santosh Rao

To: <u>City Council</u>; <u>Rachelle Sander</u>; <u>City Clerk</u>; <u>Tina Kapoor</u> **Subject:** BlackBerry Farm festivities are missing on July 4th agenda.

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:53:40 PM

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

[Writing on behalf of myself only, as a Cupertino resident]

Dear City Clerk,

Would you please include the below in written communications for the upcoming Cupertino city council meeting.

Dear Mayor Chao, July 4th sub-committee council members, City Council, Acting Manager Kapoor, Director Sander,

I am delighted to see the July 4th celebrations back. It was a dark night in the city's history during thanksgiving week of 2023 when then Mayor Wei and the prior council majority defunded July 4th evening celebrations. It was done the week of Thanksgiving. When no residents were in attendance. What was the rush back then to defund it and that too the week of Thanksgiving. Was it to ensure that resident input could be avoided.

I remember then and on many occasions since then being the lone resident voice advocating to bring July 4th evening celebrations event back. It is therefore with great joy that I see the return of July 4th all day celebrations after prolonged and lone advocacy to do so for many meetings now since that dark week of Thanksgiving 2023.

I want to congratulate Mayor Chao, Council member Wang and Vice-Mayor Moore on bringing this back.

I look forward to a grand and stunning July 4th celebration. I urge you to start planning immediately for July 4th 2026 when it will be the 250th year since the founding of our great nation.

With all that said, I am deeply disappointed that the BlackBerry Farm day time festivities are missing in the agenda. Is this an oversight. I hope it is. Please fix the oversight and add back the BlackBerry Farm daytime celebrations to the agenda.

If staff have concerns about limited BBF parking please limit it to residents only and if needed a fixed capacity of advance reservations and not for non-residents.

I look forward to your correcting the agenda to add back the BlackBerry Farm daytime celebrations.

https://www.cupertino.gov/Parks-Recreation/Events/Fourth-of-July

Thank you.

Thanks, San Rao From: <u>Devendar</u>

To: <u>City Council</u>; <u>City Clerk</u>

**Subject:** Request for Urgent Action to Implement Resolution No. 25-13918

**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 9:00:18 AM

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

Dear City Clerk,

Please include the below in written communications for the upcoming city council meeting.

Subject: Request for Urgent Action to Implement Resolution No. 25-13918

Dear Mayor Liang Chao, Vice-Mayor Kitty Moore, and Honorable Council Members,

I hope you are doing well. I am a resident of McClellan Road and one of the families directly impacted by the displacement efforts currently being carried out by Foothill-De Anza at McClellan Terrace.

With sincere concern, I respectfully request that you urgently direct staff to take the next steps to implement Resolution No. 25-13918, which was adopted by the City Council on May 6, 2025. This resolution acknowledges the severe impact that converting multifamily rental housing to student housing has on our community and calls for protections to prevent such harmful transitions.

Many families—including those with children attending Lincoln Elementary, Kennedy Middle, and Monta Vista High—are facing forced eviction. This situation is causing significant hardship and emotional stress to long-standing Cupertino residents.

While we understand the importance of student housing, it should not come by displacing families who have made Cupertino their home. I kindly urge the Council to move forward with updates to the municipal code—similar to San Francisco Municipal Code Section 317—to protect our city's rental housing and maintain stability for working families.

Thank you for your leadership and continued support for our community.

Warm regards, Cupertino resident Devendar From: <u>LindaVistaTT</u>

To: <u>City Council; Tina Kapoor; City Attorney"s Office; City Clerk</u>

Cc: Vikram Saxena; dennismtsao@gmail.com; avinashpd@gmail.com; Helena Cohen; tsakhi@hotmail.com;

themeichu@gmail.com; derchang@gmail.com; saba sathya@yahoo.com; uniquefamily@yahoo.com; Srinivas Raghvendra; malathi.srinivas@gmail.com; Parimal Kopardekar; akilatn@gmail.com; tsailipu@yahoo.com; vlentfer@gmail.com; Amy Chung; lconstant97@yahoo.com; constantbodies@gmail.com; rkonduri@gmail.com;

andy const@yahoo.com; James Choi; amitu26@gmail.com; jim.lentfer@gmail.com;

santateresacupertino@gmail.com; dtconstantdds@aol.com; ydillaha@yahoo.com; maryigunderson@gmail.com;

davidcyan@gmail.com

Subject: Request to Deny Density Bonus Approval for Summerhill Homes Development on Evulich Court

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 10:53:42 AM

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

#### **Executive Summary**

We, the residents, respectfully request that the Cupertino City Council deny approval of density bonus waiver incentives for the proposed Summerhill Homes development on Evulich Court. Recent devastating wildfires in Southern California and emerging fire safety research demonstrate that the proposed density bonuses—which would allow reduced setbacks and increased building heights beyond R3 zoning limits—create unacceptable fire risks in areas recently designated as Very High Fire Risk zones.

These changes materially alter the public safety profile of the development.

State law under Government Code § 65915(d)(2)(C) provides cities with discretion to deny waivers when they would result in a specific, adverse impact on public health or safety that cannot be mitigated. Given the site's new designation as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone by Cal Fire in 2025, combined with topographical vulnerability and limited evacuation routes, Cupertino is on strong legal footing to not approve these waivers based on safety risk.

#### **Background**

The subject property on Evulich Court, located on Linda Vista Drive, was originally zoned for 11 single-family homes (R1) and later changed to R3 zoning. Summerhill Homes now proposes to construct 51 townhomes by utilizing California density bonus laws to:

•

Reduce required setbacks below R3 standards

Increase building heights beyond R3 limits

**Critical Context:** This neighborhood has recently been designated as Very High Fire Risk under CalFire's updated Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps, released following the analysis of the devastating January 2025 Eaton and Palisades fires. As documented in the City of Cupertino's own notification letter dated May 23, 2025, the City has received formal notification from CalFire about these recommendations and is required by CA Government Code Section 51175 to adopt the State's Fire Hazard Severity Zone designations by June 24, 2025.

**Elevated Wildfire Vulnerability:** The Evulich Court development site is particularly vulnerable to wildfire as it backs directly into open space areas including golf course and nature preserves. This wildland-urban interface (WUI) location creates heightened fire risk because:

- Open space areas provide continuous fuel loads that can carry wildfire directly to structures
- Golf courses and nature preserves often contain dry vegetation during fire season
- The interface between developed and undeveloped land is where most catastrophic structure losses occur

#### **Key Findings from Recent Fire Research**

#### Structure Density as a Major Fire Risk Factor

The Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety (IBHS) preliminary report on the Eaton and Palisades fires identified **structure density as a major risk factor**, specifically noting:

"In tightly packed areas, flames leapt from home to home, overwhelming even some fire-resistant structures."

This finding is supported by scientific research from the Fire Safety Research Institute and NIST, which demonstrates that:

Radiant heat transfer from structure fires can cause neighboring structures to ignite

- Structure-to-structure fire spread significantly impacts loss of life and destruction of infrastructure
- Residential structures can catch fire when exposed to fully involved structures located as close as 8 feet from the eaves

#### **CalFire's Updated Recommendations**

Following the Eaton and Palisades fires, CalFire and IBHS specifically recommend:

- "Use setbacks to maximize the spacing between structures to the greatest extent possible"
- Enhanced fire-resistant construction in dense areas
- Elimination of "connective fuels" (fences, decks, landscaping) that enable fire spread between structures

These recommendations directly contradict the proposed density bonuses that would reduce setbacks and increase height. The proposed site plan allows minimal side and rear setbacks in a WUI zone, ignoring the core firebreak strategies recommended by fire agencies.

#### **Fast-Moving Fire Risk**

Research shows that 78% of structures destroyed in U.S. fires in the first two decades of the 21st century burned in fast-moving fires. The Eaton and Palisades fires rank among the fastest-growing fires on record, demonstrating that when fires move quickly, traditional fire suppression becomes impossible—making structure separation even more critical.

#### **Policy Conflicts and Legal Considerations**

#### **California's Contradictory Policies**

California has created a fundamental conflict between:

**Housing density laws** that encourage reduced setbacks and increased building height

 Fire safety requirements that call for maximum structure separation in high-risk areas

These two policies are not harmonized in current law, creating a gray area that cities must resolve using § 65915(d)(2)(C) when life safety is at risk.

#### **Local Authority to Protect Public Safety**

California density bonus law specifically states that local governments are **not required** to grant waivers or density bonuses if they would:

"have a specific, adverse impact upon health, safety, or the physical environment, and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact."

In this case, mitigation is not feasible because the hazard stems from the reduced setbacks and increased height demanded by the developer, not design details that can be engineered away.

City's Legal Responsibility as Local Responsibility Area (LRA): As stated in the City's own May 23, 2025 notification letter, Cupertino is designated as a Local Responsibility Area where "the local government, and not the State Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention, is responsible for wildfire protection." This places a direct legal duty on the City Council to prioritize fire prevention and protection measures.

**Failure to Fulfill Legal Duty:** Approving density bonuses that contradict fire safety science in a newly designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone would constitute a failure to discharge the City's legal responsibility for wildfire protection under CA Government Code Sections 51177-51179.

#### **Specific Concerns for Cupertino**

#### 1. Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Risk

The Evulich Court location on Linda Vista Drive, backing into open space areas (golf course and nature preserve), places this development in the highest-risk wildland-urban interface (WUI) zone. Research consistently shows that:

Most catastrophic wildfire losses occur at the WUI where wildland meets developed areas

- Open space vegetation provides continuous fuel loads that carry fire directly to structures
- Golf courses and nature preserves, despite maintenance, contain seasonal dry vegetation that becomes highly flammable
- Increasing structural density in WUI areas compounds fire risk by creating more targets for ignition and enabling rapid structure-to-structure spread due to reduced setbacks.

#### 2. Recent Fire Risk Designation and Legal Timeline

The neighborhood's recent designation as Very High Fire Risk indicates that standard development practices are insufficient. As documented in the City's May 23, 2025 notification letter:

- CalFire issued official Fire Hazard Severity Zone recommendations in February and March 2025
- The City is legally required to adopt these designations by **June 24, 2025**
- The City "may not reduce the recommended designations or boundaries included on the CAL FIRE maps"
- These designations directly impact development standards and fire protection requirements

Approving density bonuses that contradict this recent Very High Fire Risk designation would be inconsistent with the City's legal obligations under state fire safety law.

The change in designation was not known or accounted for during the Housing Element rezoning process in early 2023. Because density bonus entitlements are conditioned on prevailing health and safety standards, this new data materially alters the underlying

calculus.

The City is not obligated to apply waivers or incentives under density bonus law when circumstances pose a "specific, adverse impact" on health and safety. The California Government Code explicitly provides that local jurisdictions may deny waivers or concessions when such impacts cannot be mitigated. In this case, the elevated risk is unmitigable under the current proposal, as density itself is the hazard.

#### 3. Insurance Impact on Existing Residents

Insurance companies are increasingly using their own wildfire risk models that consider structure density and separation. Some models now apply a surcharge to all properties within a set radius of high-density nodes, meaning adjacent homeowners will bear financial consequences for a project they did not choose.

The proposed development could:

- Increase fire risk ratings for the entire neighborhood
- Lead to higher premiums or policy cancellations for existing residents
- Reduce property values due to increased fire risk

#### 4. Evacuation Concerns

The proposed increase from 11 to 51 units creates significant evacuation challenges:

- Wildlife Urban Interface limits the number of exit paths out of the area; Linda Vista drive is the only exit route, and there is no parallel street on the other side of the development.
- Potential for evacuation bottlenecks that could prove fatal in fast-moving fires.
- Cupertino's current emergency evacuation modeling was based on low-density projections and does not account for a fivefold increase in residential units on this parcel.

#### 5. Infrastructure Strain

Emergency services and fire suppression resources designed for lower-density development may be inadequate for the proposed high-density configuration under the new very high fire risk designation.

#### Recommendations

We respectfully request that the Cupertino City Council:

#### **Immediate Action**

1.

**Deny the density bonus application** for the Summerhill Homes development based on fire safety concerns related to reduced setbacks and waiver of building height limits.

2. Reduce density of the site: The proposed site had one of the highest increases in permitted density; from R1 (5 DU/acre) to R3/TH (up to 35 DU/acre). The 7x increase in density was approved prior to the designation of the neighborhood as a Very High

**Long-Term Policy Development** 

Fire Risk zone.

1

**Establish local fire safety standards** that guide the interpretation of state density bonus provisions in Very High Fire Risk zones

 Develop objective criteria for evaluating density bonus applications in fire-prone areas

 Engage with regional partners to address the conflict between housing production and fire safety

#### Conclusion

The devastating Eaton and Palisades fires have provided clear evidence that increasing structural density in Very High Fire Risk zones can have catastrophic consequences. The proposed Summerhill Homes development, which relies on density bonuses to exceed safe development standards, directly contradicts current fire safety science and CalFire's updated recommendations.

**The City's Legal Duty is Clear:** As a Local Responsibility Area, Cupertino bears direct legal responsibility for wildfire protection under CA Government Code Sections 51177-51179. The City's own May 23, 2025 notification letter acknowledges this responsibility and the requirement to adopt Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone designations by June 24, 2025.

We urge the City Council to prioritize public safety over housing production goals and deny the density bonus provisions for this development. **Granting density bonuses that** increase fire risk in a newly designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone would constitute a failure to discharge the City's legal duty to protect residents from wildfire.

The City has clear discretion to deny waivers that would erode defensible space, vertical separation, and emergency access in a known fire corridor. Cupertino would not be the first city to invoke § 65915(d)(2)(C) in a high-risk area. The state housing laws recognize that public safety must remain a non-negotiable floor.

The lessons learned from Southern California's recent fires must inform our local development decisions to protect our community from similar tragedies.

The choice before the Council is clear: approve a development that contradicts fire safety science and the City's legal obligations, or uphold the community's safety by requiring development that conforms to underlying zoning designed to protect residents in this newly recognized high-risk area.

We trust that the City Council will make the decision that prioritizes the safety and welfare of Cupertino residents and fulfills the City's legal responsibilities as a Local Responsibility Area.

#### Supporting Research URLs:

CalFire Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps: <a href="https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps">https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps</a>

IBHS Heat Transfer from Structure Fires Research: <a href="https://fsri.org/research/heat-transfer-structure-fires">https://fsri.org/research/heat-transfer-structure-fires</a>

•

NIST Structure Separation Experiments: <a href="https://www.nist.gov/el/fire-research-division-73300/wildland-urban-interface-fire-73305/structure-separation-experiments">https://www.nist.gov/el/fire-research-division-73300/wildland-urban-interface-fire-73305/structure-separation-experiments</a>

- CalFire Official Fire Information: https://www.fire.ca.gov/
- IBHS Resilient Rebuilding Report: <a href="https://ibhs.org/ibhs-news-releases/ibhs-releases-resilient-rebuilding-a-path-forward-for-los-angeles-a-blueprint-for-survivable-and-insurable-homes-and-communities/">https://ibhs.org/ibhs-news-releases/ibhs-releases-resilient-rebuilding-a-path-forward-for-los-angeles-a-blueprint-for-survivable-and-insurable-homes-and-communities/</a>
- Reuters Analysis on LA Fire Speed and Structure Density:
  <a href="https://www.reuters.com/graphics/CALIFORNIA-WILDFIRE/SPEED/akpeewrodpr/">https://www.reuters.com/graphics/CALIFORNIA-WILDFIRE/SPEED/akpeewrodpr/</a>
- Scientific American on Fast-Moving Fire Dangers:

  <a href="https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/palisades-and-eaton-fires-show-rising-dangers-of-fast-moving-fires/">https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/palisades-and-eaton-fires-show-rising-dangers-of-fast-moving-fires/</a>
- UCLA Analysis of Altadena Fire Impacts:
  <a href="https://newsroom.ucla.edu/releases/altadenas-black-community-disproportionately-affected-eaton-fire-report-shows">https://newsroom.ucla.edu/releases/altadenas-black-community-disproportionately-affected-eaton-fire-report-shows</a>

This letter is based on peer-reviewed fire safety research, CalFire recommendations, and analysis of recent wildfire events. Residents are available to provide additional technical documentation and expert testimony as needed.

#### Residents who endorsed this email

David Yan	davidcyan@gmail.com	Columbus Ave Cupertino, CA
Dennis Tsao	dennismtsao@gmail.com	10996 Linda Vista Dr, Cupertino
Avinash Deshpande	avinashpd@gmail.com	10956 Linda Vista Dr, Cupertino,CA 95014
Helena Cohen	4helenacohen@gmail.com	11105 La Paloma Drive. Cupertino, CA 95014
Tsakhi Segal	tsakhi@hotmail.com	11215 Mount Crest PL, Cupertino, CA 95014
Michu Huang	themeichu@gmail.com	10847 Linda Vista Drive, Cupertino, CA 95014
DerChang Kau	DerChang@gmail.com	10847 Linda Vista Drive, Cupertino, CA 95014
Saba Sathya	saba_sathya@yahoo.com	22023 Baxley Court, Cupertino, CA 95014

Selvi Sathya	uniquefamily@yahoo.com	22023 Baxley Court, Cupertino, CA 95014
Srinivas Raghvendra	srini.email@gmail.com	22004, Baxley Court, Cupertino, CA
Malathi Nagamangala	mnagaman@yahoo.com	22004 Baxley Ct , Cupertino CA 95014
Parimal Kopardekar	parimal.kopardekar@gmail.com	22083 Baxley Ct, Cupertino, CA
Akila Natarajan	akilatn@gmail.com	21840 TERRACE DR, Cupertino, CA
Sharon, Wu & Philip Tsai	tsailipu@yahoo.com	11046 Linda Vista Dr, Cupertino, CA
Veronica Lentfer	vlentfer@gmail.com	22024 Baxley Court, Cupertino, CA
Yiming Chung	sunny6887@yahoo.com	11096 Linda Vista Dr, cupertino, ca
LeeAnn Constant	lconstant97@yahoo.com	11097 Linda Vista Drive, Cupertino, CA
Stephanie Constant	constantbodies@gmail.com	11056 Linda Vista Dr. Cupertino
Ravi Konduri	rkonduri@gmail.com	22013 Baxley Ct, Cupertino, CA
Andy Constant	andy_const@yahoo.com	11097 Linda Vista Dr, Cupertino, CA
James Choi	jameschoi408@gmail.com	11093 Bel Aire Ct, Cupertino, CA 95014
Amit	amitu26@gmail.com	10881 Santa Teresa drive Cupertino
Jim Lentfer	jim.lentfer@gmail.com	22024 Baxley Court, Cupertino
Jenny Chui	santateresacupertino@gmail.com	11191 Santa Teresa Dr, Cupertino, CA 95014
David Constant	dtconstantdds@aol.com	11208 Mt. Crest Drive, Cupertino, CA
Ying Sosic	ydillaha@yahoo.com	11137 Linda Vista Drive, Cupertino, CA
Mary Jo Gunderson	maryjgunderson@gmail.com	22074 Baxley Ct Cupertino Ca
Vikram Saxena	vsaxena@gmail.com	11126 Linda Vista Drive, Cupertino, CA 95014

### CC 07-1-2025

Item No. 8

## Appoint Negotiator for 10480 Finch Avenue

Written Communications

From: Santosh Rao

To: <u>City Council</u>; <u>City Clerk</u>

**Subject:** Please pull agenda item 8 from consent calendar. **Date:** Wednesday, June 25, 2025 10:33:58 PM

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

Dear City Clerk,

Would you please include the below in written communications for the upcoming City Council meeting. Thank you.

[Writing on behalf of myself only, as a Cupertino resident and taxpayer]

Dear Mayor Chao, and council members,

Please pull agenda item 8 from consent calendar.

I hope the reason is obvious and does not need explaining. Items of this magnitude need to be discussed and do not belong on consent calendar.

Thank you.

Thanks,

San Rao (representing myself only)

 From:
 Peggy Griffin

 To:
 City Council

 Cc:
 City Clerk

**Subject:** 2025-07-01 City Council Regular Mtg-ITEM8 - Purchase of Finch Ave Property for parkland YES!

**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 3:28:43 PM

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

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

Dear City Council and Staff,

I support the purchase of the Finch Ave property for the use of Parkland.

Now days more and more development projects are paying parkland fees in-lieu rather than providing actual land for parks OR even worse, getting out of providing the land/fees all together. This is an increasing situation. The fees our city receives need to be used to purchase land to provide much needed parks for new and existing residents and visitors.

The availability of land for parks is becoming less attainable as our area becomes more dense. That said, the City of Cupertino needs to focus on all size parcels, small ones included, to provide park facilities. The park-in-lieu fees were to purchase land for parkland. Yes, there are specific other expenditures it can be used for but LAND is the largest cost and land has become difficult to find in our suburban area.

This is an opportunity to purchase land to benefit an area that is lacking in adequate park land. Please act to correct this situation!

Sincerely, Peggy Griffin

P.S. Jeff Whited's email sent for the 6-17-2025 Council Meeting Item 16 sounds like a wonderful way to use the land without immense costs. Just a thought.

From: <u>Lisa Warren</u>

To: <u>City Clerk; Liang Chao</u>
Cc: <u>City Attorney"s Office</u>

Subject: Please Include this info in Written Communications for Agenda Consent item 8- City Council regular meeting July

1, 2025

**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 3:51:15 PM

Attachments: LW response to Mayor with CUSD mtg minute info Aug 22 2024 ..... Written Communications for City Council

JUNE 3 2025 mtg ITEM 9 - FINCH property.pdf

Written Communications for City Council JUNE 3 2025 mtg ITEM 9 - FINCH property.pdf

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

#### City Clerk Squarcia,

I request that this email and attachments be made part of Written Communications for the July 1, 2025 meeting. In the event that Consent Item #8 on City Council Agenda for July 1, 2025 regular meeting is 'pulled' from consent for discussion, it is important to have this for public record.

Thank you.

Lisa Warren

#### previously sent on...

On Monday, June 16, 2025 at 09:40:31 PM PDT, Lisa Warren <la-warren@att.net> wrote:

#### Mayor, Vice Mayor, City Council Members,

Below, I have included late afternoon information (a response to an email from Mayor Chao on June 3, 2025) to my comments emailed on June 3, 2025 for public record on the NOW **Agenda Action Item 16, regarding 10480 Finch Ave Property** potential Purchase discussion that was previously item 9 on June 3, 2025 City Council agenda.

I have attached other documents, including one with three emails that were sent in for the June 3, 2025 CC mtg where this item was the Postponed agenda item #9. Emails were from myself, Jeff Whited, and Jennifer Griffin. Please revisit those communications.

Mr. Whited has an excellent idea, and an informed vision for the Finch property. While the school district is wanting to sell the property, students could most certainly benefit from a space as he describes just as all residents could. It would be exciting if CUSD would partner with the city in some way to provide science based learning in a space that he has outlined.

I am so very grateful that a public discussion related to the possible purchase of 10480 Finch Ave by the

City of Cupertino is taking place. There were several months where I believe that city was making claims and having no public discussion about this opportunity. I sense, and hope, that CUSD Board majority has the same vision as Mrs. Pestarino did. I applaud her heirs for making efforts to honor her wishes. I encourage the city of Cupertino to do the same.

A 'PARK' on the East side of the city, that could be used by all residents that live in the park starved area... and all other residents as well.

The definition of a park can be greatly varied. Let's get creative and give life to something special and unique to the city. It can, and perhaps should be, 'simple'.

Thank you.

Lisa Warren

I would also like to note that a former Cupertino mayor had, years ago and more than once, suggested on the dais and recorded, that the city purchase 10480 Finch Avenue from CUSD, OR partner with CUSD to create a park on the site. Stating that the east side of the city needed more parks.

Over past years, there have been several 2X2 City/CUSD meetings held that included such an idea.

There is a typo in the minutes from CUSD Aug 22, 2024

Correction : It was *January 5, 2017* when the property was purchased off market. Close to 7 years, 7 months prior to August 2024 meeting.

- Mr. Sheldon gave a brief review of the Finch property:
  - about 1.4 acres of land next to Sedgwick
  - the District acquired the property 17 years ago at approximately \$5.6M

In addition, please be aware that Agenda Item 16 and supporting documents refer incorrectly to CUSD as Cupertino Unified School District and should be corrected on all documents to Cupertino Union School District. Thank you.

Thank you. Lisa Warren

---- Forwarded Message -----

From: Lisa Warren <la-warren@att.net>

To: City Clerk <cityclerk@cupertino.gov>; Liang Chao <lchao@cupertino.gov>

Cc: City Attorney's Office <cityattorney@cupertino.gov>; Cupertino City Manager's Office

<citymanager@cupertino.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 at 04:41:54 PM PDT

Subject: Re: Agenda Item 9 - City Council regular meeting June 3, 2025

Thank you for the question, Mayor Chao.

You can refer to the info below which was taken from the minutes of CUSD Board meeting Aug 22, 2024.

You could also hear **full** presentation and Q & A on the youtube recording of the same meeting.

I have heard more specific statements in the past (going back a decade or more).

It is likely possible to get more 'quotes', but I have no time at this moment.

Lisa Warren

#### 5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Updates on the District's Real Property Matters (<a href="https://youtu.be/cVcqGwisd2q&t=34m58s">https://youtu.be/cVcqGwisd2q&t=34m58s</a>)

- CBO Jew shared an update on the Luther and Serra leases:
  - all current tenants accepted the updated District's long-term (LT) lease terms
    - tenants have requested a 10-year lease at their existing spaces at the rate of \$3.75/sq. foot, effective July1, 2025
    - staff will bring the new lease agreements to the Board for approval at a subsequent Board meeting
- CBO Jew invited Scott Sheldon and Barry Schimmel from Terra Realty to present options for the Finch property
- Mr. Sheldon gave a brief review of the Finch property:
  - about 1.4 acres of land next to Sedgwick
  - the District acquired the property 17 years ago at approximately \$5.6M
- Superintendent Yao shared that:
  - the District is considering all possibilities for the property
  - the Board has not made any decision on the property
  - after today's discussion, staff will look to the Board for direction regarding next steps
- Mr. Sheldon shared that there are four available options (slide 6):
  - Option 1 District Educational or Recreation needs:
    - examples include CuperDoodle, before and after school programs, sports
    - the lot is currently vacant, so the District will need to consider the initial capital/infrastructure outlay and ongoing operational costs
  - Option 2 City of Cupertino's needs/parks:
    - staff have been told by City staff that the City does not have funds to pay for the property
    - if the property is to be turned into a public park, the District will probably need to donate the land and spend District funds to develop the land
  - Option 3 Work Force Housing:
    - to obtain the most efficiency, these would be higher density housing e.g. a minimum of 10 units
    - economic impacts on the District's financials (slides 7 and 8) possible issuance of bonds, donation of land, capital infusion
    - at present, work force housing costs more than its market value
    - case study: Jefferson Union SD in Daly City
  - Option 4 Revenue Generation:

- highest and best use of the property is residential housing development
  - slide 12 shows the value, pros and cons, and potential revenues from (1) senior project/ground lease; (2) single family project; and (3) townhome project
  - slide 13 shows the development process the District needs to go through for any of these projects
- exchanges and other options
  - legal provisions as specified by Ed Code, ITS guidelines and Deed of Trusts (slide 15)
  - Net Net Net (NNN) Lease tenants responsible for all operating costs;
     the District just collects the lease payments
- whatever the Board decides, Terra recommends the Board NOT to get rid of the asset

#### • the Board asked clarifying questions/commented:

- do NNN leases tend to be commercial?
  - it depends; it's typically commercial
  - for NNN leases, the District does not need to manage them, whether they be commercial or residential
- is a NNN lease a good fit for the Finch property?
  - the location is not desirable for commercial NNN for neighbors
  - would recommend a residential NNN
- when did the City advise us that they have no money for the property? who at the City said there was no money?
  - in spring just before schools got out
  - it was communicated by the City Community Development staff, not at the City Council level
- if we keep the property as is, what's our expense?
  - minimal maintenance at the site
  - state accesses fees if a site is not used as a school; the fee is 1% of the assessed value of the property
- what is the history on the purchase of this property?
  - the original owner presented the opportunity to CUSD
  - the thought at that time was the District might need more space to add classrooms
- would what we did for the Montebello property be applicable to this property as well?
  - probably, but short-term though
- how does residential development affect the prices for the nearby homes?
  - their property value would probably be elevated
- slide 13 shows the development process, but we didn't do that for the Montebello property?
  - Terra staff did the work for the District
- if we were to do a trade, does that require a 2/3 Board vote?
  - yes
- comment teacher housing has negative financial impacts for the District
- comment perhaps work with the county instead of the City of Cupertino for financing options
- four members of the public submitted a comment card on time for this agenda item:
  - Mark Wright not present when invited to speak
  - Jennifer Griffins expressed the need for a public park at this location; mentioned that the City should have funds to do so
  - Anjali Sagdeo not present when invited to speak
  - Lisa Warren gave additional history regarding the District's purchase of the Finch property; talked about the need to turn the property into a public park or educational/recreational uses
- the Board further commented:
  - Trustee Madhathil:
    - keep the discussion ongoing with the City of Cupertino
    - prefers Option 1 educational purposes for our kids
  - Trustee Liu:
    - wants the District to take action regarding Finch and spend the resulting funds in the classrooms
    - preference is use the property for District educational; not CuperDoodle, though
    - if there are no educational needs for this property, then use it for recreational

- purposes e.g. parks
- not considering Options 3 or 4
- requests the City Manager to consider putting this on the City Council agenda
- with recent development agreements with the City, project/get generation numbers to see if we need to add to Sedgwick
- Trustee Leong:
  - Option 1 get analysis with the addition of the Vallco units and what the impact on Sedgwick might be
  - Option 2 if the City were to purchase the property, do we have to sell at a discount?
    - don't believe so, but the District will have to go through an appraisal process
  - Option 3 it's too small a site for work force housing
  - Option 4 open to this option, but try to keep the neighborhood as much status quo as possible
- Trustee Chiao:
  - Option 1 may not be viable because:
    - CuperDoodle generates only \$2M annually and the other options generate more revenues
    - the Rise takes about ten years to build, and it's still early in the process to estimate its enrollment impact
    - the District determines school assignment, and it may be at Collins which is closer to the Rise instead of at Sedgwick
  - Option 2 there are news reports that the City is in debt; believe that the City has no money
  - Option 3 if there are staff/social needs, look at financing options to lessen the net cost to the District
  - Option 4 maintain the area as residential and not commercial
- Trustee Vogel:
  - Option 1 first choice; interested to see the generation numbers
  - Option 2 second choice; explore with the City for finances; parks are lacking in this area
  - Option 3 not interested
  - Option 4 third choice if we can do a trade to create additional revenues
- Mr. Sheldon added:
  - there will be developer fees to be collected from the Rise project
  - there were precedents in the past that school districts have gone back to the developers for add-on fees to mitigate the expense of educational experience enhancements such as science labs, media centers
- Superintendent Yao commented that staff has enough information from the Board as to next steps and will update the Board in subsequent meetings

On Tuesday, June 3, 2025 at 02:58:36 PM PDT, Liang Chao < Ichao@cupertino.gov> wrote:

Removed the Council.

Lisa,

Thank you for sharing the history of this property with us.

Has the wishes of Mrs. Pestarino and her descendants been recorded any where? Perhaps, mentioned in an email or public comment at a school board meeting?

Thanks,



From: Lisa Warren <la-warren@att.net> Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 2:48 PM

To: City Council <citycouncil@cupertino.gov>; City Clerk <cityclerk@cupertino.gov>

**Cc:** City Attorney's Office <cityattorney@cupertino.gov>; Cupertino City Manager's Office

<citymanager@cupertino.gov>

**Subject:** Agenda Item 9 - City Council regular meeting June 3, 2025

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

Please include this message in Written Communications for Item 9. 10480 Finch Ave Property potential Purchase 6/3/25 Thank you.

Mayor, Vice Mayor, City Council members, and Staff,

I attended and spoke at CUSD Board meetings approximately a decade ago when deliberation about the possibility of purchasing 10480 Finch Avenue was taking place.

I have also listened to, CUSD Board members, staff and consultant give presentations and discuss 'options' for this property last Fall. I have sent comments via email. Some including pieces of 'history' related to how and why the 'Finch site' was purchased by the district. CUSD agendas referred such a purchase as 'Sedgwick Expansion'. The positioning of the school district to acquire the residential portion of a much larger piece of land (originally farmland) that would be used for expanding the districts assets and allow for anticipated growth that would accommodate growing enrollment (Vallco housing, etc.)

The idea was proactive. Bond measure funds were available. The land was purchased.

The property at 10480 Finch Ave. APN 375-40-067, was NOT on the MLS, or Multiple Listing Service. This **is verifiable** on MLS. The reason that it became available to the school district is that the children/Trustees of the

estate reached out to the district to open a dialogue focused on whether the district would be interesting in purchasing that corner adjacent to the school site. The Pestarino trustees were honoring their mother's hope/wish that the home and property where she lived for so very long, would be used for the benefit of children and education. While I am disappointed that CUSD has chosen to sell the now vacant property, I believe that it would be truly a huge disgrace if the land was not used in a way that Mrs. Pestarino would be comfortable with.

From: <u>Lisa Warren</u>

To: <u>City Clerk</u>; <u>Liang Chao</u>

Cc: <u>City Attorney"s Office; Cupertino City Manager"s Office</u>
Subject: Re: Agenda Item 9 - City Council regular meeting June 3, 2025

**Date:** Tuesday, June 3, 2025 4:42:09 PM

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

Thank you for the question Mayor Chao.

You can refer to the info below which was taken from the minutes of CUSD Board meeting Aug 22, 2024.

You could also hear **full** Q & A on the youtube recording of the same meeting.

I have heard more specific statements in the past (going back a decade or more).

It is likely possible to get more 'quotes', but I have not time at this moment.

#### Lisa Warren

#### 5. DISCUSSION

- 5.1 Updates on the District's Real Property Matters (https://youtu.be/cVcgGwisd2g&t=34m58s)
  - CBO Jew shared an update on the Luther and Serra leases:
    - all current tenants accepted the updated District's long-term (LT) lease terms
      - tenants have requested a 10-year lease at their existing spaces at the rate of \$3.75/sq. foot, effective July1, 2025
      - staff will bring the new lease agreements to the Board for approval at a subsequent Board meeting
  - CBO Jew invited Scott Sheldon and Barry Schimmel from Terra Realty to present options for the Finch property
  - Mr. Sheldon gave a brief review of the Finch property:
    - about 1.4 acres of land next to Sedgwick
    - the District acquired the property 17 years ago at approximately \$5.6M
  - Superintendent Yao shared that:
    - the District is considering all possibilities for the property
    - the Board has not made any decision on the property
    - · after today's discussion, staff will look to the Board for direction regarding next steps
  - Mr. Sheldon shared that there are four available options (slide 6):
    - Option 1 District Educational or Recreation needs:
      - examples include CuperDoodle, before and after school programs, sports
      - the lot is currently vacant, so the District will need to consider the initial

capital/infrastructure outlay and ongoing operational costs

- Option 2 City of Cupertino's needs/parks:
  - staff have been told by City staff that the City does not have funds to pay for the property
  - if the property is to be turned into a public park, the District will probably need to donate the land and spend District funds to develop the land
- Option 3 Work Force Housing:
  - to obtain the most efficiency, these would be higher density housing e.g. a minimum of 10 units
  - economic impacts on the District's financials (slides 7 and 8) possible issuance of bonds, donation of land, capital infusion
  - at present, work force housing costs more than its market value
  - case study: Jefferson Union SD in Daly City
- Option 4 Revenue Generation:
  - highest and best use of the property is residential housing development
    - slide 12 shows the value, pros and cons, and potential revenues from (1) senior project/ground lease; (2) single family project; and (3) townhome project
    - slide 13 shows the development process the District needs to go through for any of these projects
  - exchanges and other options
    - legal provisions as specified by Ed Code, ITS guidelines and Deed of Trusts (slide 15)
    - Net Net (NNN) Lease tenants responsible for all operating costs;
       the District just collects the lease payments
- whatever the Board decides, Terra recommends the Board NOT to get rid of the asset
- the Board asked clarifying questions/commented:
  - do NNN leases tend to be commercial?
    - it depends; it's typically commercial
    - for NNN leases, the District does not need to manage them, whether they be commercial or residential
  - is a NNN lease a good fit for the Finch property?
    - the location is not desirable for commercial NNN for neighbors
    - would recommend a residential NNN
  - when did the City advise us that they have no money for the property? who at the City said there was no money?
    - in spring just before schools got out
    - it was communicated by the City Community Development staff, not at the City Council level
  - if we keep the property as is, what's our expense?
    - minimal maintenance at the site
    - state accesses fees if a site is not used as a school; the fee is 1% of the assessed value of the property
  - what is the history on the purchase of this property?
    - the original owner presented the opportunity to CUSD
    - the thought at that time was the District might need more space to add classrooms
  - would what we did for the Montebello property be applicable to this property as well?
    - probably, but short-term though
  - how does residential development affect the prices for the nearby homes?
    - their property value would probably be elevated
  - slide 13 shows the development process, but we didn't do that for the Montebello property?
    - Terra staff did the work for the District
  - if we were to do a trade, does that require a 2/3 Board vote?
    - yes
  - comment teacher housing has negative financial impacts for the District
  - comment perhaps work with the county instead of the City of Cupertino for financing options
- four members of the public submitted a comment card on time for this agenda item:
  - Mark Wright not present when invited to speak
  - Jennifer Griffins expressed the need for a public park at this location; mentioned that the City should have funds to do so
  - Anjali Sagdeo not present when invited to speak

- Lisa Warren gave additional history regarding the District's purchase of the Finch property; talked about the need to turn the property into a public park or educational/recreational uses
- the Board further commented:
  - Trustee Madhathil:
    - keep the discussion ongoing with the City of Cupertino
    - prefers Option 1 educational purposes for our kids
  - Trustee Liu:
    - wants the District to take action regarding Finch and spend the resulting funds in the classrooms
    - preference is use the property for District educational; not CuperDoodle, though
    - if there are no educational needs for this property, then use it for recreational purposes e.g. parks
    - not considering Options 3 or 4
    - requests the City Manager to consider putting this on the City Council agenda
    - with recent development agreements with the City, project/get generation numbers to see if we need to add to Sedgwick
  - Trustee Leong:
    - Option 1 get analysis with the addition of the Vallco units and what the impact on Sedgwick might be
    - Option 2 if the City were to purchase the property, do we have to sell at a discount?
      - don't believe so, but the District will have to go through an appraisal process
    - Option 3 it's too small a site for work force housing
    - Option 4 open to this option, but try to keep the neighborhood as much status quo as possible
  - Trustee Chiao:
    - Option 1 may not be viable because:
      - CuperDoodle generates only \$2M annually and the other options generate more revenues
      - the Rise takes about ten years to build, and it's still early in the process to estimate its enrollment impact
      - the District determines school assignment, and it may be at Collins which is closer to the Rise instead of at Sedqwick
    - Option 2 there are news reports that the City is in debt; believe that the City has no money
    - Option 3 if there are staff/social needs, look at financing options to lessen the net cost to the District
    - Option 4 maintain the area as residential and not commercial
  - Trustee Vogel:
    - Option 1 first choice; interested to see the generation numbers
    - Option 2 second choice; explore with the City for finances; parks are lacking in this area
    - Option 3 not interested
    - Option 4 third choice if we can do a trade to create additional revenues
- Mr. Sheldon added:
  - there will be developer fees to be collected from the Rise project
  - there were precedents in the past that school districts have gone back to the developers for add-on fees to mitigate the expense of educational experience enhancements such as science labs, media centers
- Superintendent Yao commented that staff has enough information from the Board as to next steps and will update the Board in subsequent meetings

Removed the Council.

#### Lisa,

Thank you for sharing the history of this property with us.

Has the wishes of Mrs. Pestarino and her descendants been recorded any where? Perhaps, mentioned in an email or public comment at a school board meeting?

Thanks,



From: Lisa Warren <la-warren@att.net> Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 2:48 PM

**To:** City Council <citycouncil@cupertino.gov>; City Clerk <cityclerk@cupertino.gov> **Cc:** City Attorney's Office <cityattorney@cupertino.gov>; Cupertino City Manager's Office <citymanager@cupertino.gov>

**Subject:** Agenda Item 9 - City Council regular meeting June 3, 2025

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

Please include this message in Written Communications for Item 9. 10480 Finch Ave Property potential Purchase 6/3/25 Thank you.

Mayor, Vice Mayor, City Council members, and Staff,

I attended and spoke at CUSD Board meetings approximately a decade ago when deliberation about the possibility of purchasing 10480 Finch Avenue was taking place.

I have also listened to, CUSD Board members, staff and consultant give presentations and discuss 'options' for this property last Fall. I have send comments via email. Some including pieces of 'history' related to how and why the 'Finch site' was purchased by the district. CUSD agendas referred such a purchase as 'Sedgwick Expansion'. The positioning of the

school district to acquire the residential portion of a much larger piece of land (originally farm land) that would be used for expanding the districts assets and allow for anticipated growth that would accommodate growing enrollment (Vallco housing, etc.)

The idea was proactive. Bond measure funds were available. The land was purchased.

The property at 10480 Finch Ave. APN 375-40-067, was NOT on the MLS, or Multiple Listing Service. The reason that it became available to the school district is that the children/Trustees of the estate reached out to the district to open a dialogue focused on whether the district would be interesting in purchasing that corner adjacent to the school site. The trustees were honoring their mother's hope/wish that the home and property where she lived for so very long, would be used for the benefit of children and education. While I am disappointed that CUSD has chosen to sell the now vacant property, I believe that it would be truly a disgrace if the land was not used in a way that Mrs. Pestarino would comfortable with.

I am so very grateful that a public discussion related to the possible purchase of 10480 Finch Ave by the City of Cupertino is taking place. There were several months where I believe that city was making claims and having no public discussion about this opportunity. I sense, and hope, that CUSD Board majority has the same vision as Mrs. Pestarino did. I applaud her heirs for making efforts to honor her wishes. I encourage the city of Cupertino to do the same.

A 'PARK' on the East side of the city, that could be used by all residents that live in the park starved area... and all other residents as well.

The definition of a park can be greatly varied. Let's get creative and give life to something special and unique to the city. It can, and perhaps should be, 'simple'.

Thank you.

Lisa Warren

From: <u>Jeff Whited</u>

To: <u>City Council; City Clerk; Cupertino City Manager"s Office</u>

Subject: CC mtq June 3 2025 Agenda Item 9 Public Comment

**Date:** Sunday, June 1, 2025 9:31:57 AM

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

Dear Cupertino City Council Member, City Leadership Team member;

I am writing to you concerning the possible interest of the City of Cupertino in purchasing the Finch property currently in possession of the Cupertino School District. I wish to offer a suggestion as to what the city might do with the space once it has acquired it (should the city acquire it).

And while I have the brunt of your attention early on in this correspondence, let me say that the development of this land into a public facility can be done in such a way that is economical to construct, practically self-sustaining once constructed, requires less maintenance funds and manpower than a standard "turf and barbecue pit" park facility, and actually becomes less expensive to maintain as the facility matures.

With the west side of Cupertino already rife with outdoor walking and interactive nature trails and facilities (Blackberry Farm, walking trails along the foothills, Stevens Canyon trails and outdoor event facilities, etc.), this is an opportunity for our city to provide the same amenity to the eastern population of the city, within their neighborhood. Therefore I propose that this acre-and-a-half tract of land be transformed into a public space where the citizens of Cupertino, along with groups of Sedgwick Elementary School students, can retreat to in order to become immersed in a natural setting. You can call it a park, but it's not the typical mow-and-blow park one would see around our city.

This facility would be an exercise in permaculture, a food forrest, a semi-natural setting with guilds (strategic groupings of plants) of flora and any of the fauna that find living with it desirable and sustainable. A meandering, slightly elevated pathway would be the public's access to and through the facility, with strategically placed table settings and seatings where people can sit and contemplate, meditate, view nature, greet and converse with their neighbors, settle in with friends and family to have a game of Mahjong, chess, dominoes, read a book, or have a connecting conversation. You see, this is not a park for physical recreation, although the walk through it would be a physical exercise, but a retreat for the mind, be it stimulating, contemplative, or restorative in nature.

This facility would also be educational. The flourishing plant guilds would offer botanical suggestions and possibilities, and pathways shaded and cooled by the surrounding trees and the transpiration they provide would remind the public that simple steps are all that is needed to make some progress towards reducing local, and possibly global, temperatures.

With all of the development currently taking place in our neck of the "woods," in addition to all of the development slated for this area still of the drawing board, I think a balance must be struck, and the transformation of this space into a natural public setting would be the leveling agent needed to do just that.

Thank you for your time,

Jeff Whited Rancho Rinconada resident From: <u>Lisa Warren</u>

To: <u>City Council</u>; <u>City Clerk</u>

Cc: <u>City Attorney"s Office; Cupertino City Manager"s Office</u>
Subject: Agenda Item 9 - City Council regular meeting June 3, 2025

**Date:** Tuesday, June 3, 2025 2:48:24 PM

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

Please include this message in Written Communications for Item 9. 10480 Finch Ave Property potential Purchase 6/3/25 Thank you.

Mayor, Vice Mayor, City Council members, and Staff,

I attended and spoke at CUSD Board meetings approximately a decade ago when deliberation about the possibility of purchasing 10480 Finch Avenue was taking place.

I have also listened to, CUSD Board members, staff and consultant give presentations and discuss 'options' for this property last Fall. I have send comments via email. Some including pieces of 'history' related to how and why the 'Finch site' was purchased by the district. CUSD agendas referred such a purchase as 'Sedgwick Expansion'. The positioning of the school district to acquire the residential portion of a much larger piece of land (originally farm land) that would be used for expanding the districts assets and allow for anticipated growth that would accommodate growing enrollment (Vallco housing, etc.)

The idea was proactive. Bond measure funds were available. The land was purchased.

The property at 10480 Finch Ave. APN 375-40-067, was NOT on the MLS, or Multiple Listing Service. The reason that it became available to the school district is that the children/Trustees of the estate reached out to the district to open a dialogue focused on whether the district would be interesting in purchasing that corner adjacent to the school site. The trustees were honoring their mother's hope/wish that the home and property where she lived for so very long, would be used for the benefit of children and education. While I am disappointed that CUSD has chosen to sell the now vacant property, I believe that it would be truly a disgrace if the land was not used in a way that Mrs. Pestarino would comfortable with.

I am so very grateful that a public discussion related to the possible purchase of 10480 Finch Ave by the City of Cupertino is taking place. There were several months where I believe that city was making claims

and having no public discussion about this opportunity. I sense, and hope, that CUSD Board majority has the same vision as Mrs. Pestarino did. I applaud her heirs for making efforts to honor her wishes. I encourage the city of Cupertino to do the same.

A 'PARK' on the East side of the city, that could be used by all residents that live in the park starved area... and all other residents as well.

The definition of a park can be greatly varied. Let's get creative and give life to something special and unique to the city. It can, and perhaps should be, 'simple'.

Thank you.

Lisa Warren

From: Jennifer Griffin

To: City Council; City Clerk

Cc: grenna5000@vahoo.com

Subject: Purchase of Finch Property

Date: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 10:00:02 AM

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

Dear City Council:

(Please include the following as input for Item 9 on the Cupertino City Council Agenda for June 3, 2025).

I am very happy Cupertino is considering purchasing the Finch Property (adjacent to Sedgwick Elementary School). This is Item 9 in the City Council Agenda for 6/3/25. This is a very Nice piece of property with a huge redwood tree on the property, and it will make a wonderful Park for the area which does not have many parks. It will be a great place to have a neighborhood Park and having it close to the school is an added bonus.

The property is fairly deep into the neighborhood and it will have great use by the folks who Live around the park. The redwood tree is a wonderful addition to the park and will most Likely have a host of bird inhabitants already which will be wonderful to study and observe.

I am so excited to think a new park will come from this purchase of the Finch property! Think Of all the years to come of enjoyment that this park purchase will bring for everyone!

Thank you.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin

# 10480 Finch Ave, Cupertino, CA 95014-3424, Santa Clara County

CLIP: 7309095122 APN: 375-40-067 Sale Date Sale Price Half Baths Full Baths Beds NA N/A 3 Type Yr Built Lot Sq Ft Bldg Sq Ft SFR 1956 64,468 2,754 OWNER INFORMATION 95014 Tax Billing Zip **Cupertino Union S D** Owner Name No Owner Occupied 10301 Vista Dr Tax Billing Address Superintendent Owner Name 2 Cupertino, CA Tax Billing City & State LOCATION INFORMATION C073 **Property Carrier Route** Fremont Un School District R1-10 Zoning Community College District Foothill 18 Market Area Elementary School District Cupertino Un Within 250 Feet of Multiple Flood Z No Census Tract 5080.03 one TAX INFORMATION 13134 APN Tax Area 375-40-067 CHARACTERISTICS Land Use - CoreLogic SFR Bedrooms Land Use - County **Resid Single Family Total Baths** Lot Acres 1.48 Full Baths Lot Area 64,468 Half Baths Style H-Shape Heat Type Heated Year Built 1956 Porch None **Effective Year Built** 1956 Patio Type None Gross Area 2,754 Parking Type Type Unknown Building Sq Ft 2,754 Garage Sq Ft 484 Ground Floor Area 2,754 Construction Wood Stories Condition Average **Total Rooms** Quality Excellent LAST MARKET SALE & SALES HISTORY Recording Date 04/10/1996 Owner Name **Cupertino Union S D Document Number** 13251350 Owner Name 2 Superintendent Deed Type **Grant Deed** Seller Pestarino Aida M Trust **Recording Date** 01/05/2017 08/02/2016 04/27/2016 12/20/2012 12/27/2011 Nominal **Buyer Name Cupertino Union** Pestarinc Bart X Trust Pestarino F A Jr Pestarino Bart X Trust School Distric Pestarino F A Jr Buyer Name 2 Orrock Courtney E P Tr Orrock Courtney E P Tr ust ust Pestarino Bart X Trust Seller Name Pestarino Fa Jr Pestarino Aida M Trust Pestarino F A Jr Pestarino Aida M Trust Document Number 23551369 23388523 23288332 22013329 21475202 Document Type **Grant Deed** Trustee's Deed(Transfe Correction Deed Trustee's Deed(Transfe Trustee's Deed(Transfe

### CC 07-1-2025

Item No. 9

## DIALOG Design LP for City Annex Project

Written Communications

From: <u>Jean Bedord</u>

To: City Council; City Clerk; Cupertino City Manager"s Office; Chad Mosley

Subject: Agenda Item #9: Fiscal irresponsibility - 10455 Torre Avenue, Dialog Professional Service Contract, City Council,

July 1, 2025

**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 3:45:40 PM

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

Please include in Written Communications:

Mayor Chao, Vice-Mayor Moore, Councilmembers Fruen, Mohan and Wang,

I object to this contract on the basis of fiscal irresponsibility. Why would the city authorize \$493,243 to do yet another programming and design contract for City Hall Annex, when construction costs for implementing such a design would cost a minimum of \$7 million (2023 costs)? The city has already paid \$4,450,000 for the building, making the total investment close to \$12 million for a mere 5730 sq. ft., which can accommodate only 20-25% of the space needed as an interim city hall for any renovation/rebuilding of the current city hall. Staff can't function in a construction zone, so staff relocation has to be the first step in addressing our seismically unsafe approximately 24,000 sq. ft. city hall. It will take at least a 1 to 2 years to negotiate a temporary location and make the tenant improvements so staff can function. An interim city hall needs to function for 3 to 10 years depending on construction since renovation of the current city hall will cost a minimum of \$20 to \$25 million (\$7 million for seismic updates, plus required building upgrades to meet current legal requirements).

Council failed to act on 19400 Stevens Creek Blvd, which would have met the city's space needs for an interim city hall. Thus El Camino Hospital was able to purchase this building for a rock-bottom price of \$10.4 million for a 20,000 sq. ft. building that can be renovated for \$1-2 million, thus obtaining an asset rather than a lease. Now the city is back to square one. There is very little suitable office space available in Cupertino -- and the city may have to obtain a lease with less flexibility than it would have had by purchasing an asset.

The deficiencies at the current city hall building have been on the council's radar since at least 2018, with seismic safety issues identified as far back as 2011. The building has been declared seismically unsafe, a concern to both staff members and the public, and identified in the Santa Clara County Grand Jury Report.

Isn't it time to long-time needs of the city instead of wasting money on wishful thinking? I urge the council to reject this agenda item.

Fiscal responsibility advocate, Jean Bedord

## CC 07-1-2025

Item No. 12

Public Hearing
Townhome
Development

Written Communications

From: Cupertino ForAll
To: City Council

Cc: <u>City Clerk; Cupertino City Manager"s Office</u>

**Subject:** Support for Proposed Townhome Development at 20840 Stevens Creek

**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 10:05:26 AM

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

Dear Mayor Chao, Vice Mayor Moore, and City Councilmembers, Cupertino for All is writing to express strong support for the 59 townhomes at 20840 Stevens Creek Blvd (Item 12 on the City Council agenda.) We believe this project will provide significant benefits such as supporting neighborhood businesses, promoting homeownership for young families, and making progress towards our housing element goals.

Our community has long valued homeownership, but rising costs have pushed this dream out of reach for young families. This townhome development directly addresses this challenge by creating attainable homeownership opportunities for families that find themselves priced out of traditional single-family homes. Moreover, 12 units (or 20%) are reserved for moderate income families providing a housing type that is much needed in our community. This project will expand equity-building opportunities for these families.

Moreover, these families will expand the customer base of the Stevens Creek retail corridor. We all love retail and want as much retail that can be realistically supported. Brick-and-mortar retail has been hurt by consumer trends such as shopping at Amazon and being able to get delivery at the click of a button at restaurants in surrounding cities. In order for Cupertino businesses to thrive we need to build homes for the customers who will spend money to support these businesses. Putting a townhome development right in the middle of Stevens Creek retail is the best way to support our local businesses.

Cupertino has been mandated by the state of California to build nearly 5,000 units by 2031. We have only built 76 units in the past two years, which will not get us anywhere close to our goal in this timeframe. This project will create 75% of the units we built in the last two years in just one project. The developer, SummerHill Homes has stated they will be able to break ground as soon as they have their building permits in hand.

Finally, this project is unique in Cupertino because there has not been one neighbor that has shown opposition to this project. How often do we see that?? This is likely because the developer designed a project to fit in with the community character and made project changes to protect the privacy of their fence-line neighbors.

So we urge the City Council to make the easy decision tomorrow (July 1) and approve the actions on Item 12 that were unanimously recommended by the Cupertino Planning Commission. The SummerHill Townhome project will expand homeownership, promote existing retail, and help us meet housing element goals. We enthusiastically support this project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Cupertino for All From: <u>Yvonne Strom</u>
To: <u>City Council</u>

Cc: City Clerk; Cupertino City Manager"s Office

**Subject:** Support for Summerhill Townhouse project (item 12)

**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 12:02:20 PM

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

Dear Mayor Chao, Vice Mayor Moore, and City Councilmembers,

I am delighted to write in support of the Summerhill Townhouse project on Stevens Creek Blvd. It can be challenging to find places to build new housing so this underutilized land is a gem. The location is ideal because it is close to services and transit, and it will not disturb any neighbors.

Cupertino needs more housing, especially for first time home buyers and young families. The townhouse format is a good fit for this purpose. In addition, it is the right size for the neighborhood and could help revitalize local businesses.

I urge the City Council to approve Item 12, the Townhouse project, as recommended by the planning commission. Completing this housing project will be a shining legacy for the City and will welcome 59 new households to Cupertino.

Respectfully, Yvonne Thorstenson, Cupertino resident and community volunteer

## CC 07-1-2025

Item No. 13

FY 2025-26 Fee Schedule Update

Written Communications

From: <u>Venkat Ranganathan</u>

To: <u>City Council; City Clerk; Cupertino City Manager"s Office</u>

Subject: Comments regarding staff Report and Unsustainable Fee Increases – Agenda Item 13 (07/01/25)

**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 6:18:28 PM

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

Dear City Clerk,

Please include the below in written communication for the 07/01/25 city council meeting agenda item on fee increases.

Dear Cupertino City Council,

I am Venkat Ranganathan, a long time resident of the city of Cupertino.

I urge you to delay action on Agenda Item 13. While the staff report claims there are no new fees being imposed, it obscures a nearly 10% increase in existing fees across planning, building, and engineering.

These increases stem from the 2024 cost recovery policy and make this an annual, compounding burden. The Council should reconsider the policy and explore sustainable alternatives, including comparisons with neighboring cities and identifying other avenues for shifting the costs.

Please require a revised report with clear, department-wise dollar increases before proceeding.

Thanks

Venkat

From: Santosh Rao
To: City Clerk

**Subject:** Fw: Misleading staff report for agenda item on resident fee increases.

**Date:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:56:39 AM

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

+ City Clerk. Thanks.

Thanks, Santosh Rao

Begin forwarded message:

On Thursday, June 26, 2025, 8:59 AM, Santosh Rao <santo a rao@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear City Clerk,

Would you please include the below in written communication for the upcoming city council meeting. Thank you.

[Writing on behalf of myself only, as a Cupertino resident.]

Dear Mayor Chao and Cupertino city council,

I wish to raise a strong objection and concern on the misleading staff report for agenda item 13 on the 07/01/25 city council meeting.

The staff report states "<u>no new fees are proposed</u>" for many of the sections such as planning, building, engineering etc.

https://cupertino.legistar.com/View.ashx? M=F&ID=14319557&GUID=8497FFF7-2F5C-4F02-A965-F16FD3CBC240

To the casual reader this may appear as satisfactory. The staff report does not highlight that existing fees are rising 9.7% in most cases.

Please require that the staff report do a transparent disclosure of the fee increases in existing fees by department. Stating no new fees are proposed is misleading at best and deceptive to the casual reader frankly.

I am including the last column from the redline reports to show the % annual fee increases from each of the departments below.

I urge city council to please continue this item till a revised staff report is produced that does not mislead council and residents with irrelevant and

## misleading statements such as "no new fees are proposed" and instead lists the fee increases by department.

These fee increases are a result of the user cost recovery policy that was adopted in 2024 by then council.

These fee increases are due to rise in employee costs driven by healthcare and pensions. The increases are not one time. They will recur annually at or higher than the current increase. An increase of 9.7+% annually is unsustainable for residents.

- 1. I urge you to reject these fee increases, and instead agendaize an item to rollback the user cost recovery policy passed in 2024.
- 2. Please instead study alternate ways of covering employee costs without passing them directly onto residents.
- 3. Please ask for a like for like comparative fee schedule for the same items from neighboring cities such as Saratoga, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, San Jose. Not the like for like increases but actual and absolute fee comparison for each department and line item fees.

Please ask staff to explicitly identify where Cupertino absolute fees for line items are higher than neighboring cities (not picking the highest as the comparison).

- 4. Please explore ways to pass these costs onto other areas such as commercial or rentals or non-resident fees rather than directly onto residents.
- 5. Lastly if you are unwilling or unable to do any of the above please agendaize a study of the staffing currently in the city and take action to reduce full time staffing and replace with contract roles to reduce the cost of pensions and healthcare on the city.

It is not sustainable to hike fees 9.7+% annually on residents. Please postpone approval on this item until the above actions are first taken. I will vote based on this issue in 2026 and I hear likewise from the residents I talk to. I fully expect residents will be kept informed of the council members that vote to increase fees on residents annually 9.7% or higher so that they can vote accordingly in 2026.

Thank you.

	FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$ ▲	YOY % ▲
I	\$318	28.00	9.7%
I			

Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate		
\$30,047	2,654.00	9.79
\$51,639	4,561.00	9.79
1	100.00	
\$5,573	492.00	9.79
\$11,761	1,039.00	9.79
\$28,250	2,495.00	9.7
\$43,109	3,808.00	9.79
\$12,744	1,126.00	9.79
\$27,500	2,429.00	9.79
¢11.720	1 026 00	0.70
\$11,728	1,036.00	9.79
\$18,299	1,616.00	9.79
\$27,917	2,466.00	9.79
\$4,414	390.00	9.79
\$5,523	488.00	9.79
\$6,745	596.00	9.79
\$6,030	533.00	9.7°

<u> </u>		
\$4,992	441.00	9.7%
\$5,126	453.00	9.7%
\$5,686	502.00	9.7%
\$7,657	676.00	9.7%
\$8,579	758.00	9.7%
\$27,560	2,434.00	9.7%
\$26,287	2,322.00	9.7%
\$8,711	769.00	9.7%
\$9,961	880.00	9.7%
\$1,978	175.00	9.7%
\$2,747.00	243.00	9.7%
\$2,780.00	246.00	9.7%
\$6,023.00	532.00	9.7%
\$10,475.00	925.00	9.7%
\$2,184.00	193.00	9.7%
\$9,627.00	850.00	9.7%
\$14,862.00	1,313.00	9.7%
\$21,451.00	1,895.00	9.7%

FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY \$ A	YOY % 🛦

9.7%	\$58.88	\$667
9.7%	\$40.73	\$461
9.7%	\$103.48	\$1,172
		Double the permit cost
9.7%	\$214.83	\$2,432
9.7%	\$169.25	\$1,916
9.7%	\$344.03	\$3,895
9.7%	\$25.00	5% of Project Costs and/or \$282 per inspection
9.7%	\$51.18	\$579
		No Charge
9.7%	\$130.97	\$1,483
9.7%	\$474.00	Greater of \$5365 or 6% of cost of improvement
9.7%	\$812.21	\$9,195
9.7%	\$1,326.03	\$15,013
9.7%	\$126.15	\$1,428
9.7%	\$31.00	\$349
9.7%	\$31.00	\$349
9.7%	\$548.00	Greater of \$6203 or 5% of cost of improvement

9.7%	\$1,039.00	Greater of \$11768 or 5% of cost of improvement
9.7%	\$153.95	\$1,743
9.7%	\$18.40	\$208
		*Cost of review + City
		Administrative Fee
9.7%	\$61.57	\$697
9.7%	\$341.18	\$3,863
9.7%	\$210.91	\$2,388
9.7%	\$210.91	\$2,388
9.7%	\$408.43	\$4,624
0.0%	\$0.00	\$6,797
0.0%	\$0.00	\$4,215
0.0%	\$0.00	\$10.94
0.0%	\$0.00	\$19.15
0.0%	\$0.00	\$3,728
0.0%	\$0.00	\$6,862
0.0%	\$0.00	\$16
0.0%	\$0.00	\$90
9.7%	\$30.83	\$349

Fee Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY % 🛦
\$809	\$71.47	9.7%
\$5,014	\$442.87	9.7%
No Charge		
\$3,510	\$310.02	9.7%
\$5,462	\$482.48	9.7%
\$2,848	\$251.58	9.7%
\$1,766	\$156.00	9.7%
\$1,234	\$108.96	9.7%
\$329	\$29.10	9.7%
\$1,548	\$136.74	9.7%
\$1,260	\$111.33	9.7%
No Charge		
\$511	\$45.17	9.7%
\$4,669	-\$37.18	-0.8%

\$6,339	-\$50.48	-0.8%
\$4,548	-\$36.21	-0.8%
\$345	-\$2.74	-0.8%
\$12,246	-\$97.51	-0.8%
\$4,666	-\$37.16	-0.8%
\$2,357	-\$18.77	-0.8%
No charge		
\$476	\$42.00	9.7%
\$173	\$15.28	9.7%
\$346	\$30.55	9.7%
ψο 10	φου.σο	J., 70
\$2,432	\$214.81	9.7%
φ <b>2,432</b>	Ψ214.01	9.7 /0
d010	ф <b>э</b> о <b>э</b> о	0.79/
\$319	\$28.20	9.7%
5.8%		

FY 2025-26	YOY \$ A	YOY % 🛦
Prop. Fee		101 %

26.00	9.8%
26.00	9.8%
26.00	9.8%
25.00	9.6%
38.00	9.7%
13.00	9.9%
51.00	9.8%
25.00	9.6%
	26.00 26.00 25.00 38.00 13.00 51.00

\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$573	51.00	9.8%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$95	8.00	9.2%
\$10	1.00	11.1%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$10	1.00	11.1%
\$33	3.00	10.0%

\_

1		1
\$48	4.00	9.1%
\$94	8.00	9.3%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$430	38.00	9.7%
\$95	8.00	9.2%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$430	38.00	9.7%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292 \$292	26.00	9.8%
\$573	51.00	9.8%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
I	I	

\$71	6.00	9.2%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$71	6.00	9.2%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$20	2.00	11.1%
\$29	3.00	11.5%
\$71	6.00	9.2%
\$215	19.00	9.7%
\$215	19.00	9.7%
\$95	8.00	9.2%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$71	6.00	9.2%
\$29	3.00	11.5%
\$19	2.00	11.8%
\$144	13.00	9.9%

FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY %
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$304	27.00	9.7%
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$423	37.00	9.6%
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$2,029	870.00	75.1%
\$3,879	1,643.00	73.5%
\$4,343	1,576.00	57.0%
\$2,789	915.00	48.8%
\$3,665	1,273.00	53.2%
\$4.581	1 501 00	53.2%

ψ <del>1</del> ,υυ1	1,071.00	JJ.4 /0
\$1,882	166.00	9.7%
\$2,760	244.00	9.7%
\$2,691	238.00	9.7%
\$3,908	345.00	9.7%
\$2,865	253.00	9.7%
\$4,010	354.00	9.7%
\$256	23.00	9.9%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$128	11.00	9.4%
\$280	25.00	9.8%
\$502	44.00	9.6%
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$2,491	220.00	9.7%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$718	63.00	9.6%

9.6% 9.7% 9.6%
9.6%
0.69/
9.6%
9.7%
9.8%
9.9%
9.7%
9.7%
9.7%
9.7%

	FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$ ▲	YOY %
-	#1 OOF	00.00	0.770/

)	\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
2	\$847	75.00	9.7%
)	\$295	26.00	9.7%
2	\$847	75.00	9.7%
)	\$295	26.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%
3	\$853	75.00	9.6%
1	\$286	25.00	9.6%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$423	37.00	9.6%
5	\$718	63.00	9.6%
7	\$128	11.00	9.4%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
٦	A. = 4	4	~

)	\$152	13.00	9.4%
)	\$152	13.00	9.4%
7	\$304	27.00	9.7%
5	\$609	54.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%
l	\$144	13.00	9.9%
5	\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
2	\$573	51.00	9.8%
5	\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%
3	\$1,292	114.00	9.7%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%

5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
3	\$338	30.00	9.7%
<u>-</u>	\$144	13.00	9.9%
Ī	\$286	5 25.00	9.6%
	FY 2025-26	YOY \$ A	YOY %
F	Proposed Fee	101ψ =	<b>A</b>
F	Proposed Fee	101 ψ <b>-</b>	<b>A</b>
F	Proposed Fee \$718	63.00	9.6%
<u> </u>			9.6% 9.7%
<u>F</u>	\$718	63.00	
<u>-</u>	\$718 \$295	63.00	9.7%
<u>-</u>	\$718 \$295 \$1,023	63.00 26.00 90.00	9.7% 9.6%
<u>F</u>	\$718 \$295 \$1,023	63.00 26.00 90.00	9.7% 9.6%
<u>F</u>	\$718 \$295 \$1,023 \$292	63.00 26.00 90.00 26.00	9.7% 9.6% 9.8%

\$802	/ 0.00	<b>9.</b> /%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$1,023	90.00	9.6%
\$1,023	90.00	9.6%
\$1,023	90.00	9.6%
\$439	39.00	9.8%
\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
\$450	0.00	0.0%
\$15	0.00	0.0%
\$1,000	0.00	0.0%
\$7	0.00	0.0%
\$5	0.00	0.0%

0.00	0.0%
0.00	0.0%
0.00	0.0%
0.00	0.0%
0.00	0.0%
116.00	9.7%
78.00	9.8%
116.00	9.7%
78.00	9.8%
25.00	9.8%
27.00	9.7%
31.00	9.5%
27.00	9.7%
	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 116.00 78.00 116.00 78.00 25.00 27.00 31.00

Check Fee			
\$305	27.00	9.7%	
\$494	44.00	9.8%	
FY 2025-26	YOY\$▲	YOY %	
Proposed Fee	101ψ2	<u> </u>	
\$1,140	101.00	9.7%	
\$1,140	101.00	9.7%	
\$1,005	89.00	9.7%	
\$2.51	0.22	9.7%	
\$2,760	244.00	9.7%	
\$0.58	0.05	9.7%	
\$3,637	321.00	9.7%	
\$0.29	0.03	9.7%	

			_		
	2.	00		8.0	)%
	2.	00		8.0	)%
	62.	00		9.	7%
	25.	00		9.0	5%
1	16.	00		9.	7%
	78.	00		9.8	3%
1	68.	00		9.	7%
1	03.	00		9.	7%
1	93.	00		9.	7%
1	28.	00		9.	7%
1	68.	00		9.	7%
1	03.	00		9.	7%
1	93.	00		9.	7%
1	28.	00		9.	7%
	26.	00		9.8	3%
	89.	00		9.	7%

\$701	62.00	9.7%
\$557	49.00	9.6%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$295	26.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$136	12.00	9.7%
\$423	37.00	9.6%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$295	26.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$295	26.00	9.7%

FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY %
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$862	76.00	9.7%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$557	49.00	9.6%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$1,882	166.00	9.7%
\$439	39.00	9.8%

-

\$3,192	282.00	9.7%
\$878	78.00	9.8%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
5.8%		
\$862	76.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$415	37.00	9.8%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$355	31.00	9.6%
\$502	44.00	9.6%
\$502	44.00	9.6%

Thanks, San Rao (writing on behalf of myself only) From: Yuvaraj Athur Raghuvir

To: City Council; Tina Kapoor; City Clerk; Benjamin Fu; Luke Connolly; Chad Mosley

**Subject:** Objection to Misleading Staff Report and Unsustainable Fee Increases – Agenda Item 13 (07/01/25)

**Date:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:30:32 PM

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

## Dear City Clerk,

Please include the below in written communication for the 07/01/25 city council meeting agenda item on fee increases.

Subject: Objection to Misleading Staff Report and Unsustainable Fee Increases – Agenda Item 13 (07/01/25)

Dear Mayor Chao and Cupertino City Council,

I'm a Cupertino resident writing to express serious concern about the staff report for agenda item 13 on the July 1st agenda. While the report states that "no new fees are proposed" for departments such as planning, building, and engineering, it fails to clearly disclose that most existing fees are increasing by 9.7%. That's a substantial and recurring increase, and presenting it without transparency is deeply misleading to the public.

I urge the Council to require a revised report that clearly outlines department-by-department increases in actual dollar amounts. The language used in the current report minimizes the impact and misleads both residents and policymakers.

These increases are tied to the cost recovery policy adopted in 2024 and are largely driven by rising employee benefit costs like pensions and healthcare. This is not a one-time issue—it's an annual, compounding burden that I and many others believe is not sustainable.

Rather than approving another near +10% increase on residents, I believe the Council should revisit the 2024 cost recovery policy and consider rolling it back. There should be a serious exploration of alternative ways to fund employee-related costs without passing them directly to residents year after year. A proper study comparing Cupertino's absolute fee levels—not just the percentage increases—with those in neighboring cities like Saratoga, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and San Jose is essential. We need to understand where Cupertino stands, especially for individual line-item fees, and identify areas where our residents are paying more than their counterparts elsewhere.

If these increases must happen, then cost shifts should be prioritized away from residents and toward non-resident users, commercial operations, or rental groups that use city services and facilities. And if none of that is workable, then we need to look seriously at restructuring staffing—possibly reducing full-time roles and transitioning to contract-based positions to ease the long-term cost burden on the city.

I respectfully ask that you delay action on this item until these issues are addressed in a clear and revised staff report. This issue matters deeply to me, and I know many others in our

community are paying attention. Decisions like this will certainly shape how I vote in 2026.

Thank you, Yuva Athur Cupertino Resident From: Ajith Dasari

To: <u>Tina Kapoor; City Council; City Clerk; Benjamin Fu; Luke Connolly; Chad Mosley</u>

Subject: Objection to Misleading Staff Report and Unsustainable Fee Increases – Agenda Item 13 (07/01/25)

**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 1:21:48 PM

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

Dear City Clerk,

Please include the below in written communication for the 07/01/25 city council meeting agenda item on fee increases.

Subject: Objection to Misleading Staff Report and Unsustainable Fee Increases – Agenda Item 13 (07/01/25)

Dear Mayor Chao and Cupertino City Council,

I'm a Cupertino resident writing to express serious concern about the staff report for agenda item 13 on the July 1st agenda. While the report states that "no new fees are proposed" for departments such as planning, building, and engineering, it fails to clearly disclose that most existing fees are increasing by 9.7%. That's a substantial and recurring increase, and presenting it without transparency is deeply misleading to the public.

I urge the Council to require a revised report that clearly outlines department-by-department increases in actual dollar amounts. The language used in the current report minimizes the impact and misleads both residents and policymakers.

These increases are tied to the cost recovery policy adopted in 2024 and are largely driven by rising employee benefit costs like pensions and healthcare. This is not a one-time issue—it's an annual, compounding burden that I and many others believe is not sustainable.

Rather than approving another near-10% increase on residents, I believe the Council should revisit the 2024 cost recovery policy and consider rolling it back. There should be a serious exploration of alternative ways to fund employee-related costs without passing them directly to residents year after year. A proper study comparing Cupertino's absolute fee levels—not just the percentage increases—with those in neighboring cities like Saratoga, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and San Jose is essential. We need to understand where Cupertino stands, especially for individual line-item fees, and identify areas where our residents are paying more than their counterparts elsewhere.

If these increases must happen, then cost shifts should be prioritized away from residents and toward non-resident users, commercial operations, or rental groups that use city services and facilities. And if none of that is workable, then we need to look seriously at restructuring staffing—possibly reducing full-time roles and transitioning to contract-based positions to ease the long-term cost burden on the city.

I respectfully ask that you delay action on this item until these issues are addressed in a clear and revised staff report. This issue matters deeply to me, and I know many others in our community are paying attention. Decisions like this will certainly shape how I vote in 2026.

Thank you, Ajith Cupertino Resident From: Vidya Gurikar

To: City Council; City Clerk

Subject: Proposed Fee increases

**Date:** Thursday, June 26, 2025 2:39:32 PM

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

Dear City Clerk,

Please include the below in written communication for the 07/01/25 city council meeting agenda item on fee increases.

Subject: Objection to Misleading Staff Report and Unsustainable Fee Increases – Agenda Item 13 (07/01/25)

\_\_\_\_

Dear Mayor Chao and Cupertino City Council,

I'm a Cupertino resident writing to express serious concern about the staff report for agenda item 13 on the July 1st agenda. While the report states that "no new fees are proposed" for departments such as planning, building, and engineering, it fails to clearly disclose that most existing fees are increasing by 9.7%. That's a substantial and recurring increase, and presenting it without transparency is deeply misleading to the public.

I urge the Council to require a revised report that clearly outlines department-by-department increases in actual dollar amounts.

These increases are tied to the cost recovery policy adopted in 2024 and are largely driven by rising employee benefit costs like pensions and healthcare. This is not a one-time issue—it's an annual, compounding burden that I and many others believe is not sustainable.

Rather than approving another near-10% increase on residents, I believe the Council should revisit the 2024 cost recovery policy and consider rolling it back. There should be a serious exploration of alternative ways to fund employee-related costs without passing them directly to residents year after year. A proper study comparing Cupertino's absolute fee levels—not just the percentage increases—with those in neighboring cities like Saratoga, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, and San Jose is essential. We need to understand where Cupertino stands, especially for individual line-item fees, and identify areas where our residents are paying more than their counterparts elsewhere.

If these increases must happen, then cost shifts should be prioritized away from residents and toward non-resident users, commercial operations, or rental groups that use city services and facilities.

I respectfully ask that you delay action on this item until these issues are addressed in a clear and revised staff report.

Thank you, Shrividya Gurikar Cupertino Resident From: Santosh Rao

To: <u>City Council; Tina Kapoor; Kristina Alfaro; Benjamin Fu; Luke Connolly; Chad Mosley; City Clerk</u>

**Subject:** Re: Misleading staff report for agenda item on resident fee increases.

**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 11:08:22 AM

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

Dear City Clerk,

Would you please include the below in written communications for the 07/01/25 city council meeting on user fee increase agenda item.

[Writing on behalf of myself only, as a Cupertino resident]

Dear Mayor Chao and City Council members,

I am writing to request that you continue/postpone the user fee agenda item to a further out date and instead ask staff for more data along the lines below. Next week is the week of July 4th and attendance from residents will be light. Please do not discuss an item with such a major impact on residents at a time when attendance may be light due to a holiday week.

Further I am including snapshots from the informational memo published today (06/27/25) of the fee hikes passed last year in 2024. You can see the last column across the board on the below. The fee increases in 2024 were mind boggling and it is being followed up by another 9.7% fee hike. This is not sustainable and is broken.

Please ask staff for a line by line item level fee comparison with smaller neighboring cities comparable to us. Los Altos, Saratoga. Los Gatos etc.

Please ask staff to produce a table of what the hikes would have been if the cost recovery policy had not been adopted.

This cost recovery policy from 2024 is breaking the backs of already over taxed residents. It is a huge burden. I implore you to rollback the cost recovery policy and take a fresh look at this whole area. Residents considering a remodel are often those who have lived decades in their home which is in need of repairs or improvements. Many may be seniors and on the verge of retiring or retired. Indeed of the 6 - 8 remodels I know of in the past 12 months almost all fit that bill. The other category are new residents who just bought a home and are looking to remodel. These are already burdened with a huge cost basis for the purchase and a huge tax basis for property taxes.

Residents cannot bear the brunt of employee healthcare and pension costs while you give developers \$77M fee waivers.

Please do not keep this agenda item for 07/01/25. Please postpone this item till a holistic study is done on the above areas.

FY 2023-24 Fee	FY 2023-24 Total Cost	FY 2024-25 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY % 🛦
\$332	\$287	\$290	(42.00)	-12.7%
Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate	Staff Hourly Rate		
\$20,917	\$27,117	\$27,393	6,476.00	31.0%
\$34,792	\$46,604	\$47,078	12,286.00	35.3%
\$34,792	φ40,004	φ47,076	12,200.00	33.3 /0
\$4,639	\$5,030	\$5,081	442.00	9.5%
\$7,682	\$10,614	\$10,722	3,040.00	39.6%
\$21,043	\$25,496	\$25,755	4,712.00	22.4%
\$35,064	\$38,905	\$39,301	4,237.00	12.1%
, ,	, ,	, ,	,	
\$9,666	\$11,501	\$11,618	1,952.00	20.2%
\$17,654	\$24,819	\$25,071	7,417.00	42.0%
			,	
\$7,393	\$10,584	\$10,692	3,299.00	44.6%
\$14,557	\$16,515	\$16,683	2,126.00	14.6%
\$21,667	\$25,195	\$25,451	3,784.00	17.5%
\$3,796	\$3,983	\$4,024	228.00	6.0%
\$4,929	\$4,985	\$5,035	106.00	2.2%
\$5,915	\$6,088	\$6,149	234.00	4.0%
\$5,185	\$5,441	\$5,497	312.00	6.0%
\$4,322	\$4,506	\$4,551	229.00	5.3%
\$1,411	\$4,626	\$4,673	3,262.00	231.2%
\$4,749	\$5,132	\$5,184	435.00	9.2%
\$5,405	\$6,911	\$6,981	1,576.00	29.2%
\$7,677	\$7,742	\$7,821	144.00	1.9%
\$21,460	\$24,873	\$25,126	3,666.00	17.1%
\$22,241	\$23,724	\$23,965	1,724.00	7.8%
\$7,408	\$7,862	\$7,942	534.00	7.2%
\$8,489	\$8,990	\$9,081	592.00	7.0%
\$1,232	\$3,570	\$1,803	571.00	46.3%
	\$2,478.98	\$2,504.00		

. ,		
\$2,508.49	\$2,534.00	
\$5,435.74	\$5,491.00	
\$9,454.37	\$9,550.00	
\$1,971.46	\$1,991.00	
\$8,688.72	\$8,777.00	
\$13,412.54	\$13,549.00	
\$19,359.32	\$19,556.00	

FY 2023-24 Fee FY 2023-24 Total Cost		FY 2024-25 Proposed Fee		
\$328	\$1,260	\$424	96.00	29.3%
\$165	\$276	\$167	2.00	1.2%
\$492	\$2,305	\$776	284.00	57.7%
\$247	\$950	\$250	3.00	1.2%
\$5,464	\$5,464	\$5,520	56.00	1.0%
\$411	\$4,182	\$422	11.00	2.7%
\$7,724	\$7,871	\$7,951	227.00	2.9%
\$524	\$547	\$553	29.00	5.5%
\$5,405	\$6,911	\$7,532	2,127.00	39.4%
\$4,242	\$4,411	\$4,456	214.00	5.0%
\$7,822	\$7,973	\$8,054	232.00	3.0%
\$2,103	\$2,082	\$2,103	0.00	0.0%
Contract+Admin Fee	Contract+Admin Fee	Contract+Admin Fee		
Contract+Admin Fee	Contract+Admin Fee	Contract+Admin Fee		
Contract+Admin Fee	Contract+Admin Fee	Contract+Admin Fee		
\$379	\$397	\$401	22.00	5.8%
\$379	\$19,006	\$505	126.00	33.2%
\$379	\$19,294	\$505	126.00	33.2%
\$440	\$521	\$527	87.00	19.8%
Acutal Cost + Admin Fee	Actual Cost + Admin Fee	Actual Cost + Admin Fee		
\$555	\$577	\$583	28.00	5.0%
\$279	\$288	\$291	12.00	4.3%
\$232	\$405	\$409	177.00	76.3%
\$332	\$543	\$548	216.00	65.1%

	\$4,836.63	\$4,886.00		
	\$2,161.79	\$500.00		
	\$425.43	\$430.00		
	5.8%	5.8%		
\$10.18	\$10.18	\$10.28	0.10	1.0%
\$2,218	\$2,218	\$2,241	23.00	1.0%
\$0.49	\$1.50	\$1.52	1.03	209.4%
\$0.24	\$1.50	\$1.52	1.28	535.4%
\$0.45	\$1.50	\$1.52	1.07	235.8%
	20% of Plan Check and	20% of Plan Check and		
	Inspection fees	Inspection fees		

FY 2023-24 FY 2024-25 Fee Total Cost Prop. Fee YOY\$ ▲ YOY% ▲

\$82	\$263	\$266	184.00	224.4%
\$243	\$263	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$243	\$263	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$486	\$517	\$522	36.00	7.4%
\$243	\$259	\$261	18.00	7.4%
<del>\$16</del>				
\$62	\$65	\$65	3.00	4.8%
\$121	\$129	\$131	10.00	8.3%

	\$65	\$65		
	\$129	\$131		
	\$18	\$18		
	\$26	\$26		
<del>\$16</del>				
<del>\$243</del>				
\$62	\$65	\$65	3.00	4.8%
\$182	\$194	\$196	14.00	7.7%
\$182	\$194	\$196	14.00	7.7%
φon	<b>\$96</b>	ф <b>о</b> 7	F 00	( 10/
\$82	\$86	\$87	5.00	6.1%
<del>\$82</del>				
<del>\$121</del>				
<del>\$121</del>				
¢101				
<del>\$121</del>				
\$121	\$129	\$131	10.00	8.3%
\$62	\$65	\$65	3.00	4.8%
\$24	\$26	\$26	2.00	8.3%
\$15	\$17	\$17	2.00	13.3%
	44.00	4404		
	\$129	\$131		

\_\_\_\_\_

Τ

\$263 \$275	Proposed Fee \$266 \$277	YOY \$ ▲ 23.00	YOY % ▲ 9.5%
\$275		23.00	9.5%
\$275		23.00	9.5%
	\$277		
	\$277		
¢640		34.00	14.0%
¢640			
\$649	\$655	47.00	7.7%
\$382	\$386	22.00	6.0%
\$649	\$655	47.00	7.7%
\$2,428	\$1,159	672.00	138.0%
\$4,625	\$2,236	1,265.00	130.3%
\$5,724	\$2,767		
\$3 103	\$1 87 <i>4</i>	661.00	54.5%
			64.3%
\$5,171	\$2,990	700.00	01.070
\$1,699	\$1,716		
\$2,491	\$2,516		
\$2,428	\$2,453	1,482.00	152.6%
\$3,527	\$3,563	1,623.00	83.7%
\$2 585	\$2,612	1 156 00	79.4%
			50.9%
			-4.1%
		` ′	9.5%
	\$117		-3.3%
\$253	\$255	12.00	4.9%
¢454	ф <b>4</b> Е0	(150.00)	24.70/
			-24.7% 34.8%
	\$2,428 \$4,625 \$5,724 \$3,103 \$4,137 \$5,171 \$1,699 \$2,491 \$2,428 \$3,527 \$2,585 \$3,620 \$231 \$263 \$116	\$649 \$655 \$2,428 \$1,159 \$4,625 \$2,236 \$5,724 \$2,767 \$3,103 \$1,874 \$4,137 \$2,392 \$5,171 \$2,990 \$1,699 \$1,716 \$2,491 \$2,516 \$2,428 \$2,453 \$3,527 \$3,563 \$3,527 \$3,563 \$2,585 \$2,612 \$3,620 \$3,656 \$231 \$233 \$263 \$266 \$116 \$117 \$253 \$255	\$649 \$655 47.00  \$2,428 \$1,159 672.00  \$4,625 \$2,236 1,265.00  \$5,724 \$2,767  \$3,103 \$1,874 661.00  \$4,137 \$2,392 936.00  \$5,171 \$2,990  \$1,699 \$1,716  \$2,491 \$2,516  \$2,428 \$2,453 1,482.00  \$3,527 \$3,563 1,623.00  \$3,620 \$3,656 1,233.00  \$231 \$233 (10.00)  \$263 \$266 23.00  \$116 \$117 (4.00)  \$253 \$255 12.00

\$1,335	\$2,248	\$2,271	936.00	70.1%
\$1,094	\$1,182	\$1,194	100.00	9.1%
\$487	\$649	\$655	168.00	34.5%
\$487	\$649	\$655	168.00	34.5%
\$1,094	\$1,572	\$1,588	494.00	45.2%
\$243	\$649	\$655	412.00	169.5%
\$121	\$382	\$386	265.00	219.0%
	0.52%	0.52%		
\$850	\$907	\$916	66.00	7.8%
\$487	\$506	\$511	24.00	4.9%
\$243	\$231	\$233	(10.00)	-4.1%
\$729	\$907	\$916	187.00	25.7%

FY 2023-24 Fee	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	YOY\$▲	YOY % 🛦
1 1 2025-24 1 66	<b>Total Cost</b>	Proposed Fee	1014	101 /0 2
<del>\$486</del>				
<del>\$729</del>				
\$1,094	\$1,182	\$1,194	100.00	9.1%
\$850	\$907	\$916	66.00	7.8%
\$850	\$907	\$916	66.00	7.8%
\$487	\$511	\$517	30.00	6.2%
ed on work item	\$255	\$266		
\$608	\$764	\$772	164.00	27.0%
\$243	\$267	\$269	26.00	10.7%
\$487	\$764	\$772	285.00	58.5%
\$243	\$267	\$269	26.00	10.7%
\$487	\$511	\$517	30.00	6.2%
\$729	\$770	\$778	49.00	6.7%
\$243	\$259	\$261	18.00	7.4%
\$243	\$263	\$266	23.00	9.5%

Ψ2-10	Ψ200	Ψ200	20.00	7.070
\$364	\$382	\$386	22.00	6.0%
\$487	\$649	\$655	168.00	34.5%
\$121	\$116	\$117	(4.00)	-3.3%
\$243	\$382	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$243	\$263	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$121	\$137	\$139	18.00	14.9%
\$121	\$137	\$139	18.00	14.9%
\$243	\$275	\$277	34.00	14.0%
\$486	\$549	\$555	69.00	14.2%
\$487	\$511	\$517	30.00	6.2%
\$121	\$129	\$131	10.00	8.3%
\$850	\$907	\$916	66.00	7.8%
\$487	\$517	\$522	35.00	7.2%
\$850	\$907	\$916	66.00	7.8%
\$487	\$511	\$517	30.00	6.2%
\$487	\$511	\$517	30.00	6.2%
\$1,094	\$1,166	\$1,178	84.00	7.7%

FY 2023-24 Fee	FY 2023-24 Total Cost	FY 2024-25 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY % ▲
<del>\$1,577</del>				
<del>\$2,066</del>				
2/sf, \$1,000 max	<del>.</del>			
<del>2/sf, \$20,000 min</del>	<del>;</del>			
\$40,000 max.				
<del>2/sf, \$35,000 mir</del>	<del>1;</del>			

<del>\$75,000 max.</del>				
\$243	\$263	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$243	\$263	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$243	\$263	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$243	\$263	\$266	23.00	9.5%
186 or 2 hr min.	\$256	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$243	\$256	\$266	23.00	9.5%
\$243	\$256	\$266	23.00	9.5%
186 or 2 hr min.	\$305	\$308	65.00	26.7%
¢121	¢120	¢121	10.00	0 20/
\$121 \$243	\$129 \$259	\$131 \$261	10.00	8.3% 7.4%
\$1,456	\$239	\$201	18.00	7.470
\$608	\$649	\$655	47.00	7.7%
\$243	\$267	\$269	26.00	10.7%
\$1,094	\$923	\$933		-14.7%
\$243	\$263	\$266	(161.00)	9.5%
\$243	φ203	\$200	23.00	9.5 /0
\$487	\$511	\$517	30.00	6.2%
\$487	\$511	\$517	30.00	6.2%
\$729	\$778	\$786	57.00	7.8%
\$243	\$259	\$261	18.00	7.4%
\$487	\$511	\$517	30.00	6.2%
\$121	\$259	\$261	140.00	115.7%
\$584	\$923	\$933	349.00	59.8%
\$584	\$923	\$933	349.00	59.8%
\$816	\$923	\$933	117.00	14.3%
\$350	\$396	\$400	50.00	14.3%
\$816	\$907	\$916	100.00	12.3%
<del>\$467</del>				

Т

Т

Т

Т

Т

FY 2023-24 Fee	Fac   FY 2023-24   FY 2024-25   V		YOY\$ ▲	YOY % 🛦
F Y 2023-24 Fee	<b>Total Cost</b>	Proposed Fee	1015	101 %
\$427	\$450	\$450	23.00	5.4%
	\$15	\$15		
\$608	\$1,000	\$1,000	392.00	64.5%
\$62	\$7	\$7	(55.00)	-88.7%
	\$5	\$5		
	\$450	\$450		
	\$15	\$15		
	\$1,000	\$1,000		
	\$7	\$7		
	\$5	\$5		
\$1,094	\$1,182	\$1,194	100.00	9.1%
\$729	\$792	\$800	71.00	9.7%
\$1,094	\$1,182	\$1,194	100.00	9.1%
\$729	\$792	\$800	71.00	9.7%
\$243	\$253	\$255	12.00	4.9%
\$243	\$275	\$277	34.00	14.0%
486 or 2 hr min.	\$321	\$325	82.00	33.7%
486 or 2 hr min.	\$275	\$277	34.00	14.0%
	1.5x Plan	1.5x Plan		
	Check Fee	Check Fee		
\$121	\$275	\$278	157.00	129.8%
<del>\$243</del>				
\$460	\$446	\$450	(10.00)	-2.2%

			· · · · · ·	
\$971	\$1,028	\$1,039	68.00	7.0%
\$971	\$1,028	\$1,039	68.00	7.0%
\$729	\$907	\$916	187.00	25.7%
\$364	\$2.26	\$2.29	(361.71)	-99.4%
\$2,308	\$2,491	\$2,516	208.00	9.0%
\$364	\$0.53	\$0.53	(363.47)	-99.9%
\$3,037	\$3,282	\$3,316	279.00	9.2%
\$364.00	\$0.26	\$0.27	(363.73)	-99.9%
\$26	\$25	\$25	(1.00)	-3.8%
\$26	\$25	\$25	(1.00)	-3.8%
\$608	\$633	\$639	31.00	5.1%
\$243	\$259	\$261	18.00	7.4%
\$1,094	\$1,182	\$1,194	100.00	9.1%
\$729	\$792	\$800	71.00	9.7%
\$1,577	\$1,715	\$1,733	156.00	9.9%
\$971	\$1,050	\$1,061	90.00	9.3%
\$1,821	\$1,974	\$1,994	173.00	9.5%
\$1,213	\$1,309	\$1,322	109.00	9.0%

Thanks, San Rao (writing on behalf of myself only, as a Cupertino resident)

On Thursday, June 26, 2025, 8:59 AM, Santosh Rao <santo\_a\_rao@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear City Clerk,

Would you please include the below in written communication for the upcoming city council meeting. Thank you.

[Writing on behalf of myself only, as a Cupertino resident.]

Dear Mayor Chao and Cupertino city council,

I wish to raise a strong objection and concern on the misleading staff report for

agenda item 13 on the 07/01/25 city council meeting.

The staff report states "**no new fees are proposed**" for many of the sections such as planning, building, engineering etc.

https://cupertino.legistar.com/View.ashx? M=F&ID=14319557&GUID=8497FFF7-2F5C-4F02-A965-F16FD3CBC240

To the casual reader this may appear as satisfactory. The staff report does not highlight that existing fees are rising 9.7% in most cases.

Please require that the staff report do a transparent disclosure of the fee increases in existing fees by department. Stating no new fees are proposed is misleading at best and deceptive to the casual reader frankly.

I am including the last column from the redline reports to show the % annual fee increases from each of the departments below.

I urge city council to please continue this item till a revised staff report is produced that does not mislead council and residents with irrelevant and misleading statements such as "no new fees are proposed" and instead lists the fee increases by department.

These fee increases are a result of the user cost recovery policy that was adopted in 2024 by then council.

These fee increases are due to rise in employee costs driven by healthcare and pensions. The increases are not one time. They will recur annually at or higher than the current increase. An increase of 9.7+% annually is unsustainable for residents.

- 1. I urge you to reject these fee increases, and instead agendaize an item to rollback the user cost recovery policy passed in 2024.
- 2. Please instead study alternate ways of covering employee costs without passing them directly onto residents.
- 3. Please ask for a like for like comparative fee schedule for the same items from neighboring cities such as Saratoga, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, San Jose. Not the like for like increases but actual and absolute fee comparison for each department and line item fees.

Please ask staff to explicitly identify where Cupertino absolute fees for line items are higher than neighboring cities (not picking the highest as the comparison).

- 4. Please explore ways to pass these costs onto other areas such as commercial or rentals or non-resident fees rather than directly onto residents.
- 5. Lastly if you are unwilling or unable to do any of the above please agendaize a study of the staffing currently in the city and take action to reduce full time

staffing and replace with contract roles to reduce the cost of pensions and healthcare on the city.

It is not sustainable to hike fees 9.7+% annually on residents. Please postpone approval on this item until the above actions are first taken. I will vote based on this issue in 2026 and I hear likewise from the residents I talk to. I fully expect residents will be kept informed of the council members that vote to increase fees on residents annually 9.7% or higher so that they can vote accordingly in 2026.

Thank you.

FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$ ▲	YOY % ▲
\$318	28.00	9.7%
Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate		
Staff Hourly Rate		
\$30,047	2,654.00	9.7%
\$51,639	4,561.00	9.7%
\$5,573	492.00	9.7%
\$11,761	1,039.00	9.7%
\$28,250	2,495.00	9.7%
\$43,109	3,808.00	9.7%
¢10 7/1/1	1 124 00	Q 7%

Ψ14,/ ττ	1,120.00	J.1 /0
\$27,500	2,429.00	9.7%
\$11,728	1,036.00	9.7%
\$18,299	1,616.00	9.7%
\$27,917	2,466.00	9.7%
\$4,414	390.00	9.7%
\$5,523	488.00	9.7%
\$6,745	596.00	9.7%
\$6,030	533.00	9.7%
\$4,992	441.00	9.7%
\$5,126	453.00	9.7%
\$5,686	502.00	9.7%
\$7,657	676.00	9.7%
\$8,579	758.00	9.7%
\$27,560	2,434.00	9.7%
\$26,287	2,322.00	9.7%
\$8,711	769.00	9.7%
\$9,961	880.00	9.7%
\$1,978	175.00	9.7%
\$2,747.00	243.00	9.7%
¢2.780.00	246.00	0.79/
\$2,780.00	246.00	9.7%

\$6,023.00	532.00	9.7%
\$10,475.00	925.00	9.7%
\$2,184.00	193.00	9.7%
\$9,627.00	850.00	9.7%
\$14,862.00	1,313.00	9.7%
\$21,451.00	1,895.00	9.7%

FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY % 🛦
\$667	\$58.88	9.7%
\$461	\$40.73	9.7%
\$1,172	\$103.48	9.7%
Double the permit cost		
\$2,432	\$214.83	9.7%
\$1,916	\$169.25	9.7%
\$3,895	\$344.03	9.7%
5% of Project Costs and/or \$282 per inspection	\$25.00	9.7%
\$579	\$51.18	9.7%
No Charge		
\$1,483	\$130.97	9.7%
Greater of \$5365 or 6% of	\$474.00	9.7%

cost of improvement		
\$9,195	\$812.21	9.7%
\$15,013	\$1,326.03	9.7%
\$1,428	\$126.15	9.7%
\$349	\$31.00	9.7%
\$349	\$31.00	9.7%
Greater of \$6203 or 5% of cost of improvement	\$548.00	9.7%
Greater of \$11768 or 5% of cost of improvement	\$1,039.00	9.7%
\$1,743	\$153.95	9.7%
\$208	\$18.40	9.7%
*Cost of review + City		
Administrative Fee		
#C07	\$61.57	9.7%
\$697		
\$3,863	\$341.18	9.7%
\$2,388	\$210.91	9.7%
\$2,388	\$210.91	9.7%
\$4,624	\$408.43	9.7%
ψ4,024	ψ100.40	<i>7.1</i> /0
\$6,797	\$0.00	0.0%
4.24	Φ0 00	0.00/

\$4,215	\$0.00	0.0%
\$10.94	\$0.00	0.0%
\$19.15	\$0.00	0.0%
\$3,728	\$0.00	0.0%
\$6,862	\$0.00	0.0%
\$16	\$0.00	0.0%
\$90	\$0.00	0.0%
\$349	\$30.83	9.7%

Y 2025-26 Proposed	YOY \$ A	YOY % 🛦	
Fee	1014	101 /6 🗷	
\$809	\$71.47	9.7%	
\$5,014	\$442.87	9.7%	
No Charge			
\$3,510	\$310.02	9.7%	
\$5,462	\$482.48	9.7%	
\$2,848	\$251.58	9.7%	
\$1,766	\$156.00	9.7%	
\$1,234	\$108.96	9.7%	
¢329	\$29 10	9 7%	

ψυΔι	Ψ=2.10	2.1 N
\$1,548	\$136.74	9.7%
\$1,260	\$111.33	9.7%
No Charge		
\$511	\$45.17	9.7%
\$4,669	-\$37.18	-0.8%
	<b>\$ 5 6 1 6</b>	0.00/
\$6,339	-\$50.48	-0.8%
\$4,548	-\$36.21	-0.8%
\$345	-\$2.74	-0.8%
\$12,246	-\$97.51	-0.8%
\$4,666	-\$37.16	-0.8%
\$2,357	-\$18.77	-0.8%
No charge		

\$42.00	9.7%
\$15.28	9.7%
\$30.55	9.7%
\$214.81	9.7%
\$28.20	9.7%
	\$15.28 \$30.55 \$214.81

FY 2025-26	YOY \$ A	YOY % 🛦
Prop. Fee		101 %

\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%

\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$430	38.00	9.7%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$573	51.00	9.8%
\$286	25.00	9.6%

\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$573	51.00	9.8%
\$286	25.00	9.6%

\$95	8.00	9.2%
\$10	1.00	11.1%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$10	1.00	11.1%
\$33	3.00	10.0%
\$48	4.00	9.1%
\$94	8.00	9.3%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$430	38.00	9.7%
\$95	8.00	9.2%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$430	38.00	9.7%
\$286	25.00	9.6%

2 6-2 2

\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$573	51.00	9.8%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$71	6.00	9.2%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$71	6.00	9.2%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$20	2.00	11.1%
\$29	3.00	11.5%
\$71	6.00	9.2%
\$215	19.00	9.7%
\$215	19 በበ	9 7%

ΨΔΙΟ	17.00	J.1 /0
\$95	8.00	9.2%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$71	6.00	9.2%
\$29	3.00	11.5%
\$19	2.00	11.8%
\$144	13.00	9.9%

FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY %
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$304	27.00	9.7%
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$423	37.00	9.6%
\$718	63.00	9.6%

\$2,029	870.00	75.1%
\$3,879	1,643.00	73.5%
\$4,343	1,576.00	57.0%
\$2,789	915.00	48.8%
\$3,665	1,273.00	53.2%
\$4,581	1,591.00	53.2%
\$1,882	166.00	9.7%
\$2,760	244.00	9.7%
\$2,691	238.00	9.7%
\$3,908	345.00	9.7%
\$2,865	253.00	9.7%
\$4,010	354.00	9.7%
\$256	23.00	9.9%
\$292	26.00	9.8%

\$128	11.00	9.4%
\$280	25.00	9.8%
\$502	44.00	9.6%
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$2,491	220.00	9.7%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$1,742	154.00	9.7%
\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$423	37.00	9.6%
0.52%		
\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
\$561	50.00	9.8%
\$256	23.00	9.9%
\$1,005	89.00	9.7%

\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$1,005	89.00	9.7%

	FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY %
5	\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
2	\$847	75.00	9.7%
)	\$295	26.00	9.7%
2	\$847	75.00	9.7%
)	\$295	26.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%
3	\$853	75.00	9.6%
1	\$286	25.00	9.6%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%

5	\$423	37.00	9.6%
5	\$718	63.00	9.6%
7	\$128	11.00	9.4%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
)	\$152	13.00	9.4%
)	\$152	13.00	9.4%
7	\$304	27.00	9.7%
5	\$609	54.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%
l	\$144	13.00	9.9%
5	\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
2	\$573	51.00	9.8%
5	\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%

P	roposed Fee	1015	<b>A</b>
	FY 2025-26	YOY\$▲	YOY %
1	\$286	25.00	9.6%
I	\$144	13.00	9.9%
3	\$338	30.00	9.7%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	2 26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
5	\$292	26.00	9.8%
٦			
3	\$1,292	2 114.00	9.7%
7	\$567	50.00	9.7%

\$718	63.00	9.6%
\$295	26.00	9.7%
\$1,023	90.00	9.6%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$862	76.00	9.7%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$1,023	90.00	9.6%
\$1,023	90.00	9.6%
\$1,023	90.00	9.6%
\$439	39.00	9.8%
\$1,005	89.00	9.7%

\$450	0.00	0.0%
\$15	0.00	0.0%
\$1,000	0.00	0.0%
\$7	0.00	0.0%
\$5	0.00	0.0%
\$450	0.00	0.0%
\$15	0.00	0.0%
\$1,000	0.00	0.0%
\$7	0.00	0.0%
\$5	0.00	0.0%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$878	78.00	9.8%
¢1 210	116 00	Q 7%

FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY %
\$494	44.00	9.8%
\$305	27.00	9.7%
Check Fee		
1.5x Plan		
\$304	27.00	9.7%
\$356	31.00	9.5%
\$304	27.00	9.7%
\$280	25.00	9.8%
\$878	78.00	9.8%
	110.00	9.7 /0

\$1,140	101.00	9.7%
\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
\$2.51	0.22	9.7%
\$2,760	244.00	9.7%
\$0.58	0.05	9.7%
\$3,637	321.00	9.7%
\$0.29	0.03	9.7%
\$27	2.00	8.0%
\$27	2.00	8.0%
\$701	62.00	9.7%
\$286	25.00	9.6%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$878	78.00	9.8%
\$1,901	168.00	9.7%
\$1,164	103.00	9.7%
\$2,187	193.00	9.7%

\$1,450	128.00	9.7%
\$1,901	168.00	9.7%
\$1,164	103.00	9.7%
\$2,187	193.00	9.7%
\$1,450	128.00	9.7%
\$292	26.00	9.8%
\$1,005	89.00	9.7%
\$701	62.00	9.7%
\$557	49.00	9.6%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$295	26.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%

\$136	12.00	9.7%
\$423	37.00	9.6%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$295	26.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$295	26.00	9.7%
FY 2025-26	VOV \$ A	YOY %
FY 2025-26 Proposed Fee	YOY\$▲	YOY %
	YOY\$	YOY %
	YOY \$ A	YOY %
	YOY \$	YOY %
	YOY \$ ▲ 63.00	YOY % ▲ 9.6%
Proposed Fee		<b>A</b>
Proposed Fee \$718	63.00	9.6%
\$718 \$144	63.00 13.00	9.6% 9.9%

\$557	49.00	9.6%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$1,310	116.00	9.7%
\$1,882	166.00	9.7%
\$439	39.00	9.8%
\$3,192	282.00	9.7%
\$878	78.00	9.8%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
5.8%		
\$862	76.00	9.7%
\$567	50.00	9.7%
\$415	37.00	9.8%
\$144	13.00	9.9%
\$355	31.00	9.6%
\$502	44.00	9.6%

\$502	44.00	9.6%

Thanks, San Rao (writing on behalf of myself only)

## CC 07-1-2025

Item No. 16

Study Session -Oversized Vehicle Parking

Written Communications

From: Peggy Griffin

To: <u>Liang Chao</u>; <u>Kitty Moore</u>; <u>Floy Andrews</u>

Cc: City Clerk; Kirsten Squarcia

Subject: 2025-07-01 City Council Meeting-ITEM 16 Study Session on Parking - NOTICING ISSUE

**Date:** Sunday, June 29, 2025 4:54:09 PM

Attachments: <u>image001.png</u>

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

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

Dear Mayor Chao, Vice Mayor Moore and City Attorney Floyd,

Please know that I am FOR the requirement to move a vehicle a noticeable distance after 72 hours. That said, I'm concerned with the wording of Agenda Item #16 because it implies that it will only impact oversized vehicles when in reality it has the potential of impacting ALL VEHICLES parked on public streets. "Section 11.24.130 Prohibited for More than Seventy-Two Hours" applies to all vehicles, even cars.

During the Planning Commission meeting on 6-24-2025 a man named "Gopal" wanted to speak about parking related to ADUs. Right now, there are many cases where only minimal if any parking is required for new developments. With people parking on the street and working from home, it is conceivable that they would park their cars for extended periods. To have an open discussion with input from people, they need to know that it could impact them too, even if they don't have an oversized vehicle.

Maybe the "Subject" can be modified someway?

Sincerely,

Peggy Griffin

#### STUDY SESSION

 Subject: Study Session regarding possible updates to oversized vehicle parking restrictions in the public right-of-way

Page 9

City Council Agenda July 1, 2025

Recommended Action: Recommend that the City Council consider the Planning Commission's recommendations to amend Sections 11.24.130 (72-hour parking limit), Section 11.24.200 (removal of vehicles), Section 11.28.010 (definition of oversized vehicles), and Section 11.28.020 (vehicle parking regulations) of the Municipal Code, to enhance the current prohibition on parking oversized vehicles for more than seventy-two (72) hours on any public street Staff Report

 From:
 Peggy Griffin

 To:
 City Council

 Cc:
 City Clerk

Subject: 2025-07-01 City Council Meeting-ITEM 16 Study Session on Parking - USE CASES TO CONSIDER

**Date:** Sunday, June 29, 2025 5:34:19 PM

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

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

Dear Mayor Chao, Vice Mayor Moore, City Councilmembers and Staff,

I will not be able to attend the study session so I'm providing my input in advance. I'm glad the city has decided to fix our parking regulations to close loopholes and make them enforceable yet not punish Cupertino residents or making it more difficult for them.

Just for disclosure purposes, my husband and I are long-time RV owners (20 years) and have rented them before owning so I have some insight on how/what a resident RV owner might need to do on a city street, especially in front of their home or while traveling visiting other cities.

I made a list of all the large vehicles I see around our neighborhood from time to time. Ideally, the proposed changes should cover these cases with the desired effect, whatever that be.

#### **TYPES OF VEHICLES AROUND TOWN**

- Plumbers, electricians, gardeners, construction and remodeling vehicles
- Delivery trucks (FedEx, Amazon, UPS, furniture/moving vans, 18-wheelers)
- Shuttle vans, Hopper vans, Apple vans
- RVs
- Long vans (over 20 ft) either a Class-B RV or a work van
- Long bed pickup trucks
- Buses
- Boat trailers
- Trailers

#### **USE CASES – SITUATIONS TO CONSIDER WHERE RVs FOLLOW EXISTING RULES**

Some situations where a resident of Cupertino would need to park their RV or boat or trailer for more than 2 hours on a city street (in front or near their house):

Preparing to leave early the next day – Often they connect the car they will be towing

- behind the RV the night before and have the RV plus car parked in front of their house ready to go in the early morning.
- An RV is stored elsewhere and is brought from storage to the home to load up. It often takes all day/multiple days to load up and prep the RV. The RV probably then stays in front overnight for an early start the next day. Usually, we store RVs empty.
- The RV is stored in the backyard but needs to be moved so workers can have access, room or prevent damage. This isn't always planned. It can happen on the weekend. It can happen when workers from your neighbor's house need you to move it.
- RV is rented for a family vacation loading an empty RV can take at least a day. Often they wait until the next morning to leave.
- Family or friends who are traveling in an RV come to visit.
- The resident has a business and does not have room to park the vehicle.
  - This gets dicey considering that now days developers are not providing adequate parking.
  - Some newer developments are shortening the length of parking spaces from 20 ft to 18 ft which don't allow some trucks or vans to be parked on-site in a parking space.

#### USES CASES – SITUATIONS TO CONSIDER THAT ARE AN ISSUE

- A owner of an oversized vehicle such as an RV parks on the street for more than 72 hours in the same location without moving it whether they are a resident or not.
- A car owner that parks their car on the street in the same location for more than 72 hours without moving it—whether they are a resident or not.
- Huge commuter buses parked on the east side of Bandley between Stevens Creek Blvd and Alves parked for hours. It's dangerous because cars coming out of the Marina parking lot cannot see around them and the cars turning onto Bandley from Stevens Creek cannot see the cars coming out of the driveways.
- Large number of oversized vehicles congregating in one area over an extended period of time, beyond 72 hours without moving.

#### IMPORTANT NOTES ON REVOKING ACCESS

- If you choose the issuance of permits, the <u>city can always revoke a permit if the rules are</u> not followed.
- If you choose to enter vehicles in some type of database, the <u>vehicle can be flagged as</u> <u>not following the regulations</u> and therefore equivalent to revoking its ability to park on the street.

I've heard comments like "Well, we only enforce our laws if there is a complaint." Implying that it's okay to disobey our laws so long as nobody reports you! This attitude leads to people not obeying other laws and the problem grows.

#### **REQUEST:**

When you look at changing the city's vehicle parking ordinances, please keep these in mind and make sure the desired outcome is obtained for these various situations without punishing Cupertino residents who follow our laws. Please <u>make the resulting vehicle parking ordinances fit reality. When laws don't make sense, people ignore them.</u>

Sincerely,

Peggy Griffin

From: <u>Yvonne Strom</u>
To: <u>City Council</u>

Cc: <u>City Clerk; Cupertino City Manager"s Office</u>

**Subject:** Comment on possible updates to oversized vehicle parking restrictions (item 16)

**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 2:06:24 PM

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

Esteemed members of the Cupertino City Council,

I am writing about the July 1 Study Session (item 16) involving possible updates to oversized vehicle parking restrictions. The Cupertino planning commission has recommended a permit system but the plan is unwieldy for law enforcement, ineffective, and a burden for Cupertino residents.

The permit plan for RVs will not work because more and more people have found no other option for affordable housing. How will enforcement be better with an expensive permit plan? People still need a place to sleep at night.

Instead of a permit system I suggest that more research is needed. For example, what are the best practices for smaller cities to manage the unhoused? Could RV parking only be restricted in certain over-utilized areas, like where the most complaints arise?

For example, the Rotating Safe Car Park offers overnight parking in church parking lots for people sleeping in their cars. There have been zero complaints from neighbors over the last eight years because the location changes every month. The impact is spread out.

There is so much cruelty in the world right now. Let's work to find a non-punitive solution that will work for everyone.

In community,

Yvonne Thorstenson Cupertino resident and RSCP volunteer From: Deborah
To: City Clerk

**Subject:** July 1, 2025 City Council Agenda; Item #16, 25-14050

**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 11:27:58 AM

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

Hello Mayor, Vice-Mayor, and Council Members, Thank you for reviewing the CMC regarding oversized vehicles in the City.

I know that in other cities, it appears they have designated areas that these vehicles can park, but they are highly industrialized. Our local businesses have some issues with trailer homes being parked near their entrances as it deters customers from entering or using the business. I am not sure what new rules would prevent this.

Nominally, near some of our hotels some have parked for the regulated amount of time (I believe it's still 72 hours before they have to move) but you can see how this would hurt hotel business particularly when they have not quite recovered from the effects of the pandemic similar to a lot of our small businesses.

I ask that the business community be considered when making changes to these regulations as it will affect the health of our economy and therefore revenue to the City.

Thank you for your consideration., Deb

Deborah L. Feng, MBA CEO O. 408 2527054 ext.101 Deb@cupertino-chamber.org www.cupertino-chamber.org From: <u>Liang Chao</u>
To: <u>City Clerk</u>

**Subject:** Oversized vehicle parking ordinance from other cities

**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2025 1:45:03 PM

Please add this to the written communication of the 7/1 Council meeting.

The enclosed email thread includes the original agenda request, which contains the information on similar ordinances on parking in other cities.



From: Liang Chao <LChao@cupertino.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 11:15 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.gov>

Subject: Fw: Agenda Item Request: Minor Modification to Muni Code for Parking

Please add this to the written communication for Item 14 TBD list to provide context of the agenda request.



From: Liang Chao <LChao@cupertino.gov> Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 10:34 PM

**To:** Floy Andrews <fandrews@awattorneys.com>; Pamela Wu <PamelaW@cupertino.gov>; Valenzuela, Neil <Neil.Valenzuela@shf.sccgov.org>

**Cc:** Tina Kapoor <TinaK@cupertino.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.gov>; Kitty Moore <KMoore@cupertino.gov>

**Subject:** Re: Agenda Item Request: Minor Modification to Muni Code for Parking

Adding Vice Mayor, with whom I have discussed some of this.

I looked into the Muni Code for 72-hour parking restriction in Saratoga and Los Altos, who are also under the same Sheriff's Office:

- Los Altos's version: "For the purposes of this section, a vehicle or trailer shall be considered to have been parked or left standing for seventy-two (72) or more consecutive hours if it has not been moved at least one thousand (1,000) feet during such seventy-two (72) hour period."
- Saratoga's version: "A vehicle shall be considered to have been parked or left standing for seventy-two or more consecutive hours if it has remained inoperable or has not been moved and remained at least one mile from its original parked location for at least twenty-four hours during the seventy-two-hour period."

I found Fremont's version is similar to Mountain View's version:

- Fremont's version: "any vehicle that has been parked in the same location for 72 hours move at least 1,000 feet from its current location and may not return to the same parking spot for at least 24 hours" (adopted Nov. 2024)
- Fremont on restriction near residential streets: "Additionally, oversized vehicles, including any attached trailers, vehicles, or loads which exceed 22 feet in length, and/or 6 feet in width and 7 feet in height, are no longer allowed to park on any public street within 100 feet of a residential property line. The ordinance allows for limited exemptions of loading/unloading, emergency vehicles and commercial deliveries. If the oversized vehicle is not moved within 24 hours after receiving a warning notice, the vehicle could receive a citation and will be at risk for getting towed. " (adopted Nov. 2024)

I realize that restrictions on oversized vehicles are more complicated since we need to consider exemptions to allow construction vehicles etc and we need to define oversized vehicles. So, in the first version, I would just consider the minor modification on parking violation, which would not require a study session.

For restrictions on oversized vehicles, we would likely need a study session first to get public and council input, which could be considered as a part of the FY 2025-27 Work Program.

========

#### Los Altos Muni Code

https://library.municode.com/ca/los\_altos/codes/code\_of\_ordinances? nodeld=TIT8VETR\_CH8.20STSTPA

#### 8.20.090 - Parking for more than 72 hours.

No person who owns or has possession, custody, or control of any vehicle or trailer shall park such vehicle or trailer upon any street, alley, or public place continuously for more than a consecutive period of seventy-two (72) hours. For the purposes of this section, a vehicle or trailer shall be considered to have been parked or left standing for seventy-two (72) or more consecutive hours if it has not been moved at least one thousand (1,000) feet during such seventy-two (72) hour period.

(Prior code § 3-2.913)

#### 8.20.100 - Removal of vehicles parked more than 72 hours.

Any regularly employed and salaried officer of the police department may remove, or cause to be removed, any vehicle which has been parked or left standing upon a street, highway, or public parking lot for seventy-two (72) or more consecutive hours. (Prior code § 3-2.914)

#### Saratoga Muni Code

https://library.municode.com/ca/saratoga/codes/code of ordinances? nodeld=CH9MOVETR ART9-25PAREAPALHI

#### 9-25.030 - Parking of certain oversize vehicles on residential streets.

- (a) No person who owns or has possession, custody or control of any commercial vehicle recreational vehicle, boat or trailer, shall park or leave standing such vehicle upon any street in a residential district or abutting any property or area within a residential district for a period of seventy-two consecutive hours or more. A vehicle shall be considered to have been parked or left standing for seventy-two or more consecutive hours if it has remained inoperable or has not been moved and **remained at least one mile from its original parked location for at least twenty-four hours during the seventy-two-hour period.**
- (b) Unattached boats and trailers shall not park or stand upon any public street.
- (c) For the purposes of this section:
  - (1) Trailer means a vehicle, other than a motor vehicle, designed for industrial, professional, or commercial purposes, for carrying property on its own structure, and for being drawn by a motor vehicle.
  - (2) Commercial vehicle shall have the meaning set forth in section 9-10.040;
  - (3) Recreational vehicle means any vehicle used for recreation and designed for human habitation for recreational, emergency, or other occupancy, and not including passenger vehicles.

(Ord. No. 394, § 1(Att. A), 12-7-2022)

#### 9-25.040 - Application of other laws.

The provisions of this Article are in addition to other parking regulations which are or may be imposed by the laws of the State and the provisions of this Code and shall not relieve any person from the duty to observe other and more restrictive provisions of the Vehicle Code or this Code.

#### 9-25.050 - Enforcement of Article.

It shall be the duty of all policemen and Community Service Officers appointed for such purpose and all deputies of the County Sheriff performing police services in the City to enforce the regulations set forth in this Article.



From: Liang Chao <LChao@cupertino.gov> Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2025 1:37 PM

**To:** Floy Andrews <fandrews@awattorneys.com>; Pamela Wu <PamelaW@cupertino.gov>;

Valenzuela, Neil < Neil. Valenzuela@shf.sccgov.org>

**Cc:** Tina Kapoor <TinaK@cupertino.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.gov> **Subject:** Re: Agenda Item Request: Minor Modification to Muni Code for Parking

Adding Captain Neil.

Captain,

What do you think about a potential change in parking regulation to require a vehicle to move by 1000 feet after 72 hours? And not return to the same spot within. 24 hours.

This mirrors the regulation in Mountain View.

In terms of implementation, I suppose that this would be complaints based like other Muni code enforcement. So, there is no need to track every parked vehicle. Only a few ones where a complaint is submitted for violating this code.

Thank you.

Liang



**From:** Floy Andrews <fandrews@awattorneys.com>

**Sent:** Saturday, March 22, 2025 1:26 PM

**To:** Liang Chao <LChao@cupertino.gov>; Pamela Wu <PamelaW@cupertino.gov> **Cc:** Tina Kapoor <TinaK@cupertino.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.gov> **Subject:** RE: Agenda Item Request: Minor Modification to Muni Code for Parking

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

Thank you for this information, Mayor. I appreciate the research!

From a legal perspective, I believe an updated like this could be implemented in short order.

Curious whether we would need to loop in the County Sheriff's department? I assume the County Sheriff is the entity that enforces the parking ordinance. I think we should take a quick look at whatever MOU or other agreement the City has with the County.

I would be inclined to mirror Mountain View's version. I like its simplicity.

Best, Floy

From: Liang Chao <LChao@cupertino.gov> Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2025 7:34 PM

To: Pamela Wu <PamelaW@cupertino.gov>; Floy Andrews <fandrews@awattorneys.com>

**Cc:** Tina Kapoor <TinaK@cupertino.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@cupertino.gov> **Subject:** Agenda Item Request: Minor Modification to Muni Code for Parking

#### \*\*\* EXTERNAL SENDER \*\*\*

I learned that the cities around us have revised their Muni Code to address the issue of RV parking and we are lacking behind.

I would like to propose a minor modification to the Muni Code for parking to address the issue that a vehicle could occupy the same section of a public street 24x7 as long as they move the vehicle by 6 inches. This is against the original intent of the Muni Code 11.24.130.

I have included relevant Muni Code sections from Mountain VIew and Sunnyvale, in addition to Cupertino's Muni Code below.

We could consider the two options:

- Mountain View's version: Any vehicle must be moved at least one thousand (1000) feet (approximately two-tenths (2/10) of a mile) from its current location and may not return to the same parking spot for at least twenty-four (24) hours after its departure.
- Sunnyvale's version: Pushing or moving a vehicle a short distance will not be
  considered compliance with this section. Additionally, successive acts of parking
  shall be presumed to be a single act of parking within the meaning of this section
  when the vehicle is moved merely for the purpose of avoiding the parking
  limitations prescribed by this section.

I hope that such minor modification could be considered in a timely manner.

Liang				
=====	:====	:==		

Thank you.

Current Cupertino Muni Code

#### 11.24.130 Prohibited for More than Seventy-Two Hours.

No person who owns or has in his possession, custody, or control any vehicle or trailer shall park such vehicle or trailer upon any public street or alley for more than a consecutive period of seventy-two hours.

(Ord. 843, § 6, 1977)

Mountain View Muni Code:

SEC. 19.72. - Seventy-Two (72) hour parking limit—Twenty-Four (24) hour no return.

- Any vehicle that has been parked or left standing in the same location or parking spot for seventy-two (72) consecutive hours **must be moved at least one thousand (1000)** feet (approximately two-tenths (2/10) of a mile) from its current location and may not return to the same parking spot for at least twenty-four (24) hours after its departure.

#### Sunnyvale Muni Code

#### § 10.16.120

#### Use of streets or public parking facilities for storage of vehicles prohibited.

It is unlawful for any person who owns or has possession, custody or control of any vehicle, including a boat or trailer, to park or leave such vehicle upon any street, alley, or public parking facility for a period of seventy-two consecutive hours or more. The intent of this section is to limit parking of vehicles, boats and trailers to seventy-two consecutive hours. A vehicle or trailer shall be considered to have been parked or left standing for seventy-two or more consecutive hours if it has remained inoperable or has not been moved. An inoperable vehicle is a vehicle that cannot be moved under its own power or a vehicle which cannot operate legally and safely on the highways of the state.

Pushing or moving a vehicle a short distance or attempting to rub away the tire marking will not be considered compliance with this section. Additionally, successive acts of parking shall be presumed to be a single act of parking within the meaning of this section when the vehicle is moved merely for the purpose of avoiding the parking limitations prescribed by this section.

(Ord. 2435-93 § 1; Ord. 2633-00 § 1; Ord. 2925-10 § 1)



From: Liang Chao < LChao@cupertino.gov > Sent: Friday, January 24, 2025 8:05 PM

**To:** Pamela Wu < <u>Pamela W@cupertino.gov</u>>; Tom Chin < <u>Tom C@cupertino.gov</u>> **Cc:** Tina Kapoor < <u>Tina K@cupertino.gov</u>>; Serena Tu < <u>Serena T@cupertino.gov</u>>

**Subject:** Re: RV parking resources

Yes. Please direct me to county resources.

Below is a question on city code enforcement:

"California Vehicle Code (CVC) 22651(k) and Cupertino Municipal Code (CMC) 11.24.130 state that vehicles cannot be parked in the same spot on a public street for more than 72 hours. "
But they can move by 6 inches every day and still park in generally the same space?
Or they have to move by at least the length of the vehicle so that the same "space" is not occupied by the same vehicle?"

Thanks. Appreciate your attention on this issue of high interest from the community.

#### Liang

	Liang Chao				
2	Mayor				
	City Council				
	LChao@cupertino.gov				
	408-777-3192				

From: Pamela Wu < Pamela W@cupertino.gov >

**Sent:** Friday, January 24, 2025 5:58 PM

**To:** Liang Chao < LChao@cupertino.gov >; Tom Chin < TomC@cupertino.gov > **Cc:** Tina Kapoor < TinaK@cupertino.gov >; Serena Tu < SerenaT@cupertino.gov >

**Subject:** RE: RV parking resources

Mayor Chao, we can assist in directing your questions to the County planning office.

Please advice,

#### Pamela



From: Liang Chao < LChao@cupertino.gov > Sent: Friday, January 24, 2025 10:04 AM
To: Tom Chin < TomC@cupertino.gov >

**Cc:** Pamela Wu < <u>Pamela W@cupertino.gov</u>>; Tina Kapoor < <u>Tina K@cupertino.gov</u>>; Serena Tu

<<u>SerenaT@cupertino.gov</u>>

**Subject:** Re: RV parking resources

Where are legal RV parking places within Santa Clara County? Other RV parking resources?

Has the Santa Clara County adopted any RV ordinance? Or surrounding cities, like Sunnyvale? (in case the information is readily available to staff)

If we do not wish RVs to occupy our streets, I hope to know where they can park legally with and without RV facilities.

"California Vehicle Code (CVC) 22651(k) and Cupertino Municipal Code (CMC) 11.24.130 state that vehicles cannot be parked in the same spot on a public street for more than 72 hours."

But they can move by 6 inches every day and still park in generally the same space? Or they have to move by at least the length of the vehicle so that the same "space" is not occupied by the same vehicle?

Thanks for the information,

#### Liang



From: Tom Chin < TomC@cupertino.gov > Sent: Monday, January 20, 2025 8:52 AM
To: Liang Chao < LChao@cupertino.gov >

Cc: Pamela Wu < Pamela W@cupertino.gov >; Tina Kapoor < TinaK@cupertino.gov >; Serena Tu

<<u>SerenaT@cupertino.gov</u>>

**Subject:** Re: RV parking resources

#### Good morning Mayor Chao,

I have provided answers to your questions regarding RVs below:

Mary Avenue is not specifically designated for RV Parking.

The Rotating Safe Car Park (RSCP) program cannot accommodate RVs at this time. The RSCP provides parking spaces for passenger vehicles on private property. The risk of an RV breaking down or discharging grey or black water is very high. The private property owners are not likely to accept the risk.

California Vehicle Code (CVC) 22651(k) and Cupertino Municipal Code (CMC) 11.24.130 state that vehicles cannot be parked in the same spot on a public street for more than 72 hours. CVC 22651 (k) and CMC 11.24.130 aim to prevent abandoned vehicles from being stored on the street. Neither the CVC nor the CMC specifically prevents RVs from parking on public streets, and unless posted otherwise, all legally parked vehicles can be on public streets. Neither the CVC nor the CMC specify the distance a vehicle must travel to have been considered "moved."

While mostly complaint-based, Code Enforcement regularly patrols areas of the city known to have RVs parked to enforce the 72-hour and street sweeping rules. Of all the parking citations issued by Code Enforcement, violations for CVC 22651 (k) and street sweeping are the most common. In FY 24, approximately 280 citations or warnings were issued.

Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Thank you, Tom



From: Liang Chao < LChao@cupertino.gov > Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 11:10 AM
To: Pamela Wu < Pamela W@cupertino.gov > Cc: Tom Chin < TomC@cupertino.gov >

cc. Tom chin \<u>Tomc@capertino.gov</u>

**Subject:** RV parking resources

Given the high interest in RV Parking issue right now, I hope to understand what

resources there are for RV parking in Cupertino and surrounding areas or the County.

I heard that Mary Ave is a designated RV parking site?

Does the rotating Safe Parking program accommodate RVs?

I think it's important to reasonably accommodate RV parking to support RV dwellers. But they do not have the right to occupy the public street 24-7 as their own private parking space.

Thus, I'd like to know what's the practice in terms of issuing fines when muni codes for street parking or street cleaning are violated.

Thanks,





From: Santosh Rao

To: <u>City Council</u>; <u>City Clerk</u>

**Subject:** Written communications on oversized vehicle parking ordinance from PC 06/24/25 meeting.

**Date:** Monday, June 30, 2025 10:08:14 AM

Attachments: Written Communications (Updated 6252025).pdf

#### Dear City Clerk,

Would you please include the below in written communication for agenda item 16 for the 07/01/25 CC meeting.

Dead Mayor Chao and Council members,

Please find enclosed and linked below the written communications from the 06/24/25 PC meeting on oversized vehicle parking ordinance which you may find to be relevant for agenda item 16 for the 07/01/25 CC meeting.

https://cupertino.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=E2&ID=1249178&GUID=D0BBFCF1-A632-4D95-8F58-BC940409EBBB

Thank you.



# PC 6-24-2025

# Oral Communications

# Written Communications

From: E. Poon

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>

Cc:Jennifer Griffin; Rhoda FrySubject:Staples site to be developedDate:Tuesday, June 10, 2025 6:15:30 PM

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

Many people would find it helpful to know that they can return packages at Staples. Whole Foods Market is commonly known as a location for returns, but Staples is not.

It would be useful to have Staples eventually take up a location somewhere else in Cupertino, with a smaller footprint.

We just heard that in San Francisco, Nordstrom is returning with a smaller store. Staples could survive well and help the community by planning along the same lines.

The future of retail in Cupertino is really in jeopardy. More ideas are needed, or it will become a Retail desert.

Eventually, the sea of townhouses will not be attractive, as there are not enough essential stores for residents.

In the lot, there is the Fontana Restaurant. I have always wondered why a lovely building like that is vacant. What was the history? It is one of the more interesting- looking buildings around here. It is a pity to have it demolished. Is is really a relatively new building? Why do we waste a nice looking building?

I heard the idea to preserve it as a Club House for the new townhome development. It is a brilliant idea. The developer might object to "losing" land, which might be part of the townhouse development, but they can be creative about land use and make up for it.

For example, they can consider an architectural style called the BackSplit, which is essentially a stacked duplex (5 levels with 2 levels for the top unit, 3 levels for the bottom unit) which has a low elevation that looks like a two story high building from the street. It is found in Toronto, Canada, in some neighborhoods. It uses the tri-level concept to stack 5 stories and still maintain a low profile. Such an efficient use of land as the Toronto BackSplit will allow the developer to keep the Fontana Restaurant as the Club House. This distinctive looking building will elevate the style of the entire complex.

We hope the developer will be open to new ideas.

Regards, Emily Poon Resident of 18 years From: <u>Vivek Sagdeo</u>

To: sherman.wang@gmail.com; stephanieyang2010@gmail.com; 12bellabarb@gmail.com; Luke Connolly; Emi

Sugiyama; Rajiv Chamraj; City of Cupertino Planning Commission; Liang Chao

**Subject:** Followup on the public hearing on 20840 Stevens creek

**Date:** Tuesday, June 10, 2025 8:20:19 PM

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

#### Hello,

It was quite illuminating to attend the hearing.

As a block leader, I would like to request a hearing with the Scofield block, which is affected by this project. We had vigorous activity related to Scofield MFU. We had no activity at all for this and let us discuss this before approving.

Mayor, since architectural committee did not wait to hear our feedback, hope that you will be able to discuss it with us before approval.

#### Vivek

Vivek Sagdeo block leader 20821 Scofield From: Susanne Chang

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission; Santosh Rao; Liang Chao</u>

Subject:Cupertino Memorial Park - Pickleball NoiseDate:Thursday, June 12, 2025 6:16:39 AM

Attachments: Pickleball Noise at Cupertino Memorial Park.pdf

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

To: Cupertino City Council and Planning Committee Members Subject: Cupertino Memorial Park Pickleball Noise Issue

From: David and Susanne Chang

21143 Christensen Dr, Cupertino, CA 95014

Date: June 12, 2025

Dear Cupertino City Council and Planning Committee Members:

We raised the pickleball noise issues to Cupertino City Council and Planning Committee Members on August 14, 2023 and again January 10, 2025, yet there are no resolutions or improvements made to the issues, Instead, the city has allowed the problem to be further aggravated with no visible progress to alleviate: one more tennis court has been converted into 4 pickleball courts making a total of 8 courts allowing 32 people playing as well as spectators are present. Pickleball games tend to be much louder with players yelling and jeering during the game and certainly afterwards. This has brought even more noise and traffic onto Christensen Drive. Players park cars on the street, ignoring the "Permit Parking" and "No Parking Any Time" signs. Pickup, dropoff, and food delivery cars are constantly circling our formerly quiet street with children - including our grandchildren - playing, and cars speed off recklessly.

The Cupertino Pickleball Club has grown to 1,000+ members, majority of the players are non-Cupertino residents who do not pay property tax to support Cupertino City matters. Players start playing early in the morning once daylight breaks until the lights turn off at 9:09pm.

This pickleball noise is in violation of the City of Cupertino's own Municipal Code Chapter 10.48 Community Noise Control, where this sustained level of noise is exceeding the daytime residential and non-residential maximum noise levels of 60dBA. When the hard surface of the pickleball racket connects with the hard surface of the ball, sound waves vibrate rapidly, registering a decibel level of ~70 dBA at 100 feet from the court. Consider how much noise is generated when 32 people are playing at the same time.

Our past and current feedback and complaints from the Memorial Park pickleball courts have yet to be addressed; instead, our physical home, mental health, and general well being as Cupertino residents of over four decades continue to be exacerbated. We request that Cupertino City to set an ordinance in regulating the players using the USA Pickleball quiet category-compliant paddle sanctioned for recreational use, proven to reduce noise by 50 percent. Also to set the starting time at 9am to reduce early morning noise.

Appreciate your response with proposed resolutions; other residents are also sharing similar concerns so we'd like to resolve this respectfully and cooperatively.

Thanks
Susanne and David Chang

From: valerie < vjmc1124@gmail.com > Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2025 7:11 PM

**To:** City Council < citycouncil@cupertino.gov >; City Clerk < cityclerk@cupertino.gov >;

planningcommissions@cupertino.org

Subject: CEQA and traffic impact for McClellan Rd SB 330 project

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

Dear City Clerk,

I understand this is a bit late for today's meeting at 6:45. But please include the below request in written communication for the ongoing meeting now.

Dear Mayor Chao and City Council Members,

As a long time Cupertino resident near McClellan Rd SB 330 project, I believe the proposed 27 unit townhomes is not a safe dwelling design for the current neighbors and the future residents.

Please conduct a full CEQA analysis and traffic impact study for the McClellan Rd SB 330 project, and share the results with the community.

Thank you very much for your attention.

νj

From: Gill Doyle < <a href="mailto:outerdog@gmail.com">outerdog@gmail.com</a>>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 1:34 PM

**To:** Santosh Rao <<u>srao@cupertino.gov</u>>; Tracy Kosolcharoen

- <<u>Tkosolcharoen@cupertino.gov</u>>; David Fung <<u>dfung@cupertino.gov</u>>; Seema Lindskog
- <slindskog@cupertino.gov>; Steven Scharf@cupertino.gov>; Luke Connolly
- <<u>LukeC@cupertino.gov</u>>; Piu Ghosh (she/her) <<u>PiuG@cupertino.gov</u>>; Emi Sugiyama
- <<u>EmiS@cupertino.gov</u>>; Ravi Kumar <<u>ravi4biz@gmail.com</u>>; Karsten Chin
- <<u>edmk6@aol.com</u>>; Denise <<u>denise\_menon@yahoo.com</u>>; Sarah McLaren
- <<u>Sarahkmclaren@gmail.com</u>>; Veronica Law <<u>veronica.law@gmail.com</u>>; Cathy Tang
- <<u>cathyktang@yahoo.com</u>>; Jinn Su <<u>jinnsu@yahoo.com</u>>; Natalie Zhu
- <<u>vzhu.natalie@gmail.com</u>>; Howard & Janet <<u>janhowhill@mac.com</u>>; Dean Tatsuno
- <a href="mailto:chenglei.liusjsu@gmail.com">chenglei.liusjsu@gmail.com</a>; C F
- <<u>carlf9121@yahoo.com</u>>; Frank's friend <<u>Liuziqivivia@gmail.com</u>>; Grace Hsue
- <grace hsue@yahoo.com>; Sean Leu <seanleu@yahoo.com>; Bindeeya Desai
- <<u>bindeeya@comcast.net</u>>; Chen Yu Lee <<u>chenyulee260@gmail.com</u>>; William H. Kerr
- <<u>WHKerr@comcast.net</u>>; James Wang <<u>jameswang95014@yahoo.com</u>>; Ashok Natesan
- <ashok.natesan@gmail.com>; Huafei Wang < huafeiwang 1991@gmail.com>; Rahul
- Shinkre < <a href="mailto:shinkre@yahoo.com">shinkre@yahoo.com</a>; Chinh < <a href="mailto:chinhster@gmail.com">chinhster@gmail.com</a>; Meena & Pinaki Mukerji
- <mpinaki@gmail.com>; Vic Menon <victor.menon@gmail.com>

Subject: Tessellations shuttle solution

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

I live near the school and represent 29 households that have signed a petition that asks the City to deny Tessellations' request for permission to operate a high school at the old Regnart Elementary site.

In December 2023 Tessellations was granted a Conditional Use Permit that allowed it to teach preK through 9. Tessellations promised to move grade 9 to a separate campus in the fall of 2025. Quoting Tessellations: "Note... that high school will only be 9th grade on the current campus, and only for one year. In future years, we plan to move the high school to another site, so from then onward the current campus will be PK-8th." ["Tessellations Project Description for Cupertino Planning Division" (November 2023)] Tessellations got permission to teach a maximum of 300 students at the Regnart site and told the City

Council that it wasn't interested in adding more students. Again quoting Tessellations: "In terms of our philosophy on the school, we don't really want any more than 300 students just for our emotional safety and comfort . . . There's social evidence that that's a really great number to stay at in terms of the population knowing each other." [Co-founder Grace Stanat at City Council meeting 12/5/23] Tessellations is applying now for a revised Conditional Use Permit that would allow it to grow to 425 students. It's asking for permission to add grades 10, 11, and 12. Despite these plans to grow the school, Tessellations says that it will keep its staff at its current max of 85.

When Tessellations opened in 2023 it had 141 students. Today it has 268 students and plans to grow to 425. There are traffic and parking problems today that will only get worse when another 125 cars are added to the morning drop off and afternoon pick up. Remember: Tessellations is not a neighborhood school. Nearly all of its students come from outside the area and must be driven to school or will drive themselves.

Before the City considers allowing the school to expand, residents around the school would like to see the City and school address existing traffic and parking problems.

Tessellations itself has come up with a great idea that it should be encouraged to pursue. The school has talked about having parents drop off and pick up their kids at an improvised shuttle station — New Life Church, for instance. The school would then shuttle the children in its minivans between this shuttle station and the Regnart campus. The residents near the school like this idea and hope that the City will encourage Tessellations to pursue it.

Tessellations' application for a revised CUP requires that a traffic study be done. When that happens in the fall, Tessellations' shuttle program should be considered as one very good option to fixing both traffic and parking problems at the school. (The current CUP includes a provision that requires Tessellations to implement a shuttle service in the event that the City's Director of Community Development deems parking around the school to be a nuisance.)

- Gill Doyle (7952 Folkestone Drive)

## PC 6-24-2025

Item No.2 Oversized Vehicle Oridinance

Written

Communications

From: Ravi Kiran Singh Sapaharam

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>

Subject: Support for RV Rental Ban Policy in Cupertino

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:30:00 AM

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

#### Dear Cupertino Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my support for a policy in Cupertino similar to San Jose's recent ban on renting RVs to unhoused residents for use as homes, as outlined in the San José Spotlight article (<a href="https://sanjosespotlight.com/sanjose-bans-homeless-people-renting-rvs/">https://sanjosespotlight.com/sanjose-bans-homeless-people-renting-rvs/</a>).

I believe this policy is necessary to address the challenges posed by "vanlording," where individuals rent out often inoperable RVs to unhoused people, leading to unsafe and unsanitary conditions on public streets and private properties. This practice burdens businesses, property owners, and residents while exploiting vulnerable individuals. A clear policy would enable Cupertino to maintain community safety and cleanliness, similar to San Jose's approach.

However, I strongly urge the city to pair this policy with compassionate solutions for unhoused residents. Cupertino should expand safe parking programs with adequate sanitation and support services or partner with Santa Clara County to provide housing resources. Without these alternatives, we risk displacing people without viable options.

Thank you for considering my input.

Sincerely,

Ravi Kiran Singh

Cupertino Resident

From: Peggy Griffin

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>

Cc: <u>City Clerk</u>

Subject: 2025-06-24 Planning Commission Mtg ITEM2 - Vehicle Parking Ordinance QUESTIONS

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 4:48:50 PM

Attachments: <u>image002.pnq</u>

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

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

Dear Planning Commission and Staff,

Just for disclosure purposes, my husband and I are long-time RV owners (20 years) and have rented them before owning so I have some insight on how/what a resident RV owner might need to do on a city street, especially in front of their home or while traveling visiting other cities.

Thank you for providing additional information and data regarding the RV parking situation. It is very informative and eye opening, especially having examples of how our existing laws are rendered ineffective by the actions of some RV owners.

I have several questions regarding the STAFF REPORT:

Q1...It's proposed to add a definition of "oversized vehicles" in Muni Code Section 11.28.010.

Q1: What would the definition of "oversized vehicle" look like?

Q2...Question regarding our existing Muni Code Section 11.28.020

- A. Living or Sleeping Quarters. No vehicle shall be used for living or sleeping quarters on any public street.
- B. Mobile Homes. Mobile homes, excluding travel trailers, are not permitted to be parked on public streets within the residential zones of the City.
- C. Unmounted Campers. It shall be unlawful for any person to place, keep or maintain, or permit to be placed, kept or maintained, any unmounted camper on any public street.
- D. Loading and Unloading and Utility Vehicles. The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to active loading or unloading of any vehicle, or to any public service or utility company vehicle while in the performance of service or maintenance work.
- E. Construction Trailers. Trailers may be used for temporary offices on construction projects. A permit must be obtained from the City Building Department after satisfactory information has been given that the use is in compliance with the conditions of this chapter.

(Ord. 1346, (part), 1986; Ord. 547, § 1, 1972; Ord. 276, § 2, 1964)

According to Section 11.28.020 it is unlawful to live or sleep in ANY vehicle parked on the street.

Q2: Why is Section 11.28.020.A not enforced now?

Sincerely,

Peggy Griffin

From: Peggy Griffin

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>

Cc: <u>City Clerk</u>

Subject: 2025-06-24 Planning Commission Mtg ITEM2 - Vehicle Parking SITUATIONS TO CONSIDER

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:14:21 PM

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

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

Dear Planning Commission and Staff,

Just for disclosure purposes, my husband and I are long-time RV owners (20 years) and have rented them before owning so I have some insight on how/what a resident RV owner might need to do on a city street, especially in front of their home or while traveling visiting other cities.

When reading these proposed options I made a list of all the large vehicles I see around our neighborhood from time to time. Ideally, the proposed changes should cover these cases with the desired effect, whatever that be.

Types of vehicles around town:

- RVs
- Long vans (over 20 ft) either a Class-B RV or a work van
- Long bed pickup trucks
- Shuttle vans, Hopper vans, Apple vans
- Buses
- Delivery trucks (FedEx, Amazon, UPS, furniture/moving vans, 18-wheelers)
- Boat trailers
- Trailers
- Plumber, electrician, gardeners, construction vehicles

Some situations where a resident of Cupertino would need to park their RV or boat or trailer for more than 2 hours on a city street (in front or near their house):

- Preparing to leave early the next day Often they connect the car they are towing behind
  the RV the night before and have the RV plus car parked in front of their house ready to
  go in the early morning.
- An RV is stored elsewhere and is brought from storage to the home to load up. It often takes all day to load up and prep the RV. The RV probably then stays in front overnight for an early start the next day.

- The RV is stored in the backyard but needs to be moved so workers can have access, room or prevent damage. This isn't always planned. It can happen on the weekend. It can happen when workers from your neighbor's house need you to move it.
- RV is rented for a family vacation <u>loading an empty RV can take a day</u>. Often they wait until the next morning to leave.
- Family or friends who are traveling in an RV come to visit.
- The resident has a business and does not have room to park the vehicle.
  - This gets dicey considering that now days developers are not providing adequate parking.
  - Some newer developments are shortening the length of parking spaces from 20 ft to 18 ft which don't allow some trucks or vans to be parked on-site in a parking space.

#### **REQUEST:**

When you look at changing the city's vehicle parking ordinances, please keep these in mind and make sure the desired outcome is obtained for these various situations. Please make the resulting vehicle parking ordinances fit reality. When laws don't make sense, people ignore them.

Thank you.

Sincerely, Peggy Griffin From: Peggy Griffin

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>

Cc: <u>City Clerk</u>

Subject: 2025-06-24 Planning Commission Mtg ITEM2 - Vehicle Parking Ordinance COMMENTS

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:47:25 PM

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

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

Dear Planning Commission and Staff,

I'm glad the city is revising it's parking ordinance and addressing some of the issues the city has been encountering.

- 1. I agree that once the 72 hours are expired, the vehicle should move 1500 ft away for at least 72 hours.
  - a. That said, I think there should be a way a resident can get an extension.
- 2. Permits...I do not support requiring residents to have to get a permit every time they need to park their RV on the street.
  - a. The times when this is needed are not always planned and can happen when the city is closed (weekends, holidays, evenings).
  - b. It would require more staff time and overhead which results in more taxpayer money being wasted.
  - c. It would require more time for the resident.
- 3. Some provision is needed to allow friends and/or family that are traveling in an RV to visit and park on the street.
- 4. Some provision is needed to allow visitors in RVs to visit and shop in Cupertino.

In Campbell, on Dell Avenue, near the perk ponds which is a large commercial area with lots of parking, they installed signs restricting the heights of the vehicles overnight. Maybe in troubled areas, the city could do the same?

Q: What are other cities doing to solve this problem?

Sincerely, Peggy Griffin From: <u>Jean Orr</u>

**To:** <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>

Subject: RV Parking

**Date:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:47:09 PM

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

Re: Planning Commission Meeting; June 24, 2025

Item 2; RV Parking Regulations Proposal:

We own an RV and only park it in the road, in front of our house, when getting it packed and ready for a trip.

We think that short term parking should be permitted on the public road.

Keep this in mind when making any proposal for parking restrictions.

Thanks you

From: Mark Wright

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>

**Subject:** Oversize Vehicles opinion

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 11:51:44 AM

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

Hi

On the matter of oversized vehicle control in parking lots, my suggestion is to Limit parking to a specified time. E.g. 72 hours as is same for parking cars on streets. Then ticket, then tow.

Mark Wright 10620 Culbertson Dr. Cupertino CA95014 From: Rhoda Fry

To: City of Cupertino Planning Commission; City Clerk; City Attorney"s Office; Cupertino City Manager"s Office

**Subject:** 6/24/2025 Planning Commission Agenda Item #2

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:03:18 PM

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

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Regarding 6/24/2025 Planning Commission Agenda Item #2

## Please do not consider doing parking permits.

It puts a lot of time and money stress on residents and extra overhead for staff.

It seems that one of the issues is that code enforcement is not adequately responding to resident complaints.

This is an area upon which we can improve.

Another thing that I'd like you to consider is that our storm drains lead straight to the bay. Many people don't realize this. Although I have no evidence that people have been dumping effluent into our storm drains, the more people who reside in their vehicles, the greater the possibility of it happening. Note that the City of Santa Clara storm drains go to the sewage treatment plant.

I don't know who is responsible for painting our storm drains, but having looked at a few this week when I was walking around town, it looks like they could use some sprucing up. Maybe we need a paint that doesn't fade? Below is an image of one of the better-looking ones on my walk.

Regards, Rhoda Fry



From: <u>Jean Bedord</u>

To: City of Cupertino Planning Commission; City of Cupertino Planning Dept.; Cupertino City Manager"s Office; City

Attorney"s Office; City Clerk

Cc: Chad Mosley

**Subject:** Agenda Item #2 Oversized Vehicle Parking, Planning Commission, June 24, 2025

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:41:26 PM

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

Please include in Written Communications

\_\_\_\_\_

Planning Commission,

I am writing to oppose the options presented in the staff report. First of all, this is not included in the city work plan or received direction of the council as a whole, thus violating the Municipal Code requiring council to approve any council member's request that exceeds two hours of staff time. Who directed "staff" and who is this unknown Deputy City Manager who wrote the report?

Secondly, though this report is an improvement from the original report which suddenly appeared on the April 22, 2025, Planning Commission agenda, it proposes a punitive permit system that would be cumbersome and expensive to implement. Permits would cost approximately \$50 each. The recommended option would require residents with recreational RVs to obtain a permit every 72 hours AND move their vehicle 1500 feet. Residents would be subject to the same enforcement as unsheltered RV residents. Is the city prepared to operate a permit system 24/7 so weekends and evenings are covered? City hall operates 8 to 5 Monday through Friday and there is already a staff shortage. Directors' names are not on this report, but staff time would be required to enforce such a policy, instead of providing services to residents. Money spent on signage is better spent on improving resident services.

The staff report fails to address the overall issue of the ongoing challenge for unsheltered residents. It focuses on punitive actions which impact both residents with recreational vehicles as well unhoused residents. Context is missing. It cites 200 complaints about oversized vehicles in the past year. But how many vehicles are actually involved? Perhaps as few as 10-20 vehicles? What are the demographics? How many are "working poor" who have to live close to their work? What outreach has been done to the occupants of these vehicles? Due to lack of affordable housing, "vehicle lodging" is a reality until more permanent housing is available.

Shouldn't overnight parking be addressed within the broader **context of unhoused residents which include (1) Tents, (2) Cars/vans and (3) RVs/Trailers?** Mountain View has <u>Safe Parking programs</u> which differentiate between cars/vans which can be accommodated in church parking lots, and RVs in commercial areas which can provide more space and waste disposal services. Cupertino has neither. The Prince of Peace Lutheran Church in Saratoga does NOT accommodate RV's (an error in the

staff report). How are other similar jurisdictions managing unhoused residents? The San Mateo City Council adopted a "compassionate approach" to enforcing its ban on people sleeping in vehicles, prioritizing outreach and services before citations.

I urge you to take the compassionate approach to provide outreach and services to address the underlying issue, rather than a punitive approach which also impacts residents who have recreational vehicles, as well as their visitors who should be allowed to park (with homeowner permission) in residential areas without the hassle (and expense) of a permit system. Cupertino can do better......

Housing and Community advocate, Jean Bedord From: <u>Venkat Ranganathan</u>

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>
Subject: Input on Oversized Vehicle Parking
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:48:35 PM

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

Dear Planning Commission Members,

This is Venkat Ranganathan, a long time Cupertino resident.

Thank you for your continued efforts to address the growing concern around oversized vehicle parking in Cupertino.

I support the direction outlined in Option 1 of the June 24 staff report, which proposes requiring a City-issued permit to park oversized vehicles on public rights-of-way, along with mandatory 1500-foot relocation every 72 hours. This strikes a reasonable balance between the needs of residents, enforcement feasibility, and community aesthetics.

However, I urge the Commission to strengthen this option further through two key amendments:

- 1. Restrict permits to 3 per month per vehicle rather than 5. The current proposal allows oversized vehicles to legally occupy public streets for up to half the month. Reducing this to 3 permits ensures such parking remains transitional, not semi-permanent.
- 2. Establish designated zones for oversized vehicle parking—especially in commercial or less trafficked areas—rather than allowing dispersed parking throughout the city. Without clear zones, enforcement becomes difficult and neighborhoods may still see clustering despite the permit requirement.

Additionally, while daytime and short-term exceptions (2 hours during the day, 1 hour at night) offer flexibility, these should not become loopholes for routine overnight dwellers.

With the suggested improvements, Cupertino can better manage public space while respecting occasional residential use.

Thank you for considering this feedback.

Sincerely,

Venkat Ranganathan Get <u>Outlook for Android</u> From: Greg Endom

To: City of Cupertino Planning Commission

Subject: Over-sized Vehicle Parking City of Cupertino

Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 3:08:40 PM

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

# Chair Rao:

I received your email to Amy Chan, who forwarded it to me. I represent the ownership of the Marina Plaza Shopping Center, specifically with respect to its planned redevelopment of the Marina Plaza Shopping Center property into a mixed-use residential and retail project.

In response to your request for commentary related to the current oversized parking of vehicles on Alves adjacent to the Marina Plaza center, I can offer you these thoughts...

While the current parked vehicles and their residents have not caused any material problems or generated concerns/complaints that the center ownership is aware of, the long-term viability of this type of parking pattern is in question at this location.

When the redevelopment of the center occurs, the construction activities and changes to the property during its redevelopment will not be conducive or most likely allow for this type of long-term parking. Once the redevelopment is complete, I would envision Alves being more conducive to bicycle lanes and parallel parking for

the retail tenants, customers, and visitors to the residential units being planned at the site. The nature and use of Alves after the planned redevelopment will be substantially different from its current level of activity. The new mixed-use project envisions an activation and upgrade of this secondary street into a more pedestrian-friendly and neighborhood-welcoming thoroughfare.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comments.

Sincerely,

Marina Plaza Shopping Center

/s/ Greg Endom

By: Greg Endom

**Project Manager** 

Greg Endom 925-550-8082 DRE# 00766333 From: Ram Sripathi

To: <u>City of Cupertino Planning Commission</u>

**Subject:** Rv parking menace

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 3:31:17 PM

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

Hello planning commission

We are seeing a rampant use of rv parking behind target in Cupertino. They park in and around the xyz hotel.

I'm a long time resident of Cupertino and pride our city. But allowing these rvs that don't belong to Cupertino and the occupants don't contribute to cupertinos welfare or well being. I'd say strongly that they are a menace and should be asked to leave and further not allow any rv parking in public spaces.

It's a menace because they slowly start dirtying the surrounding and because they don't want to leave for fear of losing the spot, start doing things like throwing garbage, emptying water, lounging around etc.

They also probably hurt the hotel xyzs look and that impacts the city revenue.

If we continue to allow there maybe other spots people will park. We should further go ahead and pass an ordinance banning Rv parking.

I hope the commission listens to its loyal long resident citizens and does the right thing.

Thanks Ram Sripathi

Cupertino resident Sent from my iPhone From: <u>Deborah</u>

To: City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Subject: Oversized Vehicle Parking Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 3:39:35 PM
Attachments: CCHC New logo Signatures-02.png

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

### Hello Planning Commissioners,

Thank. You for reviewing the CMC regarding oversized vehicles in the City.

I know that in other cities, it appears they have designated areas that these vehicles can park, but they are highly industrialized. Out local businesses have some issues with trailer homes being parked near their entrances as it deters customers from entering or using the business. I am not sure what new rules would prevent this.

Nominally near some of our hotels some have parked for the regulated amount of time (I believe it's still 72 hours before they have to move) but you can see how this would hurt hotel business specifically, particular when they have not quite recovered from the effects of the pandemic like a lot of our small businesses.

I just ask that the business community be considered when making changes to these regulations as it will effect the health of our economy and therefore revenue to the City.

Thank you for your consideration., Deb

Deborah L. Feng, MBA CEO O. 408 2527054 ext.101 Deb@cupertino-chamber.org www.cupertino-chamber.org



From: Rinal Shah

To: Santosh Rao; City of Cupertino Planning Commission; City Attorney's Office; City Clerk; Tina Kapoor; Benjamin

Fu; Chad Mosley; Daniel Degu

Cc: <u>Dipesh Gupta</u>; <u>Manish Gupta</u>

Subject: Re: Cupertino Planning Commission Study Session: Oversized Vehicle Parking Regulations – June 24

**Date:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025 3:53:51 PM

Attachments: Aloft Cupertino Comments on Oversized Vehicle Parking.pdf

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

Dear Members of the City Planning Commission -

Please find our comments/feedback on the City of Cupertino's parking regulations for oversized vehicles.

Thank you for your time and for considering our perspective.

Best Regards,

Rinal

Rinal Shah VP of Operations Aloft Cupertino

From: Daniel Degu < <u>Daniel De@cupertino.gov</u>> **Date:** June 23, 2025 at 11:59:10 PM PDT

To: dgupta@shashigroup.com

Subject: Cupertino Planning Commission Study Session: Oversized

Vehicle Parking Regulations – June 24

Hi Dipesh,

The Planning Commission will hold a study session on Tuesday, June 24 at 6:45pm in Cupertino Community Hall to discuss potential updates to the City's parking regulations for oversized vehicles on public streets. During the meeting, the Commission will review and consider multiple options presented by City staff and may choose to recommend one of the

proposals for City Council consideration in a future ordinance.

The staff report is attached for your reference, should you wish to learn more. Public input is welcome. You may:

- Attend the meeting in person or via teleconference
- Share your feedback by emailing Planning Commission Chair Santosh Rao at <a href="mailto:srao@cupertino.gov">srao@cupertino.gov</a> or the full commission at <a href="mailto:planningcommission@cupertino.gov">planningcommission@cupertino.gov</a>.

For additional details, please refer to the attached documents.





Aloft Cupertino 10165 North De Anza Boulevard Cupertino, CA 95014 (408) 766-7000

June 24, 2025

#### To:

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

Subject: Comments on City of Cupertino's Oversized Vehicle Parking Restrictions

Dear Members of the City Planning Commission,

We are writing to express our concerns regarding the current regulations and proposed updates related to oversized vehicle parking in the City of Cupertino. As the owner and manager of Aloft Cupertino, located at the corner of De Anza Boulevard and Alves Road, we believe it is important to provide feedback on policies that directly impact the perception, safety, and economic health of our community.

At present, the presence of RVs parked for extended periods along Alves Road—directly in front of our hotel—creates an ongoing concern for our guests and impacts our business. These vehicles contribute to a perception that the area resembles a trailer or RV park, which can give visitors the impression that the location is unsafe. We have received the following feedback from guests:

- "The line of RVs and campers along Alves is disconcerting."
- "If you have guests checking in late, there is no available parking—only street parking, which is almost entirely taken up by RVs. It's unsafe to walk that far to the hotel at night with luggage."
- "Location is iffy with RVs parked across the street and no gated parking for your own car."
- "Normally I wouldn't give this much thought, but there were half a dozen RVs parked along the hotel entrance that appeared to have been there for a while."

In light of these concerns, we respectfully request that the Commission consider a complete ban on parking oversized vehicles within 600 feet of commercial zones. We believe this policy



would protect local businesses, improve the visual environment, and help foster a safe and welcoming atmosphere for both residents and visitors.

Of the three options currently recommended by staff, we support **Option 2**, which would allow only City residents—with a City-issued permit—to park oversized vehicles on public streets for a maximum of 72 hours. Furthermore, we advocate for an additional provision requiring these vehicles to be moved at least **1,500 feet from their previous location** after the 72-hour period, and to remain at the new location for at least 72 hours before returning. This would help address the common tactic of RV owners minimally relocating their vehicles to avoid enforcement—a practice we observe regularly on Alves Road.

Thank you for your time and for considering our perspective. We appreciate your service and dedication to maintaining a thoughtfully planned, vibrant community.

Sincerely,

Rinal Shah

VP of Operations

Aloft Cupertino

From: Ty Bash <tybash@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 4:53 PM

To: Planningcommission@cuprtino.gov < Planningcommission@cuprtino.gov >

Cc: Santosh Rao < Srao@cupertino.gov >

Subject: RV ordinance

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

#### Dear commission,

My name is Ty Bash and I am the operations manager at Happy Days. Since we opened our doors in 2001, we at Happy Days have provided early childhood education for infants, preschoolers and kindergarteners to families in the Cupertino community.

As we have recovered from Covid restrictions, the challenges of remote work and return to work are compounded by challenges of the people living in RVs in front of our school. On a daily basis one could find an RV or two parked in front of our school, or across the street in front of the Target parking lot. Many addition RVs are parked along Alves, behind Target. Perspective parents frequently inquire about the status of the vehicles, while we can only assume that others are altogether deterred and do not come in. Fortunately, we have not had an incident with those who occupy the RVs, but the fear of the parents, children and our employees is real.

While we empathize with plight of the RV residents, other resident solutions must be found. We are happy that the mayor is looking into addressing the situation and are in full support of legislation that will restrict RV parking on public streets.

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Debending Santosh Rao; City of Cupertino Planning Commission
Re: Cupertino Planning Commission Study Session: Oversized Vehicle Parking Regulations – June 24
Tuesday, June 24, 2025 5:25:51 PM

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

Thank you, Deb, for including Aloft Cupertino in this discussion.

Hi Santosh,

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

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

Check out this review of Aloft Cupertino on Google Maps

https://goo.gl/maps/9gksn92N9e7PFL3m6

Nick Meier, CHRM Chief Revenue Officer

Shashi Hospitality Group 10200 North De Anza Blvd. Cupertino, CA 95014 Cell: 702-810-7275

nmeier@shashigroup.com Shashi Hotel | The NEST Palo Alto

Aloft Cupertino | Aloft Sunnyvale | Aloft San Jose Cupertino

On Tue, Jun 24, 2025, 1:12 PM Deborah < Deb@cupertino-chamber.org > wrote:

If hough, you and your folks might want to weigh in here by either attending the study session below and/or submitting your comments via both or either of the emails listed below. I will be submitting my comments to the planning commission email address.

Deb Deborah L. Feng, MBA CEO O. 408 2527054 ext.101 Deb@cupertino-chamber.org www.cupertino-chamber.org

Begin forwarded message:

From: Daniel Degu < DanielDe@cupertino.gov>
Subject: Cupertino Planning Commission Study Session: Oversized Vehicle Parking Regulations – June 24 Date: June 23, 2025 at 11:36:39 PM PDT
To: Deborah < deb@cupertino-chamber.org>

The Planning Commission will hold a study session on Tuesday, June 24 at 6:45pm in Cupertino Community Hall to discuss potential updates to the City's parking regulations for oversized vehicles on public streets. During the meeting, the Commission will review and consider multiple options presented by City staff and may choose to recommend one of the proposals for City Council consideration in a future ordinance.

The staff report is attached for your reference, should you wish to learn more. Public input is welcome. You may:

- Attend the meeting in person or via teleconference
   Share your feedback by emailing Planning Commission Chair Santosh Rao at <a href="mailto:srao@cupertino.gov">srao@cupertino.gov</a> or the full commission at <a href="mailto:planningcommission@cupertino.gov">planningcommission@cupertino.gov</a>.

For additional details, please refer to the attached documents.

