



MINUTES
CUPERTINO PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, September 9, 2025

At 6:45 p.m. Chair Santosh Rao called the Regular Planning Commission meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance in the Cupertino Community Hall Council Chamber, 10350 Torre Avenue and via teleconference.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Santosh Rao, Vice Chair Tracy Kosolcharoen, and Commissioners David Fung, Steven Scharf and Seema Lindskog. Absent: None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Subject: Approval of the July 22, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes
Recommended Action: Approve the July 22, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes

MOTION: Lindskog moved and Kosolcharoen seconded to approve the July 22, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes. The motion passed with the following vote: Ayes: Rao, Kosolcharoen, Scharf, Fung, Lindskog. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

POSTPONEMENTS – None

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Jennifer Griffin strongly opposed SB79, a housing bill by Senator Wiener, citing its frequent amendments, vague language, and potential impact on communities like hers near Stevens Creek Boulevard. She urged elected officials to vote "no" or abstain, arguing that constituents have been excluded from recent housing decisions and that local control is being eroded. Griffin also pointed to rising grassroots opposition and called for a new direction in state housing policy.

Luthern Williams, a representative from Tessellations School thanked the Planning Commission and shared updates made in response to neighborhood feedback, including dropping plans for a high school at the Regnart campus. The school is now seeking to raise its enrollment cap, ease event restrictions, and expand programs. Williams emphasized their commitment to being good neighbors through traffic management and continued collaboration with the city.

Lisa Warren raised concerns about ongoing audio issues during the meeting, noting there was no sound during the Pledge of Allegiance and that several speakers had unclear or distorted audio.

She also expressed appreciation that Tessellations removed their request to add a high school, but emphasized that, based on prior assurances, they should never have proposed it in the first place. Warren concluded by stating it's good the change was made, but it should not have been necessary.

Nori expressed strong concerns about bicycle use in Memorial Park, citing safety risks to pedestrians, including seniors, children, and people with mobility aids. They noted that bicycles are considered vehicles under California law and should not be ridden on sidewalks or in areas without designated bike trails, such as Memorial Park. Nori opposed placing a bike rack near the park's gazebo, suggesting it be moved to a less central location to discourage unsafe cycling within pedestrian areas and urged the city to prioritize pedestrian safety.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Subject: Consider Municipal Code Amendments to multiple chapters of the Municipal Code to make minor edits for clarity and consistency. (Application No.: MCA-2024-004; Applicant: City of Cupertino; Location: Citywide)
Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission adopt the draft resolution (Attachment 1) recommending that the City Council adopt an ordinance to: Amend Chapters 14.15 (Landscape), 14.18 (Protected Trees), 18.20 (Parcel Maps), 18.52 (Hillside Subdivisions), 19.08 (Definitions), 19.12 (Administration), 19.16 (Designation and Establishment of Districts), 19.28 (Single Family R1 Zones), 19.36 (Multiple-Family R3 Zones), 19.38 (Multiple-Family R4 Zones), 19.40 (Residential Hillside RHS Zones), 19.44 (Residential Single-Family Cluster R1C Zones), 19.46 (Townhomes TH Combining District), 19.60 (General Commercial CG Zones), 19.100 (Accessory Structures), 19.102 (Glass and Lighting), 19.104 (Signs), 19.124 (Parking), and 19.132 (Sale of Alcoholic Beverages and Gasoline); and
Find that the proposed actions are exempt from CEQA.

Assistant Community Development Director Connolly introduced Senior Planner Sugiyama, who gave a presentation.

Commissioners asked questions which staff responded to.

Chair Rao opened the public comment period and the following people spoke:

- Jennifer Griffin
- Lisa Warren

Chair Rao closed the public comment period.

Commissioners continued their discussion, and asked questions which staff responded

to.

MOTION: Rao moved and Scharf seconded to approve the staff recommendation, with the added condition that any changes not related to state law be removed from the current item and brought back later as a separate agenda item.

MODIFIED MOTION: Rao moved and Scharf seconded to allow for revisions to comply with state law, along with corrections to spelling and minor readability improvements, while still requiring that any substantive non-state law changes be brought back as a separate agenda item. The motion passed with the following vote: Ayes: Rao, Kosolcharoen, Scharf, Fung, Lindskog. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

NEW BUSINESS –

3. Subject: An update on the development of the Active Transportation Plan, including a summary of Phase 1 activities and an overview of what to expect during Phase 2.
Recommended Action: Receive an update on the development of the Active Transportation Plan and provide feedback on the draft project prioritization criteria

Transportation Manager Stillman introduced Senior Transportation Manager Schroeder, Petra Reyes from Alta Planning and Design, and David Wasserman from Alta Planning and Design, who gave a presentation.

Commissioners asked questions which staff and the presenter responded to.

Chair Rao opened the public comment period and the following people spoke:

- Isham Kholsa
- Jennifer Griffin
- Emily Poon
- Lisa Warren
- Jennifer Shearin
- Herve Marcy
- Louise Saadati

Chair Rao closed the public comment period.

Commissioners took a recess at 8:50 PM and returned at 8:55 PM

Commissioners provided the following feedback and recommendations:

MOTION: Lindskog moved to modify the scoring criteria as follows:

- Add a project to make the most high-injury network intersections with red lights and stop signs safer using tools such as red light cameras, and modify the scoring criteria as follows:
- Access Criteria: Change the school proximity score to “fifteen points if within half mile of a school”. Add “senior housing and senior facilities such as the senior center” to the metric definition of “Parks and Other Destinations Proximity”
- Sustainability and Connectivity Criteria: Change “Sustainability” name to “Connectivity”. Add ten points if it is within quarter mile of a trail or low-stress facility like class IV bike lanes, making the total max scores for this section twenty points instead of ten points.
- Balance Criteria: Focus on impact rather than infrastructure. Subtract ten points if a removal of a substantial number (five or more) of parking spaces used regularly fifty one percent or more of the time. Subtract ten points if it eliminates a car lane for ten percent or more portion of the project length.
- Fairness Criteria: Delete this criteria, as it is not an objective, measurable measure of the positive or negative impact of a project, and it will lead to an escalating arms race of competing public comments and create more divisiveness and animosity within the community.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Rao proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to add speeding cameras in addition to red light cameras to the first section of Lindskog’s motion.

Lindskog accepted the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Rao proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to modify the “Access” metric, by specifying that the senior center portion should only adhere to pedestrian criteria.

Lindskog accepted the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Kosolcharoen proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to modify the “Balance” section to change the negative ten points for removing a substantial number of regularly used parking spaces (five or more) to negative five points, and changing the negative ten points to negative fifteen points if it eliminates a car lane.

Lindskog accepted the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Kosolcharoen proposed a friendly amendment to the motion

to do a bike count of existing usage as a baseline before starting a project on major proposed bike infrastructure.

Lindskog accepted the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Rao made a friendly amendment to modify the “Access” criteria to specify middle schools and high schools.

Lindskog did not accept the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Scharf proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to partner with bicycle education providers to offer routine adult and family education classes in Cupertino.

Lindskog accepted the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Rao proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to keep the fairness criteria. He withdrew this friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Fung proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to move red light runners and speeding section to the end of the motion.

Lindskog accepted the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Rao proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to add a negative score if it caused a no right turn on red to the additional project recommendations.

Lindskog did not accept the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Rao proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to add prioritize sensor driven pedestrian bicyclist detection to the additional project recommendations.

Lindskog did not accept the friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Rao proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to add “Consider adaptive right-turn-on-red technology where feasible” to the additional project recommendations.

Lindskog accepted the friendly amendment.

AMENDED MOTION: Lindskog moved and Rao seconded to:

Modify the scoring criteria as follows:

- Access Criteria: Change the school proximity score to “Fifteen points if within one-half mile of a school”. Add “senior housing and senior facilities such as the Senior Center” to the metric definition of “Parks & Other Destinations Proximity.” For pedestrians.
- Sustainability/Connectivity Criteria: Change “Sustainability” name to “Connectivity.” Add ten points if it’s within one-quarter mile of a trail or low-stress facility like Class IV bike lanes, making the total maximum score for this section twenty points instead of ten points.
- Balance Criteria: Focus on impact rather than infrastructure. Subtract five points if removal of a substantial number (five or more) of regularly used parking spaces (used fifty-one percent or more of the time). Subtract fifteen points if it eliminates a car lane for a substantial (ten percent or more) portion of the project length.
- Fairness Criteria: Delete this criterion as it is not an objective, measurable measure of the positive or negative impact of a project and will lead to an escalating arms race of competing public comments and create more divisiveness and animosity within the community.
- Additional Project Recommendations: Add a project to make the most high-injury network intersections with red lights and stop signs safer using tools such as red light and speeding cameras. Consider adaptive right-turn-on-red technology where necessary. Conduct a bike count of existing usage as a baseline on major proposed bike projects. Partner with bicycle education providers (in addition to SVBC) to offer routine adult and child education courses in Cupertino.

The motion passed with the following vote: Ayes: Rao, Kosolcharoen, Scharf, Fung, Lindskog. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

STAFF AND COMMISSION REPORTS –

Scharf reported that he and Kosolcharoen took the Cert Class and encouraged fellow Commissioners to take the Cert Class when it is available.

FUTURE AGENDA SETTING – None

ADJOURNMENT

At 10:10 p.m. Chair Rao adjourned the Regular Planning Commission Meeting.

Minutes prepared by:

Lindsay Nelson

Lindsay Nelson, Administrative Assistant