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 < outerdog@gmail.com>
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
- chenglei.liusjsu@gmail.com; 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 < shinkre@yahoo.com; Chinh < chinhster@gmail.com; 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 (https://sanjosespotlight.com/sanjose-bans-homeless-people-renting-rvs/).

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

11.28.020 Vehicle Parking Regulations. %

- 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 srao@cupertino.gov or the full commission at planningcommission@cupertino.gov.

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 < <u>DanielDe@cupertino.gov</u>>
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 srao@cupertino.gov or the full commission at planningcommission@cupertino.gov.

For additional details, please refer to the attached documents.

