

PC 06-23-2026

#2

Study Session on  
Housing Element  
update to add  
capacity at all  
income levels.

Written

Communications

**From:** [Lauren Sapudar](#)  
**To:** [Lindsay Nelson](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Commission Hearing 6-23-26, Agenda Item 2  
**Date:** Monday, June 22, 2026 4:16:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [Signed Letter to PC 6-22-26.pdf](#)

---

Written communication for tomorrows Planning Commission meeting.



---

**From:** Greg Endom <gregendom@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 22, 2026 3:03 PM  
**To:** Tracy Kosolcharoen <tkosolcharoen@cupertino.gov>  
**Cc:** Steven Scharf <sscharf@cupertino.gov>; David Fung <dfung@cupertino.gov>; Seema Lindskog <slindskog@cupertino.gov>; Santosh Rao <sr Rao@cupertino.gov>; Benjamin Fu <benjaminf@cupertino.gov>; Luke Connolly <lukec@cupertino.gov>; Piu Ghosh (she/her) <piug@cupertino.gov>; Gian Martire <gianm@cupertino.gov>; Lauren Sapudar <laurens@cupertino.gov>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Hearing 6-23-26, Agenda Item 2

**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 Chair Kosolcharoen:

Please see the attached communication regarding your upcoming meeting on June 23, 2026.

Thank you.

Greg

Greg Endom  
+1 925 550 8082

DRE# 00766333

# Marina Plaza Shopping Center

Sent via email and hand-delivered

June 22, 2026

Tracy Kosolcharoen, Chair [Via email to Tkosolcharoen@cupertino.gov](mailto:Tkosolcharoen@cupertino.gov)  
City of Cupertino  
10300 Torre Avenue  
Cupertino, CA 95014

RE: Planning Commission Meeting June 23, 2026 - Regular Meeting 6:45 PM  
Agenda Item 2. Study Session, Housing Element-RHNA Capacities

Dear Chair Kosolcharoen:

Dear Planning Commission,

We own Marina Plaza, a five-acre parcel located at 10122 Bandle Drive and 10145 N DeAnza Boulevard, at the intersection with Stevens Creek Boulevard. We support Planning staff's work to identify our property as a priority housing site to meet the current shortfall in the City's Housing Element.

Earlier this month, we submitted a project application for an exciting mixed-use commercial and residential development. Rezoning the site as a priority housing site under an updated Housing Element would allow this development to proceed at a higher density than otherwise permitted. As you may recall, we have sought to build a mixed-use development on this parcel in the past. In fact, during the October 2022 Planning Commission hearing on project approval, the Commission indicated that they would like to see a project at a higher density than we proposed (and was approved), a preference which was echoed by City Council during their approval hearing in December 2022. In alignment with your advice, earlier this month, on June 18<sup>th</sup>, we submitted a project application for a larger mixed-use project with 340 units (an increase of 134 units over the previous submittal), which also includes 66 affordable units.

We ask for an opportunity to present our project application to you immediately following the hearing for the revised list of priority housing sites. The timing of your and the City Council review is important to us because it will allow us to firm up the development timeline (to obtain financing, construction estimates, and finalize design details) and begin a long-awaited vision to redevelop this parcel in a way that creates a dynamic space for our community to gather.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Tracy Kosolcharoen, Chair

June 22, 2026

Page 2

Sincerely,

On behalf of Marina Plaza Shopping Center



Greg Endom

Project Manager

cc: Steven Scharf, Vice-Chair, Planning Commission, via email to [SScharf@cupertino.gov](mailto:SScharf@cupertino.gov)  
David Fung, Planning Commission, via email to [dfung@cupertino.gov](mailto:dfung@cupertino.gov)  
Seema Lindskog, Planning Commission, via email to [slindskog@cupertino.gov](mailto:slindskog@cupertino.gov)  
Santosh Rao, Planning Commission, via email to [srao@cupertino.gov](mailto:srao@cupertino.gov)  
Benjamin Fu, Dir. of Community Development, via email to [benjaminf@cupertino.gov](mailto:benjaminf@cupertino.gov)  
Luke Connolly, Asst. Dir. of Community Development, via email to [lukec@cupertino.gov](mailto:lukec@cupertino.gov)  
Piu Ghosh, Planning Manager, via email to [piug@cupertino.gov](mailto:piug@cupertino.gov)  
Gian Martire, Senior Planner, via email to [gianm@cupertino.gov](mailto:gianm@cupertino.gov)  
Lauren Sapudar, City Clerk, via email to [LaurenS@Cupertino.gov](mailto:LaurenS@Cupertino.gov)

**From:** [Jennifer Griffin](#)  
**To:** [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)  
**Cc:** [grenna5000@yahoo.com](mailto:grenna5000@yahoo.com)  
**Subject:** Rezoning of Cupertino Parcels: Statistical Error Prone RHNA Problem  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 23, 2026 8:37:50 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 Planning Commission:

(The following is public input for Item 2 for the Study Session on Housing for the June 23, 2026 Cupertino Planning Commission meeting).

I appreciate the city having a discussion on Housing issues in Cupertino at the June 23, 2026 Cupertino Planning Commission meeting Study Session, Item Number 2. There are numerous issues which have evolved as fallout from the Sixth Cycle Housing Element and the State Housing laws passed since 2014 and the ramifications on housing in Cupertino.

There has been a marked loss of retail in Cupertino with the advent of SB 330. I am sure this was not the intention of SB 330, but the loss of retail is an emerging problem.

Lots of land in Cupertino have been rezoned for high density housing since the Sixth Cycle Housing Element. This continues to this day.

The city is losing valuable BMR stock to housing units aging out of the city's BMR properties.

I think we can all agree that one of the biggest problems contributing to these numerous side effects is the statistically error prone RHNA burden placed on Cupertino and other cities in California by the Sixth Cycle RHNA Housing numbers. The RHNA numbers are wrong and have been shown over and over again to be invalid. This has been apparent for over two or three years now. The RHNA numbers presented to the state for the Sixth Cycle were not adopted under any valid statistical modeling method and were basically numbers "pulled out of a magician's hat" and presented to the state as valid data.

Why the state and HCD and our politicians and even the governor himself have failed to discuss these invalid numbers is puzzling and worrisome. This sounds like perhaps our statewide leaders are not paying attention to this and only our city leaders are trying to discuss it.

HCD has not addressed the problem of bad RHNA and this is very concerning as they interact with the city on an ongoing basis.

Now, with some of the major housing bill authors moving on to higher elected offices beyond the state and even a change in our own governor come November 2026, it is hoped that the RHNA problem will be paid attention to and dealt with so that Cupertino and the other cities in the state can have a reasonable set of housing numbers to deal with now and in the Seventh Cycle Housing Element which will soon be beginning in Southern California. It is hoped that HCD will be properly supervised by new state leaders and a new governor to make sure the cities are not burdened by incorrect RHNA numbers. This is irresponsible and should not be allowed to continue.

I think everyone has tried to deal with the RHNA numbers since they were first introduced, though there were suspicions then there were problems with them. In successive years, as we all know, RHNA was one of the biggest contributing factors to the whole shipwreck of the Sixth Cycle Housing Element across the state. When it became apparent that RHNA had massive data problems

and were greatly inflated and just flat out wrong, no one from the state or the governor's office or HCD or the legislature stepped up to correct the obviously bad data.

Yet, the cities in the state were forced to carry on down the path of propagating the bad data of RHNA each time they tried to deal with the policy of how to enact bad data usage in their own cities. Each time we rezone using the bad RHNA data we are propagating more statistical error as we use bad data to make decisions for our city.

As we carry out this study session for the Planning Commission on Housing in Cupertino, we should single out the very bad data as the contributing cause, bad RHNA, and maybe say, "Let's don't do any more upzoning. The data is bad. RHNA is bad. Its time to stop using bad data."

I do expect the results of the upcoming elections will show people are tired of dealing with the bad RHNA data and want a change. We need statewide leaders that pay attention to population trends for the state with actual data and are concerned that the bad data of the Sixth Housing Cycle RHNA had wasted a lot of precious time and resources in our cities across the state. Its time to stop Using the bad RHNA numbers which have been called "magic numbers".

Thank you.

Best regards,

Jennifer Griffin