

Planning Commission Meeting

February 27, 2024

Written Communications

From: [Rhoda Fry](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Public Comment Planning Commission - non agenda 2/27/2024
Date: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 3:46:32 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 Planning Commissioners,

1. Please ask planning staff why the project on E Estates Drive is being considered for ministerial review when there are known hazards onsite through geotracker
2. Please ask planning staff for a report on large development projects in the City, even if they won't be coming to planning commission for decision-making. There is a project on E Estates and the Fontana Restaurant site
3. Please ask planning staff to explain whether there are any changes to the hotel plans that are requesting renewal of their development agreements. Also, since those development agreements have lapsed, can you please ensure that the hotels shall be built to the most current building codes (as you may know, Vallco has requested 2016 building codes, which are antiquated as the codes are renewed every 3 years –2016 does not require bird-safe, all electrification, zero net energy, and fire codes that are not as good as they are today.

Thanks,
Rhoda Fry



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Planning Commission
Meeting

February 27, 2024

Written Communications

Item #2

From: [Santosh Rao](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#); [Luke Connolly](#); [Chad Mosley](#)
Subject: 22777 San Juan Rd. Planning commission meeting 02/27.
Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2024 6:25:53 AM
Attachments: [3 a Vantage Point Visual Analysis.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.

Hello Planning commission, Chad and Luke,

I would like to bring to your attention the third attachment submitted for the 22777 San Juan agenda item for the 02/27 planning commission meeting. The doc link is below.

The visuals are nowhere in the vicinity of the subject property downhill view.

I don't understand how the planning commission signed off 5-0 on this without validating the impact to views of the hillside property from the valley floor actually closer to the target area such as from Alcalde Rd, San Felipe Rd, Merriman Rd, Mercedes Rd, Cordova Rd, Santa Lucia Rd.

I urge the commission and city staff to seek a revised visual attachment showing actually impacted views and conduct a study of the down hill areas to assess the impact to views and especially any potential reflection from large sections of glass windows in the proposed new designs.

Thank you.

<https://cupertino.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12698318&GUID=43C7A866-FBE1-4E03-8A94-87171FDCD4F8>

Thanks,
Santosh Rao









22777 San Juan



22777 San Juan



Planning Commission
Meeting

February 27, 2024

Written Communications

Item #3

From: [Peggy Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: 2024-02-27 PC Meeting ITEM3 - Annual HE Progress Report - Peggys Slides
Date: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 6:54:54 PM
Attachments: [2024-02-27 PC Mtg ITEM3 - Peggys Slides.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.

PLEASE INCLUDE THE ATTACHED PDF AS PART OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION FOR ITEM3 OF THE ABOVE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Dear Planning Commission AND City Clerk,

I would like this attachment displayed when I speak on ITEM 3 tonight at the Planning Commission meeting.

Thank you,
Peggy Griffin

ITEM 3 – HE Annual Progress Report, **Staff Report**, Page 4 of 4

In addition to the data collected by HCD, HCD requires an update on the activity conducted in the implementation of the Housing Policies and Strategies in the General Plan. This is reflected in both Attachment 1 and Attachment 2 (Table D). The City continues to support the production of housing, particularly affordable housing by providing technical support, and guidance. The City continues to allocate Community Development Block Group (CDBG) federal funds and Human Service Grant (HSG) funds to eligible and deserving projects. It also continues to implement its local Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program and the Non-residential BMR program. The funds received are collected in the City's BMR Affordable Housing Fund (AHF) and expended on eligible projects with City Council authorization.

Next Steps

These APRs will be presented to City Council in March 2024.



City Council DID NOT authorize the use of BMR Funds to pay off the YIMBY lawsuit!

ATTACHMENT 1 – Draft General Plan Annual Progress Report – PAGE 23 of 67, middle of the page

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY	Policy HE-2.2	Range of Housing Types	Encourage the development of diverse housing stock that provides a range of housing types (including smaller, moderate cost of housing) and affordability levels. Emphasize the provision of housing for lower- and moderate-income households including wage earners who provide essential public services (e.g. school district employees, municipal and public safety employees, etc.)	Community Development – Housing	BMR AHF	Con.	Not an action item. Hamptons (approved in 2016) provided 30 moderate and 7 Low Income units and Marina (approved in 2016) provided 2 moderate and 16 Very-low income units. Hamptons has a 10 year Development Agreement approved in 2016. Hamptons had a 5 year Development Agreement which has expired in 2021. A modification of the project is anticipated. Vallco SB35 project approved with 361 <u>267</u> Very low and 840 <u>934</u> Low income units in 2018. <u>Vallco/The Rise SB35 project has been submitted with modifications to increase total number of units to 2,669 units with 134 units affordable to Very low income households and 756 units affordable to Low income units in December 2023. 267 of these 890 units will be part of the City's BMR inventory.</u> FY 19-20, FY 20-21, FY 21-22, and FY 22-23 work program -
-----------------------	---------------	------------------------	---	---------------------------------	---------	------	--

Not an action item. Hamptons (approved in 2016) provided 30 moderate and 7 Low Income units and Marina (approved in 2016) provided 2 moderate and 16 Very-low income units. Hamptons has a 10 year Development Agreement approved in 2016. Hamptons had a 5 year Development Agreement which has expired in 2021. ~~A modification of the project is anticipated.~~ Vallco SB35 project approved with ~~361~~ 267 Very low and ~~840~~ 934 Low income units in 2018. Vallco/The Rise SB35 project has been submitted with modifications to increase total number of units to 2,669 units with 134 units affordable to Very low income households and 756 units affordable to Low income units in December 2023. 267 of these 890 units will be part of the City's BMR inventory.

ONLY 267 of the 890 BMR units controlled by City!

WHY??

WHY can't the City control them?

How do we know it's being managed properly?

Will they be able to dip into BMR Funds for non-city managed BMR units?