

From: [Jennifer Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: grenna5000@yahoo.com
Subject: Fw: A Totally Transformed Neighborhood in 10 Years
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 6:12:44 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.

FYI. This ties into the LOS vs VMT issue for Planning Commission meeting on Dec. 8, 2020.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Jennifer Griffin <grenna5000@yahoo.com>
To: CityCouncil@Cupertino.org <citycouncil@cupertino.org>; City Clerk <cityclerk@cupertino.org>
Cc: grenna5000@yahoo.com <grenna5000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020, 05:55:42 PM PST
Subject: Fw: A Totally Transformed Neighborhood in 10 Years

Dear City Council:

FYI. This area they are talking about includes the historic Shasta-Hanchett Neighborhood of Victorian homes that are protected under San Jose Historic Ordinance. I have a family member who owns a home in this area and another 1881 Victorian in Shasta-Hanchett that was owned by another family member. How can they take over people's homes in a neighborhood in San Jose by Diridon. Are they going to use eminent domain? How can the city of San Jose take over historic protected neighborhoods of San Jose to redevelop them into housing for other people? In what universe is this even fair or right? You are going to mow down row and row of protected historic homes (some from the 1870s and 1860s) to put up high rise apartment buildings? How are they planning on doing this? This is absolutely ludicrous! Public engagement, indeed! Let me take your house away!

Please see this ridiculous plan below.

Sincerely, Jennifer Griffin

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Catalyze SV <info@catalyzesv.org>
To:
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020, 12:47:52 PM PST
Subject: A Totally Transformed Neighborhood in 10 Years

From: [Jennifer Griffin](#)
To: [City of Cupertino Planning Commission](#)
Cc: greenna5000@yahoo.com
Subject: SB 743 and Streamlining
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 8:55:41 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:

I am very concerned about Sb 743. It removes ceqa protections that make sure that Developers have to provide adequate vehicle parking at their developments to Park the residents of their developments or the office staff of their developments. This is an attempt to give developers a free ride by not having to provide on-site Parking for their new buildings. This reality is not the way this "sleeper" bill has Been presented to the public.

It seems like an innocent departure from using LOS to VMT , but it is not. The literature indicates That this bill has other things written into it that the public does not know about. It is indeed A wolf in sheep's clothing bill and should be handled carefully.

It was signed in 2013, but the intent may have been to set up the state for the high density Housing bills such as sb 35, sb 330 and sb 50 which are beginning to show their true Colors from big money backer interests. Also, sb 743 may be associated with the ending of redevelopment Agencies in the state of California which happened at the same time.

Sb 743 is trying to do more things than the public knows about and has ties to the high density Housing bills and enabling developers to not build adequate parking. It may do a lot more damage Than we realize. It seems innocent, but seeks to streamline lot of things the public is not Aware of. We need to keep LOS.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Griffin

COMMENTS:

- VMT Screening – NO!
- VMT Threshold
 - Staff Report does not discuss Option 3-No VMT Growth and its result. Would like to see that discussed tonight.
 - ¼ mile instead of ½ mile
 - Retail – currently 50,000 sf
- Choose “Total Project Generated VMT” instead of per service population
- VMT Metrics - Possibly consider using 2 different VMT Metrics based on project size
 - VTA Travel Model and
 - Non-model “accounting method” for smaller projects BUT no size was discussed nor the pros/cons
- LOS - Maintain LOS in the General Plan as an analysis requirement
 - Keep it to assess impact fees during project review
 - The City should review the impact fees to ensure they are high enough to pay for the mitigations.