

FW: Council Meeting Jan-26-2021 Agenda Item 10.3

Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 1/26/2021 12:07 PM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Bert Weaver <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 9:50 AM

To: District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Council Meeting Jan-26-2021 Agenda Item 10.3

[External Email]

Dear Mayor and Council,

I ask that Council direct the Planning Director to assign a new staff member to work with the neighborhoods to find a mutually workable development height plan for the south side of San Carlos between Bird and Delmas and other DSAP amendment concerns that arise as more details of the amendment become public. We look forward to future positive and productive meetings.

Sincerely,

Bert Weaver
Diridon Area Neighborhood Group (DANG)
Delmas Park Neighborhood Association

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

January 25, 2021

Council Agenda 1/26/21

File: 21-137

Agenda Item 10.3

Sent via email

Dear Mayor and Council,

We look forward to working with the applicant to enhance the southern property line. And we understand that since there is no moratorium on project approvals in the Diridon area while the DSAP is being amended this project meets the existing standards. We acknowledge that except for the physical building, this use will likely have little direct impact for the neighbors on the block. They will be quiet, not drive cars and likely never leave the building alone.

The Subject for Council memo is “Delmas Senior Living Facility”. The staff memo Subject calls this a “Residential Care Facility”. When asked if this development would be age restricted, the response from planning staff was “no”. A Senior Living Facility does not mean that there will be medical care on site. A Residential Care Facility provides medical care and is not age restricted.

Please clarify - Does Council think it is approving a Senior Living or Residential Care Facility?

As neighborhood leaders who have spent decades reviewing and supporting dense developments in our neighborhoods, the process for approval of this project while the DSAP is being amended creates chaos. We know the proposed changes for the DSAP. We know this project will not qualify under these proposed changes. Our conversations about the DSAP amendment with the Planning Department about reducing developable heights next to existing neighborhoods have become disrespectful. As leaders who pride ourselves on working respectfully with developers, planning staff and council offices to support and welcome and new development in our neighborhoods, it is disheartening that we find ourselves unable and no longer willing to work with the existing DSAP amendment staff.

Planning staff declares that if heights are reduced on the south side of San Carlos between Bird and Delmas, it will contribute to San Jose’s housing crisis. This Residential Care Facility business is 1/6 of that area. This project provides only 4 housing units.

We need assurances that the Planning Department will not use the loss of potential housing at this site to justify maintaining their proposed development heights of up to 295’ adjacent to the existing neighborhood.

We ask that Council direct the Planning Director to assign a new staff member to work with the neighborhoods to find a mutually workable development height plan for the south side of San Carlos between Bird and Delmas and other DSAP amendment concerns that arise as more details of the amendment become public. We look forward to future positive and productive meetings.

We've heard that COVID is making community outreach difficult, that there now isn't enough time in the day. We agree. COVID is creating real challenges. But when used as an excuse for lack of direct community outreach to the surrounding neighborhoods by city staff, please note – the hours we spend reviewing the DSAP amendment is our personal time, not our job. It is our personal time that we give to our communities to bring a neighborhood voice to the table that welcomes change and development.

Thank you,

Kathy Sutherland
Diridon Area Neighborhood Group
Delmas Park Past President

Bert Weaver
Diridon Area Neighborhood Group
Delmas Park Past President

Sarah Springer
Diridon Area Neighborhood Group
Delmas Park Past President

Jake Lavin
Delmas Park Resident

Greg Felix
Delmas Park President

Patrice Shaffer
Delmas Park Resident

Kevin Christman
Diridon Area Neighborhood Group
Gardner Neighborhood Resident

Norma Ruiz
Diridon Area Neighborhood Group
Del Monte Neighborhood Resident

Bill Rankin
Diridon Area Neighborhood Group
North Willow Glen Neighborhood Resident

Mary Pizzo
Diridon Area Neighborhood Group

Gregory Plaza Resident

Edward Saum

Diridon Area Neighborhood Group

S/HPNA, Vice President and Director for Planning and Land Use

Laura Winter

Diridon Area Neighborhood Group

S/HPNA Past President

Harvey Darnell

Diridon Area Neighborhood Group

North Willow Glen Neighborhood Resident

We look forward to working with the applicant to enhance the southern property line. And we understand that since there is no moratorium on project approvals in the Diridon area while the DSAP is being amended this project meets the existing standards. We acknowledge that except for the physical building, this use will likely have little direct impact for the neighbors on the block. They will be quiet, not drive cars and likely never leave the building alone.

The Subject for Council memo is “Delmas Senior Living Facility”. The staff memo Subject calls this a “Residential Care Facility”. When asked if this development would be age restricted, the response from staff was “no”. A Senior Living Facility does not mean that there will be medical care on site. A Residential Care Facility provides medical care and is not age restricted.

Does Council think it is approving a Senior Living or Residential Care Facility?

As neighborhood leaders who have spent decades reviewing and supporting dense developments in our neighborhoods, the process for approval of this project while the DSAP is being amended creates chaos. We know the proposed changes for the DSAP. We know this project would not qualify under these proposed changes. Our conversations about the DSAP amendment with the Planning Department about reducing developable heights next to existing neighborhoods have become disrespectful. As leaders who pride ourselves on working respectfully with developers, planning staff and council offices to support and welcome new development in our neighborhoods, it is disheartening that we find ourselves unable and no longer willing to work with the existing DSAP amendment staff.

Planning staff declares that if heights are reduced on the south side of San Carlos between Bird and Delmas, it will contribute to San Jose’s housing crisis. This Residential Care Facility business is 1/6 of that area. This project provides only 4 housing units.

We need assurances that the Planning Department will not use the loss of potential housing at this site to justify maintaining their proposed development heights of up to 295’ adjacent to the existing neighborhood.

We ask that Council direct the Planning Director to assign a new staff member to work with the neighborhoods to find a mutually workable development height plan for the south side of San Carlos between Bird and Delmas and other DSAP amendment concerns that arise as more details of the amendment become public. We look forward to future positive and productive meetings.

We’ve heard that COVID is making community outreach difficult, that there now isn’t enough time in the day. We agree. COVID is creating real challenges. But when used as an excuse for lack of community outreach by city staff, please note – the hours we spend reviewing the DSAP amendment is our personal time, not our job. It is our personal time that we give to our communities to bring a neighborhood voice to the table that welcomes change and development.

FW: Item 10.3 for Council Mtg Jan 26, 2021

Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 1/26/2021 12:23 PM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Jake Lavin [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 12:15 PM

To: District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Peralez, Raul <Raul.Peralez@sanjoseca.gov>; Davis, Dev <dev.davis@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; Taber, Toni <toni.taber@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Item 10.3 for Council Mtg Jan 26, 2021

[External Email]

Dear City Council, I signed on to Kathy Sutherland's letter to encourage the City to develop a reasonable set of guidelines for how new development under the DSAP interfaces with the existing single family neighborhoods.

Honestly, I am amazed that we should have to argue with the City's planners that there should be adequate interface guidelines between new development and residential neighborhoods. What city allows a 0' setback with a 65' height limit next to property zoned for a residential neighborhood? This is the proposed interface for the Urban Catalyst project at Gifford and San Carlos. Fortunately, the property next to the project is currently an old commercial use, but this property will redevelop over time into townhomes or a small apartment building consistent with the zoning. At that time, we will be stuck with a very unfortunate and undesirable interface in which a narrow infill lot is trying to develop a small scale residential project next to a commercial facility built right up the property line. The planning professionals should be requiring the commercial facility to have a nominal minimum setback of 10' and require the commercial property to step down to an acceptable height (35'-40') next to the residential neighborhood. Are we crazy for thinking this should be the reasonable request of our planning department?

My other main issue - and this is one that needs to be solved for all similar projects throughout the City - is that there is no room for street trees next to the Urban Catalyst project. The Urban Catalyst building is praised for increasing the sidewalk width from 8' to 10', but the building then cantilevers the second floor back over the sidewalk, so that there is a total setback of 8' between the curb and the six story building. This is a horrible street interface for a small single family neighborhood street. Zero setbacks belong on big streets where the sidewalk is at least 15' so that trees can grow. Are we crazy for thinking that the planning department should be insisting on a better streetscape for these projects? How are street trees going to grow in the 8' being provided between the building and the curb? The City arborist has obviously been steamrolled on this issue.

We can achieve all of Urban Catalyst's objectives and good planning principles. We can achieve all of the City objectives for DSAP and good planning principles. But we ask that the Council send a message to the staff that it has to roll up its sleeves and provide some creative solutions. The neighborhood is otherwise very supportive of the vision and planned investment in west Downtown.

- Jake Lavin