

Fw: Betty Lawler 95051 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:59 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 7:39 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Betty Lawler 95051 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Betty Lawler

95051

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Stan Ketchum 95127 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:59 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 7:24 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Stan Ketchum 95127 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[E ternal Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer
The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

Stan Ketchum

95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Maria G Reyes 95122 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:59 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 6:31 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Maria G Reyes 95122 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[E ternal Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

No one developer should have the day so as to what happens in our communities. As an elected official, your responsibility is to the community who elected you not to any one person. Also, has the city done an environmental study to see what any future developments will do to this community?

Stop the abuse to our communities. Listen to the community.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

- 1 A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Maria G Reyes

95122

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: RICHARD TARVER 95127 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:59 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 6:18 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: RICHARD TARVER 95127 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[E ternal Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.

Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

Richard Tarver

95127

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1 A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course

2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning

3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space

4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

RICHARD TARVER

95127

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Sharon Schuetze 95127 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:59 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 7:46 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Sharon Schuetze 95127 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[E ternal Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not allow a developer to take land for their profit. This is not acceptable. We, the people, need to have a say in the matter. especially when it goes against environmental standards.

This will set a dangerous precedent.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be

applied down the road to other types of zoning

3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space

4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Sharon Schuetze

95127

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Camillia Brennan 95135 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:59 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2022 9:42 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeOfMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Camillia Brennan 95135 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Camillia Brennan

95135

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Shannon Tuttle 95127 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:59 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 5:32 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Shannon Tuttle 95127 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Shannon Tuttle

95127

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Thomas Haney 95127 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:58 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2022 11:13 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Thomas Haney 95127 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Please do the right thing by citizens and not special interest of developer

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Thomas Haney

95127

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Doris Livezey 95129 3138 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:58 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2022 11:09 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Doris Livezey 95129-3138 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Save our Open Space – when it's gone, it's gone!

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Doris Livezey

95129-3138

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Myra Nava 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:58 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2022 9:34 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Myra Nava 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.

3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Myra Nava

95148

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: JULIE NUNES 95127 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:58 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 2:41 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOffice@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: JULIE NUNES 95127 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

DON'T TAKE OUR OPEN SPACE WITHOUT COMMUNITY VISIONING!

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer
The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

JULIE NUNES

95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Susan L Price 95128 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:58 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2022 8:58 PM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Susan L Price 95128 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

There must be public discuss and a vote when public land is considered for private use. Don't make exceptions for an individual developer. This pertains to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. How to use this land must be discussed and decided IN PUBLIC by City Council.!!!

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public

open space

4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Susan L Price

95128

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Jennifer Rutherford 95136 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 3:58 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2022 10:16 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOffice@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Jennifer Rutherford 95136 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

No additional comments

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Jennifer Rutherford

95136

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: 12/6/22 Agenda Item 8.4 Council Policy 5 1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:57 PM

To: Agendadesk [REDACTED]

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main 408 535 1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: tamsanchez [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Tamara Sanchez <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 9:50 PM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 12/6/22 Agenda Item 8.4 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[External Email]

Dear City Clerk City Clerk,

I ask that you join hundreds of community members and the Planning Commission by following the Planning Department staff recommendation for updating Transportation Analysis Policy 5-1 while rejecting the Alternative Recommendation that would facilitate development on Private Recreation and Open Space land. Send a clear message that one developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

I object to the proposed Alternative Recommendation because it is inconsistent with the city's General Plan and would facilitate development of huge parcels of open space without a community visioning process, such as is currently being provided for multiple other large parcels in San Jose.

The most immediate and obvious beneficiary of this harmful policy would be the owners of the 114 acre former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, which presents an unparalleled opportunity to gain publicly accessible open space for local communities as part of a community-centered visioning process for future development of the site. If the Council would like to consider allowing this site to redevelop, the city should lead a transparent community engagement process to determine how the development of

the site could meet the needs of its future residents, the larger community, and the city.

Sincerely,

Tamara Sanchez



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

Fw: Ralph Portillo 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:57 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 7:42 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Ralph Portillo 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[E ternal Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Live next to Pleasant Hills Golf Course. I do not think it's appropriate for developers to decide what happens to the open space that was designated to be a city recreational area.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.

3 Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

Ralph Portillo

95148

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Maria Hennessy 95112 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:57 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 10:11 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Maria Hennessy 95112 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Our city needs to maintain open space. The towering apartment buildings being built by rapacious developers will add to our population without the parkland and recreational areas needed to support this influx. People need to live healthy lives in our city.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public

open space

4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Maria Hennessy

95112

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Dina Vaz 95008 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:57 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 8:49 AM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Dina Vaz 95008 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Dina Vaz

95008

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Mary Umstattd 95130 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:57 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 4:09 PM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Mary Umstattd 95130 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Mary Umstattd

95130

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Sophia Dodson 95117 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:56 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 9:57 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Sophia Dodson 95117 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Sophia Dodson

95117

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Linda Ladwig 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:56 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 12:12 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Linda Ladwig 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Please do not destroy our neighborhood without community vision and input. This is one of the last large piece of property in Evergreen area and can be used to benefit our immediate Evergreen neighborhood with a community input.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

Linda Ladwig

95148

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s)

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Susan Orth 95126 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:56 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 2:05 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Susan Orth 95126 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Please do not a developer take away any more potential open space in SJ.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Susan Orth

95126

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Joseph kochanski 95120 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:56 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 11:11 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeOfMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Joseph kochanski 95120 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

People's voice needs to be heard before the developers.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Joseph kochanski

95120

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

[https //www sanjoseunited net](https://www.sanjoseunited.net)

Community Working Together

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

Fw: 12/6/22 Agenda Item 8.4 Council Policy 5 1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:56 PM

To: Agendadesk [REDACTED]

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main 408 535 1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: rjaime24 [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Rosemary Ramirez

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 4:07 PM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Subject: 12/6/22 Agenda Item 8.4 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[External Email]

Dear City Clerk City Clerk,

I ask that you join hundreds of community members and the Planning Commission by following the Planning Department staff recommendation for updating Transportation Analysis Policy 5-1 while rejecting the Alternative Recommendation that would facilitate development on Private Recreation and Open Space land. Send a clear message that one developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

I object to the proposed Alternative Recommendation because it is inconsistent with the city's General Plan and would facilitate development of huge parcels of open space without a community visioning process, such as is currently being provided for multiple other large parcels in San Jose.

The most immediate and obvious beneficiary of this harmful policy would be the owners of the 114 acre former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, which presents an unparalleled opportunity to gain publicly accessible open space for local communities as part of a community-centered visioning process for future development of the site. If the Council would like to consider allowing this site to redevelop, the city should lead a transparent community engagement process to determine how the development of

the site could meet the needs of its future residents, the larger community, and the city.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Ramirez

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area, obscuring any handwritten notes or additional text that might have been present.

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

Fw: ANA M GAMBELIN 95127 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:56 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 9:34 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: ANA M GAMBELIN 95127 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[E ternal Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer
The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

ANA M GAMBELIN

95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Sorin Florea 95138 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:56 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 7:52 PM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Sorin Florea 95138 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Sorin Florea

95138

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Hella Bluhm Stieber 95129 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:55 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 3:47 PM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Hella Bluhm-Stieber 95129 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Open space is very important for me. I am a trail patrol volunteer and have seen how the usage of our local parks has increased over the last few years. It is really important that we all have input when open space is planned to be developed.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public

open space

4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Hella Bluhm Stieber

95129

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: 12/6/22 Agenda Item 8.4 Council Policy 5 1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:55 PM

To: Agendadesk [REDACTED]

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main 408 535 1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: dan.haifley [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Dan Haifley
<[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 10:54 AM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 12/6/22 Agenda Item 8.4 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[External Email]

Dear City Clerk City Clerk,

I ask that you join hundreds of community members and the Planning Commission by following the Planning Department staff recommendation for updating Transportation Analysis Policy 5-1 while rejecting the Alternative Recommendation that would facilitate development on Private Recreation and Open Space land. Send a clear message that one developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

I object to the proposed Alternative Recommendation because it is inconsistent with the city's General Plan and would facilitate development of huge parcels of open space without a community visioning process, such as is currently being provided for multiple other large parcels in San Jose.

The most immediate and obvious beneficiary of this harmful policy would be the owners of the 114 acre former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, which presents an unparalleled opportunity to gain publicly accessible open space for local communities as part of a community-centered visioning process for future development of the site. If the Council would like to consider allowing this site to redevelop, the city should lead a transparent community engagement process to determine how the development of

the site could meet the needs of its future residents, the larger community, and the city.

Sincerely,
Dan Haifley



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

Fw: Haroon khan 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:55 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 5:52 PM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Haroon khan 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

We must have input on developing this piece of land

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Haroon khan

95148

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: 12/6/22 Agenda Item 8.4 Council Policy 5 1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:48 PM

To: Agendadesk [REDACTED]

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main 408 535 1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: neleonard [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Nancy Leonard
[REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 3:05 PM
To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 12/6/22 Agenda Item 8.4 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[External Email]

Dear City Clerk City Clerk,

I ask that you join hundreds of community members and the Planning Commission by following the Planning Department staff recommendation for updating Transportation Analysis Policy 5-1 while rejecting the Alternative Recommendation that would facilitate development on Private Recreation and Open Space land. Send a clear message that one developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

I object to the proposed Alternative Recommendation because it is inconsistent with the city's General Plan and would facilitate development of huge parcels of open space without a community visioning process, such as is currently being provided for multiple other large parcels in San Jose.

The most immediate and obvious beneficiary of this harmful policy would be the owners of the 114 acre former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, which presents an unparalleled opportunity to gain publicly accessible open space for local communities as part of a community-centered visioning process for future development of the site. If the Council would like to consider allowing this site to redevelop, the city should lead a transparent community engagement process to determine how the development of

the site could meet the needs of its future residents, the larger community, and the city.

Sincerely,

Nancy Leonard



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

Fw: Stephanie Brooks 95117 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 8:22 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Stephanie Brooks 95117 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

With population and housing increasing, we cannot afford to lose ANY open space

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Stephanie Brooks

95117

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: james Carter 95125 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 10:45 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: james Carter 95125 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

james Carter

95125

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Rosemary Kulpa 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 2:21 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Rosemary Kulpa 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Rosemary Kulpa

95148

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: William Wong 95135 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 8:19 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: William Wong 95135 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

William Wong

95135

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Lam Ngo 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 7:15 PM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Lam Ngo 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Don't take our open space without community visioning

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Lam Ngo

95148

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: peggy cabrera 95127 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 10:45 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: peggy cabrera 95127 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[E ternal Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

i may not live in this area, but i've always appreciated the open space area with the trees when i drive past this property. i have read a lot of community input opposed to the development of this property without having gathered community input first. this is one of the last areas in our area that has some semblance of nature in our environment. please be cautious about developing this land without getting input from the people who live around this property. it's only fair. the developer will populate this space with lots of buildings and roads, but will not have to live with the consequences of this growth.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust

community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
- 2 The policy change could have implications for other areas It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
- 3 Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
- 4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

peggy cabrera

95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Rosalie jackson 95129 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 8:18 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Rosalie jackson 95129 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-

led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Rosalie jackson

95129

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

[https //www sanjoseunited net](https://www.sanjoseunited.net)

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Henry Myers 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 6:48 PM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3 <[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED] District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6 <[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED] District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9 <[REDACTED]>
[REDACTED] District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOffice@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Henry Myers 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Keep the old Pleasant Hills Golf course recreational space for the community. Use it to expand Cunningham park and reopen it as the golf course that it was intended for. Building housing on the 114 acres will increase traffic and cause great increases in toxic pollutions due to increased autos fumes, This will also exacerbate climate warming.

PLEASE PROTECT THE PUBLIC!!!

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.

3 Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

Henry Myers

95148

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s)

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Henry Myers 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 6:48 PM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Henry Myers 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Keep the old Pleasant Hills Golf course recreational space for the community. Use it to expand Cunningham park and reopen it as the golf course that it was intended for. Building housing on the 114 acres will increase traffic and cause great increases in toxic pollutions due to increased autos fumes, This will also exacerbate climate warming.

PLEASE PROTECT THE PUBLIC!!!

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.

3 Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

Henry Myers

95148

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s)

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Lawrence J Cargnoni 95135 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:45 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 8:55 AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Lawrence J Cargnoni 95135 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[E ternal Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

All development must include community and neighborhoodhoods' input and feedback

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public

open space

4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Lawrence J Cargnoni

95135

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Yolanda 95148 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:45 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 5:49 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Yolanda 95148 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Members of the City Council, join the city Planning Commission in overwhelmingly rejecting the proposal of one developer's special interest in developing the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course. What ever happened to the concept of Preservation of Open Space in area that is already impacted.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

4 If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives

Yolanda

95148

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s)

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Ramesh Gunna 95129 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:45 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 8:04 AM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@cityofsanjose.org> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Ramesh Gunna 95129 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

I am strongly opposed to short cutting any processes or allowing special provisions without citizens input.

Please allow the citizens to participate, work with them & have a meaningful engagement with the citizens.

We are not living in an autocracy, this is democracy and DO NOT FORGET that.

– thank you

Ramesh'

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

- 1 A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Ramesh Gunna

95129

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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

Fw: Jay Kenshin 95116 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5 1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Thu 12/8/2022 2:44 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax 408 292 6207

How is our service? [Please take our short survey.](#)

From: San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 7:58 AM

To: [REDACTED] District2 <[REDACTED]> District3
<[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]> District 6
<[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]> District9
<[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> The
Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOff[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Jay Kenshin 95116 - 12/6/22 Item 8.4 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join ~1,000 community members in asking you to reject the "Alternative Recommendation", that is opposed by staff and was rejected by the Planning Commission, for the update to Council Policy 5-1. It would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land. One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course.
2. The policy change could have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
3. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
4. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15 acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Jay Kenshin

95116

You may not use my contact information for any purpose other than to respond to my concern regarding the topic listed above, nor may you share my address with any other organization(s) or individual(s).

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United

<https://www.sanjoseunited.net>

Community Working Together

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