

Fw: 11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 10:40 AM

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: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 10:25 PM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Subject: 11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 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,
David Von Raesfeld

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

Fw: 11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 10:40 AM

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: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 12:08 AM

To: City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

Subject: 11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 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,

Helen Kupreichyk

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

Fwd: Steve Robles 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 10:56 AM

Subject: Steve Robles 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 listen to communities that are affected by your decisions.

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.

Steve Robles
95116

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Marvelyn Rocha 95127-2815 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 10:48 AM

Subject: Marvelyn Rocha 95127-2815 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

The development should be on a conditional requirement that 25% be open space, with another 20 geared towards ending homelessness (mini housing)

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.

Marvelyn Rocha
[REDACTED]

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Sandy Imai 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 10:39 AM

Subject: Sandy Imai 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Sandy Imai
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Violeta Perez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 10:26 AM

Subject: Violeta Perez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Violeta Perez
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Linda Odello 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 10:22 AM

Subject: Linda Odello 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Linda Odello
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Cynthia Jones 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 9:11 AM

Subject: Cynthia Jones 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Cynthia Jones
95116

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Cynthia Jones 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 9:10 AM

Subject: Cynthia Jones 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Cynthia Jones
95116

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Barbara Menge 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 8:57 AM

Subject: Barbara Menge 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Barbara Menge
95135

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Mary McLaughlin 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 8:20 AM

Subject: Mary McLaughlin 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 enjoy open space. My children and your children enjoy open space to run and play or to just relax from everyday life hustle and bustle. I do not enjoy to be surrounded by concrete walls that take away the beauty of this world and all the wildlife that call it home. STOP destroying what little beauty we have left in this world.

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 McLaughlin
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Joe Villa 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 7:49 AM

Subject: Joe Villa 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Joe Villa
95148

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Beth Villa 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 7:47 AM

Subject: Beth Villa 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Any development to the area will greatly impact our quality of life!!! The community must be involved this process.

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.

Beth Villa
95148

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Julie Will 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 7:45 AM

Subject: Julie Will 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Julie Will
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Raul Aldaz 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 7:18 AM

Subject: Raul Aldaz 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Raul Aldaz
95122

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Bruce Smith 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 6:58 AM

Subject: Bruce Smith 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 live very near the property in question and it should have community input not a developer exemption!

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.

Bruce Smith
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Jacqueline Marcoida 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 6:53 AM

Subject: Jacqueline Marcoida 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Jacqueline Marcoida
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Dina Pereira 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 29, 2022 at 12:11 AM

Subject: Dina Pereira 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 Pereira
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Mary Miranda 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 28, 2022 at 11:20 PM

Subject: Mary Miranda 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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!

Thank you!

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 Miranda
95122

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Richard Cota 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 28, 2022 at 4:44 PM

Subject: Richard Cota 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 800 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.

Richard Cota
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Ronald Miller 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 28, 2022 at 11:39 AM

Subject: Ronald Miller 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 800 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 close Reid Airport

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.

Ronald Miller
95135

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Jeannette Mestaz-Romero 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:46 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 28, 2022 at 10:01 AM

Subject: Jeannette Mestaz-Romero 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 800 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.

As the saying goes, people over profit. Please don't allow developers to dictate how residents live. East Side San José residents deserve clean and green space. There is plenty of unused commercial space throughout the City. Allowing this change, just to make an example for other areas is unacceptable. Especially when this is being pushed by two Council members who don't live in the affected area. This change, without community involvement, will negatively affect the health and safety of this community. From an equity standpoint, this change will take away green and open space, leaving the area with poor air quality, heat islands, increased traffic/air pollution, and a decrease in quality of life. Please don't take away what little the East Side has. Use other more supportive areas to build housing. And reinvest in unused commercial buildings instead of creating more vacant ones.

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.

Jeannette Mestaz-Romero
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--
Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Hoa Nguyen 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 28, 2022 at 6:08 AM

Subject: Hoa Nguyen 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 800 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.

Hoa Nguyen
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: RONNIE R DIRECTO 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 27, 2022 at 1:59 PM

Subject: RONNIE R DIRECTO 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 800 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.

RONNIE R DIRECTO
95116

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Jose Romero 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 27, 2022 at 7:02 AM

Subject: Jose Romero 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Jose Romero
95122

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Jeff Smith 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 27, 2022 at 10:40 AM

Subject: Jeff Smith 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Jeff Smith
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Bingyu lin 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 27, 2022 at 1:54 AM

Subject: Bingyu lin 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Bingyu lin
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Lyn Pebenito 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 27, 2022 at 12:34 AM

Subject: Lyn Pebenito 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Lyn Pebenito
95116

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Ken MacKay 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 8:26 PM

Subject: Ken MacKay 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Ken MacKay
95116

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Arvind Kumar 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 5:55 PM

Subject: Arvind Kumar 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

This parcel should become a public park/open space with trails and amenities and open to all. It should be vegetated with native plants to increase biodiversity and act as a carbon sink and provide clean air.

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.

Arvind Kumar
95148

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Tom 95127-1121 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 5:40 PM

Subject: Tom 95127-1121 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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 consider the community's input on land use decisions. After all, you are supposed to be representing the people, and not just those who fund your campaigns.

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.

Tom
95127-1121

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Jeffrey Wick 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 3:47 PM

Subject: Jeffrey Wick 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Jeffrey Wick
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Nancy Crummett 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 3:35 PM

Subject: Nancy Crummett 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Nancy Crummett
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Russ Van Dyne 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 2:08 PM

Subject: Russ Van Dyne 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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 always solicit and include public opinions and ideas to enhance all projects. Never limit or eliminate on site parking in all projects. If you do not believe it is necessary please drive throughout the neighborhoods in East San Jose. Families have multiple cars and multiple family members in a house or apartment mean even more cars. Public transportation is good to have but is inadequate when parking is reduced or eliminated. Thank you

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.

Russ Van Dyne
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Elizabeth Rosas 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 11:23 AM

Subject: Elizabeth Rosas 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Elizabeth Rosas
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Veronica Licon 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 10:06 AM

Subject: Veronica Licon 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

The Reid Hillview Airport is poisoning us every day from the lead in the planes. The pilots fly non stop with no restrictions over the EastSide. And the pilots are not professionals. The pilots are learning how to fly, and they fly over children, schools and homes.

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.

Veronica Licon
95122

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Linda E Lopez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 9:30 AM

Subject: Linda E Lopez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Developers are the only ones that benefit from building on this open space. Local communities dont need more housing that no one can afford. Say NO to development of former golf course.

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 E Lopez
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: John M Phelan 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 6:30 AM

Subject: John M Phelan 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

John M Phelan
95135

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Kaaren Powers 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 6:09 AM

Subject: Kaaren Powers 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Kaaren Powers
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Ashley Bowman 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 5:16 AM

Subject: Ashley Bowman 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Ashley Bowman
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Cathie Cisneros 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sat, Nov 26, 2022 at 12:47 AM

Subject: Cathie Cisneros 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Cathie Cisneros
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Ricardo R Chavez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Nov 25, 2022 at 10:31 PM

Subject: Ricardo R Chavez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Ricardo R Chavez
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Rebecca Rich 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Nov 25, 2022 at 11:43 PM

Subject: Rebecca Rich 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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 community input on any new development.

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.

Rebecca Rich
95135

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Lucille B Chacon 95138 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Nov 25, 2022 at 10:30 PM

Subject: Lucille B Chacon 95138 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Lucille B Chacon
95138

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Butch Meyner 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Nov 25, 2022 at 10:07 PM

Subject: Butch Meyner 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Development at that site would create a traffic nightmare

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.

Butch Meyner
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Susan Tao 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Nov 25, 2022 at 10:01 PM

Subject: Susan Tao 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Susan Tao
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: debbie garcia 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Nov 25, 2022 at 9:00 PM

Subject: debbie garcia 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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 leave open space alone!

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.

debbie garcia
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Megan King 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Nov 25, 2022 at 6:41 PM

Subject: Megan King 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Megan King
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Sherrie Escamilla 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Nov 25, 2022 at 6:34 PM

Subject: Sherrie Escamilla 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 800 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.

Sherrie Escamilla
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: HOLLY PELKING 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:47 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 1:31 PM

Subject: HOLLY PELKING 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

HOLLY PELKING
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: HUNG BA VO 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 10:42 AM

Subject: HUNG BA VO 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

HUNG BA VO
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Kay Mendelsohn 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 8:36 AM

Subject: Kay Mendelsohn 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

Kay Mendelsohn
95135

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Frank Chavez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 8:19 AM

Subject: Frank Chavez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

Frank Chavez
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Robert Reese 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 8:17 AM

Subject: Robert Reese 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

Robert Reese
95135

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Candelario Lopez 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 7:48 AM

Subject: Candelario Lopez 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

Candelario Lopez
95122

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Christine Azzopardi 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 7:00 AM

Subject: Christine Azzopardi 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

Christine Azzopardi
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Luis Cabrera 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 4:08 AM

Subject: Luis Cabrera 95122 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

Luis Cabrera
95122

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Norma Desepte 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 9:08 PM

Subject: Norma Desepte 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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.

Norma Desepte
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Tina Rivera 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 8:37 PM

Subject: Tina Rivera 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 700 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 just reject this. The reasons are many, you know them already. Make a positive difference and choose what is best for our community and what the community wants, say NO to the "Alternative Recommendation " that was also rejected by your staff AND the Planning Commission.
Thank you, Tina Rivera***

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.

Tina Rivera
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Sumit Wattal 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 7:46 PM

Subject: Sumit Wattal 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 600 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.

Sumit Wattal
95148

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Ernest A Gonzales 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 7:08 PM

Subject: Ernest A Gonzales 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 600 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.

Ernest A Gonzales
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Vina Valencia 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 6:16 PM

Subject: Vina Valencia 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 600 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.

Vina Valencia
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Bhavesh Sheth 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 6:15 PM

Subject: Bhavesh Sheth 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 600 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 shopping center

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.

Bhavesh Sheth
95148

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Vanita Sharma 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 4:47 PM

Subject: Vanita Sharma 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 600 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.

Vanita Sharma
95148

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Eric Cho 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 4:33 PM

Subject: Eric Cho 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join over 600 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.

Eric Cho
95127

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Cindy Barrick 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 8:28 PM

Subject: Cindy Barrick 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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 don't have enough water, electricity or space for more garbage. The streets are not designed for more cars by the thousands. I'm sure there are many other issues this build will cause. It seems that by adding more housing the prices will drop. If we look at New York or San Francisco, both of which are at capacity, we see that they are the among most expensive places to live. Just because there's a patch of dirt doesn't mean we need to build and exhaust what little resources we have left, especially without engaging 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.

Cindy Barrick
95127

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

<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Diana Wilkerson-Graham 95217 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 3:25 PM

Subject: Diana Wilkerson-Graham 95217 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Diana Wilkerson-Graham
95217

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Kathleen O'Neil 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 1:05 PM

Subject: Kathleen O'Neil 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Kathleen O'Neil
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: philip winterbottom 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 12:39 PM

Subject: philip winterbottom 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

philip winterbottom
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: stephen k rosenthal 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 12:36 PM

Subject: stephen k rosenthal 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

stephen k rosenthal
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Samuel Carrasco 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 10:55 AM

Subject: Samuel Carrasco 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Samuel Carrasco
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Daneen Matts 95120 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 8:15 AM

Subject: Daneen Matts 95120 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Too much has been developed without a plan! Please get organized before considering asking our precious 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.

Daneen Matts
95120

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Yolanda Chavez-Rossy 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:48 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 6:59 AM

Subject: Yolanda Chavez-Rossy 95135 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Yolanda Chavez-Rossy
95135

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Danny Garza 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 6:52 AM

Subject: Danny Garza 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Plata Arroyo will not support and Candidate now or in the future who does not support our Community and our ability to use the Community Voices we have on issues and Development that impacts our Community.

In Community Spirit,
Danny Garza

President
Plata Arroyo Neighborhood Association and Gateway East N.A.C.

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.

Danny Garza
95116

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--
Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Dalvinder Matharu 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 5:54 AM

Subject: Dalvinder Matharu 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Dalvinder Matharu
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Kathleen J Shanahan 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 5:15 AM

Subject: Kathleen J Shanahan 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Kathleen J Shanahan
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Denise Montes 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 4:56 AM

Subject: Denise Montes 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Denise Montes
95148

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Don Beckmann 95118 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 4:14 AM

Subject: Don Beckmann 95118 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Don Beckmann
95118

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Rosemary Vasquez 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 3:43 AM

Subject: Rosemary Vasquez 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

REJECT THE ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION THAT IS OPPOSED BY STAFF AND REJECTED BY PLANNING COMMISSION, FOR THE UPDATE TO COUNCIL POLICY 5-1

Policy change should not be driven to make change for a single property and corresponding developer.

114 acres of Pleasant Hill Golf Course should and must include community led involvement, concerns for the impact of an already highly impacted community. The city already has visions to develop in other areas community open space initiative should be in place and considered.

Thanks

***Rose Vasquez
95148***

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 Vasquez
95148

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--
Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Lorna Sumaraga 95121 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 20, 2022 at 11:34 PM

Subject: Lorna Sumaraga 95121 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Lorna Sumaraga
95121

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Lucia Mendoza 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 20, 2022 at 10:37 PM

Subject: Lucia Mendoza 95116 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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 repeat the errors of the RDA times. Community input is needed-this is our city too!

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.

Lucia Mendoza
95116

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Daniel Martinez 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 20, 2022 at 10:26 PM

Subject: Daniel Martinez 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Daniel Martinez
95148

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Susan Minor 95139 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 20, 2022 at 10:16 PM

Subject: Susan Minor 95139 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Developers are not your constituents!!!

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 Minor
95139

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Rachel Welch 95128 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 20, 2022 at 10:12 PM

Subject: Rachel Welch 95128 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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 community lacks free open space. Please keep our community green and climate friendly.

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.

Rachel Welch
95128

--

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

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

Fwd: Kim Graham 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

District 5 United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 12:49 PM

To: Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **District 5 United** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Nov 20, 2022 at 10:08 PM

Subject: Kim Graham 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

To: <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>

Dear City Council,

I join almost 600 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.

Kim Graham
95127

--
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United
<https://www.district5united.org>
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,
District 5 United
www.district5united.org

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

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:03 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 allow new development for this open space of the old golf course

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.

Quang Vu
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

Stephanie Vargas 95133-2063 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:03 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk
<[REDACTED]>

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 preserve open space. Over development creates congestion, traffic, impatience and crime. Consider turning this beautiful piece of land into something similar to Emma Prusch Park – community gardens, farm animals, fruit trees, community events, etc.

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 Vargas
95133-2063

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

Francine Gonzalez 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:03 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 San Jose's beauty!

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.

Francine Gonzalez
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.

Christine Smythe 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:03 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 really don't want more houses . The traffic is bad and we are so crowded already it is nice to have open space . Since the golf course has been closed for years it shouldn't fall in to that 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.

Christine Smythe
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

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:03 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Paul Pashby
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.

Colette Farabaugh 95148 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:04 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

The SJ Planning Commission has already rejected this proposal earlier this month. Please listen to the Planning Commission and follow their recommendations.

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.

Colette Farabaugh
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.

Sheri Sorensen 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:04 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Sheri Sorensen
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.

Camilo Valderrama 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:04 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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.

Camilo Valderrama
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.

stephen rogers 95127 - 11/29/22 Item 8.5 Transportation Policy 5-1, Reject the Alternative Recommendation

San Jose United <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:04 PM

To: Agendadesk <[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 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I join over 900 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 oppose the Alternative Recommendation, noting in the staff report: "One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive the direction of Citywide policy." I agree that if the Council would like to consider allowing the Pleasant Hills Golf Course 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.

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.

stephen rogers
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

11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 Council Policy 5-1: REJECT the Alternative Recommendation

Kira Od <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:09 PM

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

[External Email]

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am just a stupid artist, but it doesn't take much smarts to notice that San Jose is developing open space at an alarmingly destructive rate.

Humans are creatures of nature, along with other animals, and we all need open space to thrive.

Please adopt 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.

One developer's interest in one potential redevelopment project should not drive Citywide policy.

The proposed Alternative Recommendation is inconsistent with the City's General Plan, and would facilitate development of huge parcels of open space without a community visioning process, as is currently the practice for many other large parcels in San Jose. Should the Council wish 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. Refraining from developing the land presents an unparalleled opportunity to gain publicly accessible open space for local communities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kira Od

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

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

11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

Gary Campanella <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:09 PM

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

[External Email]

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

To the Mayor and City Council Members:

I am a long-time (46 years) resident of San Jose. In addition, I am quite familiar with the Pleasant Hills golf course having played there many times before its closure. It is a wonderful piece of property that provides needed green space in that part of town.

I write to ask that you adopt 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. I ask you to 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. This parcel 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.

Thank you.

Gary Campanella
[REDACTED]

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

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

11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

Lc boros <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:09 PM

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

[External Email]

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hi,

I live above the hills above area being discussed and I'm writing to ask that you adopt 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 it 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.

Thanks!

/lc

LC Boros (stega)

Voice Actor and Ranch Manager @ Purgatory Auto Works and Dinosaur Farm

stega.org / purgatory.org / boros.net / networkgirl.org

Instagram: @the.stega

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

11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

Elaine Gould <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:09 PM

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

[External Email]

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

[External Email]

In order to make SanJose a liveable city, it is very important to maintain as much open space as possible for its citizens and local wildlife. With that in mind,I write to ask that you adopt 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.

Thank you,
Elaine and Stan Gould

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

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

11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

Stacey Winters <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:09 PM

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

[External Email]

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

[External Email]

Dear Representatives,

As a San Jose resident who is concerned about habitat loss in our county, I feel compelled to speak about the need to be consistent and honor our city's General Plan.

I write to ask that you adopt 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,

Stacey Winters

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

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

11/29/22 Agenda Item 8.5 Council Policy 5-1: Reject the Alternative Recommendation

Chloe Van Loon <[REDACTED]>

Wed 11/30/2022 1:09 PM

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

[External Email]

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hello,

As a constituent, naturalist, and environmental educator, I write to ask that you adopt 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.

Thank you,
Chloe Van Loon,
San Jose

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

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