Outlook

FW: August 26, 2025 Council Agenda Item 10.2: General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Mon 8/25/2025 1:23 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

1 attachment (50 KB)
8.20.25_SJ GP Review.docx;

From: Patricia Sausedo <[redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 1:17 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; district5@sanjoseca.govv; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: August 26, 2025 Council Agenda Item 10.2: General Plan Text Amendment

San Jose City Clerk,
Please accept the attached BIA Bay Area letter for the August 26th Council Agenda packet.

Thank you,
Patricia Sausedo
BIA BAy Area South Bay

August 25, 2025

City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St.
San Jose, CA 95113
Transmitted Electronically

RE: August 26, 2025 Agenda Item 10.2: General Plan Text Amendment to Amend Policy IP-2.11

Mayor Mahan & Councilmembers,

The Building Industry Association of the Bay Area (BIA), representing more than 400 members of the San Francisco Bay Area wide residential development and home building industry supports staff recommendation to designate the Planning Commission as the Task Force for the upcoming four-year General Plan Review. Utilizing the Planning Commission is a reasonable strategy to insure timely review, analysis and full stakeholder input throughout the process.

BIA respectfully requests that the Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement Department ensures General Plan Plan review process includes the following:

1. A central website/information point for all documentation related to the General Plan Update process is established to ensure complete access to information by all interested/stakeholder parties

2. The residential market rate & affordable housing development stakeholder community are included in all outreach notifications, Agenda postings, analysis studies, etc.

3. The highest level of transparency is applied for the General Plan Review process by the administration and Planning Commission

4. A minimum of a 4-week period to peer review staff recommendations and related documentation prior to final action/public hearings by the Planning Commission

BIA Bay Area looks forward to working with the City of San Jose during the General Plan Review and the opportunity to produce effective policy tools that can generate new residential development citywide to address the critical housing crisis.

Respectfully,

[redacted]

Patricia E. Sausedo, Director
BIA Bay Area South Bay Government Affairs

Cc: SJ City Council
SJ City Clerk

Outlook

FW: Michele Sanders 95123 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:11 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 9:01 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity [redacted]
Subject: Michele Sanders 95123 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Michele Sanders
95123

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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Katja Irvin 95116 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:11 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 9:04 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity [redacted]
Subject: Katja Irvin 95116 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

The General Plan is a critical document for various stakeholder groups in San Jose. Input from these stakeholders is important to insure that the General Plan is as robust and innovative as possible.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Katja Irvin
95116

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Marco Velasco 95116 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:12 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 9:41 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Marco Velasco 95116 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Marco Velasco
95116

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Ann Jeghers 95119 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:13 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United <[redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 9:50 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Ann Jeghers 95119 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Ann Jeghers
95119

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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Elizabeth Kabanek 95117 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:13 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 9:59 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity [redacted]
Subject: Elizabeth Kabanek 95117 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Kabanek
95117

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Dan Medeiros 95127 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:13 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 10:08 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Dan Medeiros 95127 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Dan Medeiros
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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Tim Zadel 95118 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:13 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United <[redacted]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 10:32 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity [redacted]
Subject: Tim Zadel 95118 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Tim Zadel
95118

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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Lynn Kamboj 95120 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 7:13 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 11:23 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity [redacted]
Subject: Lynn Kamboj 95120 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Lynn Kamboj
95120

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Debra Tucker 95125 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 8:18 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 8:12 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Debra Tucker 95125 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Debra Tucker
95125

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Laurie Alaimo 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 8:18 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 8:15 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Laurie Alaimo 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Laurie Alaimo
95112

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Cecilia Guzman 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 8:35 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 8:32 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity [redacted]
Subject: Cecilia Guzman 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Cecilia Guzman
95112

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Cindy J Ahola 95110 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 9:05 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United <[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 8:50 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Cindy J Ahola 95110 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

As a San José resident, I'm writing to urge you to require deliberate panel input sessions with key stakeholder groups as part of the General Plan 4-Year Review.

Our city spans 178 square miles and is home to over a million people. We are diverse in geography, identity, and lived experience. Replacing the previous cross-sector Task Force with a smaller Planning Commission—while perhaps more efficient—risks silencing the voices of community members most impacted by long-term planning decisions.

I understand that large groups can be slower to reach consensus. But meaningful input takes time and intention. If the Task Force is not reinstated, then at the very least, deliberate and structured panel input sessions must be required to ensure transparency, equity, and inclusion in this process.

San José's future deserves better than narrow representation. Please protect our community's right to be heard.

Thank you for your service and consideration.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Cindy J Ahola
95110

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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Jacqueline Snell 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 9:10 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:06 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Jacqueline Snell 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

No fair planning without residents' input.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline Snell
95112

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Vina Valencia 95127 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 9:25 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:20 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Vina Valencia 95127 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Vina Valencia
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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Stephanie D Vargas 95133-2063 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 10:07 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 9:41 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Stephanie D Vargas 95133-2063 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Stephanie D 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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Rebecca J Howarth 95126 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 10:18 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:11 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity [redacted]
Subject: Rebecca J Howarth 95126 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Rebecca J Howarth
95126

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Michael Richter 95130 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 10:22 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:21 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Michael Richter 95130 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

It is important that people have input into city policies.
For example, the city's decision to require apartment and condo builders to build less than one parking space per unit has caused parking problems in all the neighborhoods surrounding these large housing structures. If there had been more neighbor input, hopefully, the council would have recognized each unit would hold more than 1 driver and 1 car driver. The result is discomfort of San Jose citizens.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Michael Richter
95130

[redacted]

Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: James Marshall 95125 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 10:58 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:47 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: James Marshall 95125 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
James Marshall
95125

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Maria Hennessy 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 10:58 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:49 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Maria Hennessy 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

It seems to me that the City Council ignores the wishes of its various constituents. We are not included and the decisions fall to a small group of people who are more involved in making money from new construction of crowded housing or digital billboards unwanted by the general population. We need a broader base that is more inclusive.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Maria Hennessy
95112

[redacted]

Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Patricia Blevins 95118 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 11:24 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 11:23 AM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Patricia Blevins 95118 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Patricia Blevins
95118

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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Marjorie Craig 95127 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 12:22 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:16 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Marjorie Craig 95127 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

It is imperative that citizens have adequate representation of their community. The shrinking of citizens' Constitutional Rights will not be accepted.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Marjorie Craig
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

[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Dorothy Cassidy 95136 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 12:35 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United <[redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:34 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Dorothy Cassidy 95136 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Dorothy Cassidy
95136

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Alie Victorine 95111 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 12:49 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:44 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Alie Victorine 95111 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

The general plan is too important to not include important stakeholders.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Alie Victorine
95111

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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Rachel Martinez 95148 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 12:50 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:49 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Rachel Martinez 95148 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Rachel Martinez
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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Jan Soule 95124 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 1:00 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:59 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Jan Soule 95124 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Jan Soule
95124

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
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Victoria Jump 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 1:57 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 1:24 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity [redacted]
Subject: Victoria Jump 95112 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Victoria Jump
95112

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

—
This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via San Jose United
[redacted]
Community Working Together

Outlook

FW: Linda Chávez 95127 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Tue 8/26/2025 4:16 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: San Jose United [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 4:12 PM
To: District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; sanjoseunity[redacted]
Subject: Linda Chávez 95127 – 8/26/25 Item 10.2: GPT25-002 - General Plan Text Amendment

Dear San Jose City Council and San Jose Planning Commission,

Regarding the proposal to replace the broad-based, cross-sector Envision San José 2024 General Plan Four-Year Review Task Force (Task Force) with the smaller, less representative Planning Commission: To make up for this reduction in expertise, the Council should require that staff identify key stakeholder groups so the Planning Commission can hold deliberate panel input sessions with those stakeholder groups. Key stakeholder groups can fill in the gaps created by the replacement of the Task Force for the third Four-Year review cycle.

Why limit public views and other opinions other than your own? The people on these Boards often more than not come in with an agenda. often are too swayed by Politics rather than for the public good.
This planning must be treated with great caution. Because what comes out, leads to more questions.
We need an extra measure of charity and we need to listen to those who have different views. You need to be careful. Because once the city plunges into this who know if decisions will truly serve for the greater good..
The City should include people from the general population and not only the focus groups you need to allow individual input so you can get a broader picture, of the needs and concerns and not just certain groups who are not truly representives of the true population..

Please also consider incorporating language to ensure the use of the Planning Commission, instead of the Task Force, is an exception rather than a default.

Sincerely,
Linda Chávez
95127

—

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

[redacted]

Community Working Together