

Provedor, Jennifer

From: Bianca Vallorz [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 11:10 AM
To: PlanningSupportStaff; GeneralPlanStaff; Ghosal, Sanhita; Cueto, Ruth; Ferguson, Jerad; carlos.rosario@sanjoseca.gov; melissa.bickford@sanjoseca.gov; louis.barocio@sanjoseca.gov; dilpreet.bhandal@sanjoseca.gov; charles.cantrell@sanjoseca.gov; daniel.cao@sanjoseca.gov; lawrence.casey@sanjoseca.gov; aimee.escobar@sanjoseca.gov; khoi.nguyen@sanjoseca.gov; pierluigi.oliverio@sanjoseca.gov; michael.young@sanjoseca.gov
Subject: No Urban Density Zoning In Cory Neighborhood

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Hello,

I live in Cory Neighborhood on W. Hedding Street, close to 826 Winchester Blvd. Cory Neighborhood zoning should not be changed to Urban Density for the following reasons:

1. Lack of parking- San Jose is not equipped for high rise urban buildings without providing enough parking. The Mercury News just reported that The Fay apartment complex was built for urban density and does not offer enough parking (fewer than one parking spot for every three units). People have chosen to not live there because of the lack of parking, The Fay is struggling with 60% occupancy rate, went through foreclosures, and now city employees are being offered housing at a reduced rate.

Additionally, Valley Fair parking already creates a nightmare in the neighborhood every weekend and especially from October-January. Residents of Cory Neighborhood who live South of W. Hedding struggle to find street parking and face issues with people blocking their driveways.

I have even witnessed people parking at O'Connor Hospital parking garage and walking to Valley Fair. People going to the hospital should not have to fight for parking!

This will only be a greater issue if Cory Neighborhood is changed to Urban Density.

Please don't make the same mistake in Cory neighborhood that was made in Downtown SJ. Do not change the zoning to benefit builders who want to turn our neighborhood into something that will not succeed because of lack of desired and needed parking.

2. Santa Clara City Concerns- Last year residents of Santa Clara came out in masses to San Jose's City Council meeting to voice their concerns with the high rises at 826 Winchester. Additionally, Santa Clara City officials submitted their objections. Urban Density should not be voted upon on the border of San Jose/Santa Clara without working with our neighboring city because Santa Clara's emergency services and Parks and Rec will also be affected. Additionally, residents of Santa Clara quality of housing/parking will also be affected.

3. Pedestrian/Bicyclist Safety- I have been struggling with the City to slow traffic and add more crosswalks across W. Hedding. W. Hedding/Redwood is a large and awkward shaped intersection traveled by many residents walking through the neighborhood to Valley Fair or Agrihood. My children and I have witnessed numerous car accidents in this area, many of which have not been reported to police and are therefore not on the city's file. These car accidents involve cars hitting bicyclists, pedestrians, destroying fire hydrants and street trees, and hitting other cars. However, the City is not showing concern for public safety and evaluates the concerned intersections during non-busy hours (not when people actually use the intersection). Creating an Urban Density will only greater the already existing concerns of bicyclists and pedestrians being hit by cars. Especially if people have to run across a busy street to find parking.

4. No Transit Hub- This does not exist in Cory Neighborhood, other than one bus stop on Winchester and a separate line on Forest. There are no light rail stations, train stations, or multiple bus lines to make this neighborhood a Transit Hub. The Bus station on Forest, by Valley Fair Mall is no longer operational. I suggest you ask VTA why they chose to close this line.

If you really want to focus on improving walkability and reducing car dependence, focus on adding a grocery store in our neighborhood or improving safety for pedestrians and bicyclists that commute along W. Hedding every day.

For the reasons stated above, I support changing zoning to Mixed Use Neighborhood, but not Urban Density, and you should too.

Thank you,
Bianca Vallorz

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

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: Theresa Do [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 12:58 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Cc: David Naczycz; Matt Savage; San Jose YIMBY
Subject: Letter of Support for Missing Middle Housing

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

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



San Jose
YIMBY

Dear Mayor Mahan and City Council,

On behalf of over one thousand members of San Jose YIMBY, we appreciate the analysis led by the Planning Department Task Force to unlock more housing capacity in the city. We know San Jose is a wonderful place to live, but housing has become increasingly unaffordable, and it's unsustainable to continue this way. Reassessing our public/quasi-public lands and increasing density in mixed-use and residential neighborhoods are necessary steps the city must take to support its existing population and build new homes for new families.

We urge the Council to adopt staff's recommendation to increase density in the identified neighborhoods as it will permit new families to live in these areas, such as teachers, healthcare workers, and young families. Let's continue to work together to build more housing capacity in San Jose.

Sincerely,

Theresa Do, David Naczycz, and Matt Savage
San Jose YIMBY

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

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: GeneralPlanStaff
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 9:02 AM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Subject: Fw: *NEW SUBMISSION* 4-year GP Review Email Sign up

David Fong, Planner

City of San Jose | Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
200 East Santa Clara Street, Tower 3rd Floor
San Jose, CA 95113-1905
408.535.8540 | david.d.fong@sanjoseca.gov



From: City of San José <webrequests@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 11:44 AM
To: GeneralPlanStaff <GeneralPlanStaff@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: *NEW SUBMISSION* 4-year GP Review Email Sign up

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

4-year GP Review Email Sign up

Submission #: 4902535
IP Address: 2a02:26f7:b361:4000:6800::7e
Submission Date: 06/22/2026 11:44
Survey Time: 1 minute, 54 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "*****" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

Full Name

Rolanda Pierre Dixon

Which topic would you like to comment on:

Urban Villages

Please leave comment.

I would like the Planning Commission to make sure that a fair percentage of the housing units are set aside for Seniors. As you get older it is harder to drive all over- an urban village would be perfect

Please enter your email if you would like to sign up for updates on the 4-Year Review:

[REDACTED]

Thank you,

City of San José

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

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

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: GeneralPlanStaff
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 9:01 AM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Subject: Fw: *NEW SUBMISSION* 4-year GP Review Email Sign up

David Fong, Planner

City of San Jose | Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
200 East Santa Clara Street, Tower 3rd Floor
San Jose, CA 95113-1905
408.535.8540 | david.d.fong@sanjoseca.gov



From: City of San José <webrequests@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 11:02 AM
To: GeneralPlanStaff <GeneralPlanStaff@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: *NEW SUBMISSION* 4-year GP Review Email Sign up

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

4-year GP Review Email Sign up

Submission #: 4896660
IP Address: 2600:1702:8450:10d0:24e0:2133:4b5f:b52f
Submission Date: 06/18/2026 11:02
Survey Time: 8 minutes, 45 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "*****" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

Full Name

Kelsey Colson

Which topic would you like to comment on:

Residential Capacity

Please leave comment.

I do not support San Jose's 4-year plan as proposed. Eliminating parking requirements for new construction is unrealistic and will worsen parking shortages, since most people still depend on cars. I'm also concerned about reclassifying all residential properties for multi-unit housing. Growth should be balanced with parking, infrastructure, neighborhood character, and quality of life, not based on assumptions that ignore real-world needs.

Please enter your email if you would like to sign up for updates on the 4-Year Review:

[REDACTED]

Thank you,
City of San José

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

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

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: GeneralPlanStaff
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 9:01 AM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Subject: Fw: *NEW SUBMISSION* 4-year GP Review Email Sign up

David Fong, Planner

City of San Jose | Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
200 East Santa Clara Street, Tower 3rd Floor
San Jose, CA 95113-1905
408.535.8540 | david.d.fong@sanjoseca.gov



From: City of San José <webrequests@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 9:44 AM
To: GeneralPlanStaff <GeneralPlanStaff@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: *NEW SUBMISSION* 4-year GP Review Email Sign up

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

4-year GP Review Email Sign up

Submission #: 4888990
IP Address: 67.172.176.202
Submission Date: 06/15/2026 9:44
Survey Time: 2 minutes, 27 seconds

You have a new online form submission.

Note: all answers displaying "*****" are marked as sensitive and must be viewed after your login.

Full Name

Debra Gordon

Which topic would you like to comment on:

Missing Middle Housing

Please leave comment.

I hope you guys are using AI for help with these projects? AI could speed up planning by: (1) screening parcels for redevelopment potential, (2) analyzing and summarizing public comments, (3) drafting reports, presentations, and meeting summaries, (4) modeling alternative land-use scenarios, (5) researching and checking compliance with state laws and policies, and (6) creating and analyzing maps/GIS data to identify opportunities and constraints.

Please enter your email if you would like to sign up for updates on the 4-Year Review:

[REDACTED]

Thank you,
City of San José

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

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

Provedor, Jennifer

From: City Clerk
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 9:04 AM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Subject: Fw: San José's General Plan Review and Missing Middle Housing
Attachments: San José GP Taskforce 6_24_26.pdf

From: Jack Farrell <jack@yesinmybackyard.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 6:46 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: San José's General Plan Review and Missing Middle Housing

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from jack@yesinmybackyard.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning,

Please find attached YIMBY Law's letter of comment for tomorrow's meeting of the General Plan taskforce.

Sincerely,

Jack Farrell *he/him*
Research Attorney

267-218-1147



[Check out everything we achieved in 2025!](#)

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

YIMBY Law

2261 Market Street STE 10416

San Francisco, CA 94114

hello@yimbylaw.org



YIMBY LAW

6/23/2026

City of San José
Planning Commission and City Council
200 E. Santa Clara St.
San José, Ca 95113

Re: San José's General Plan Review and Missing Middle Housing

Dear Planning Commission and City Council of San José,

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to ensuring compliance with California's housing laws. YIMBY Law sues municipalities when they fail to comply with state housing laws. Today we write in support of ongoing advocacy, urging San Jose to allow greater missing middle housing, exempt such housing from parking requirements, allow a FAR of 1.25 city-wide, and avoid imposing unnecessary setback requirements. In addition to the many local benefits increased housing supply will bring to your jurisdiction, we believe that Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, consistent with California Government Code § 8899.50(b)(1) requires greater availability of missing middle housing.

Government Code § 8899.50(b)(1) requires that "[a] public agency shall administer its programs and activities relating to housing and community development in a manner to affirmatively further fair housing, and take no action that is materially inconsistent with its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing." Cities and counties are explicitly named as public agencies subject to this obligation. (Gov. Code § 8899.50(a)(2)(B).) The duty extends to "all of a public agency's activities and programs relating to housing and community development." (Gov. Code § 8899.50(a)(1).) Zoning falls within that scope. The California Department of Housing and Community Development has stated in its April 2021 AFFH Guidance that "planning and zoning documents should all affirmatively further fair housing." (HCD, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing: Guidance for All Public Entities and for Housing Elements, April 2021 Update, at 17.)

The ongoing administration of single-family zoning in a high-resource, demographically segregated area is materially inconsistent with this obligation. Zoning is not a one-time legislative act. It is continuously administered through permit decisions, applications of zoning standards, and the denial of projects inconsistent with existing zoning. Each such act of administration is an action within the meaning of § 8899.50(b)(1). Single-family zoning artificially restricts housing supply and inflates housing costs in the areas where it is enforced.

The relationship between exclusionary residential zoning and patterns of racial and economic segregation is documented in HCD's own analysis of impediments to fair housing in California (HCD, Final 2020 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, June 2020), and is recognized in the AFFH Guidance, which observes that "single-family zoning emerged and replaced race-based zoning as a tool for segregating communities by restricting more affordable housing options" and that "exclusionary zoning policies have made it difficult for lower-income residents to access certain communities and in turn has had a discriminatory effect on protected characteristics such as race, disability, and familial status." (HCD AFFH Guidance, April 2021, at 6.)

Because income and race are correlated in San Jose as throughout California, zoning that inflates housing costs has a racially disparate impact in its operation. Limiting San Jose to existing single-family zoning perpetuates these exclusionary patterns and is therefore materially inconsistent with the obligation to affirmatively further fair housing under § 8899.50(b)(1).

While Government Code § 8899.50(d), provides that the section does not require or prohibit "any one particular action" in fulfilling AFFH obligations, this provision does not provide a defense. By its plain terms, subdivision (d) addresses the selection of meaningful actions to fulfill the obligation imposed by subdivision (b). It presupposes compliance with that obligation; it does not exempt agencies from it. An agency may exercise discretion in choosing among actions that affirmatively further fair housing. It may not invoke that discretion to defend the continued administration of a zoning scheme whose operation is materially inconsistent with the statutory mandate.

The City may also point to Government Code § 8899.50(c), which requires that the statute be interpreted consistent with HUD's 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Final Rule. The HUD rule's commentary states that the rule does not impose zoning decisions on local governments. (80 Fed. Reg. 42272, 42289–42290.) This language does not support the City's position. By its terms, it addresses the scope of the federal rule, which applied only to HUD grantees and public housing authorities, not to all California cities and counties. Section 8899.50(c) directs that California's statute be interpreted consistent with the federal rule, but the California legislature simultaneously enacted in subdivisions (a) and (b) a substantially broader scope, extending the AFFH obligation to all public agencies and to all activities and programs relating to housing and community development. A reading of subdivision (c) that imported the federal rule's narrower scope into the California statute would render the legislature's express scope provisions surplusage. HCD's interpretation of § 8899.50, expressed in its April 2021 AFFH

Guidance, applies the obligation to local zoning and is persuasive authority on the proper construction of the statute.

Housing Element Programs P-11 and P-35 specifically made missing middle a priority for San Jose, setting a goal of permitting 350 such units within the city. San Jose noted that P-11 itself is an AFFH implementation program. California's AFFH rules and San Jose's own Housing Element commitments support legalizing missing middle housing types, and narrowly limiting exemptions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sonja Trauss". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large, elegant loop at the end of the last name.

Sonja Trauss
Executive Director
YIMBY Law

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: Joseph Bugajski [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 4:08 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff; District 6; City Clerk
Cc: gillmor@santaclaraca.gov; kcox@santaclaraca.gov
Subject: Winchester Road Rezoning Proposal

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

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

Dear Neighbors,

I write in opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Cory Neighborhood that abuts Winchester Road between Forest Avenue and Newhall Street. I understand such a proposal will be on the table for the Planning Committee meeting tomorrow, June 24, 2026. I also understand that it seeks to change the area to an "Urban Residential" zone without parking spaces. This seems an unfortunate choice for our neighborhoods in San Jose and Santa Clara.

The housing density along the San Jose side of Winchester Road should reflect the housing density along the Santa Clara side of Winchester Road. Such development would improve the quality of life in both neighborhoods while encouraging business growth. Multifamily residences that feature pleasant frontage, nice design, and lovely walkways are most welcome. Any development, however, should increase the number of parking spaces in direct proportion to the number of new residents such developments might offer.

Winchester road frontage should feature pleasant walkways and bicycle paths from nearby neighborhoods to the amenities offered along Stevens Creek Boulevard, such as Valley Fair, Santana Row, and Winchester shopping mall. Good development should encourage growth while beautifying the area.

Our neighborhoods in this area of San Jose and Santa Clara would also value additional senior and lower income housing. We do not need denser property developments that lack access and means to travel to places of worship, shopping, work, and recreation.

Thank you for your good work on behalf of our communities.

Joe Bugajski
Santa Clara Homeowner

=====
Joseph M. Bugajski



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

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: Ken Hittleman [REDACTED] on behalf of Ken Hittleman
<hittleman@computer.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 7:44 AM
To: GeneralPlanStaff; PlanningSupportStaff; Ghosal, Sanhita; Cueto, Ruth; Ferguson, Jerad; Sandhir, Manira; Rosario, Carlos; Bickford, Melissa; Barocio, Louis; Bhandal, Dilpreet; Cantrell, Charles; Cao, Daniel; Casey, Lawrence; Escobar, Aimee; Nguyen, Khoi; Oliverio, Pierluigi; Young, Michael
Subject: Planning Commission June 24 2026 meeting: Options for PQP and Winchester Corridor voting

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Some people who received this message don't often get email from hittleman@computer.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

In the June 17, 2026, meeting, I believe it was Commissioner Young who requested that the PQP conversion recommendation be changed to allow voting for multiple options. I think this is a good idea and would like to see the Winchester Corridor zoning change also be made to allow for voting to select other zoning options where UR (Urban Residential) has been recommended. It seems there is support for other options, such as MUN and MUC, as a preferred zoning for these parcels. These alternatives should also be allowed to be voted on.

Thank you,
Ken Hittleman

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

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: Ken Hittleman [REDACTED] on behalf of Ken Hittleman
<hittleman@computer.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 12:54 AM
To: PlanningSupportStaff; GeneralPlanStaff; Ghosal, Sanhita; Cueto, Ruth; Ferguson, Jerad; Rosario, Carlos; Bickford, Melissa; Barocio, Louis; Bhandal, Dilpreet; Cantrell, Charles; Cao, Daniel; Casey, Lawrence; Escobar, Aimee; Nguyen, Khoi; Oliverio, Pierluigi; Young, Michael
Subject: Planning Commission June 24, 2026 meeting, agenda item 8 - Winchester Corridor

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Cory residents are not against additional housing; we are just advocating for additional housing that fits with the character of the neighborhood and does not destroy it. Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN) zoning would provide additional units while preserving livability for both the additional and existing residents. The proposed changes to MUN will allow 4-5 stories and a base density of up to 50 du/ac. Using the State Density Bonus Law, densities could be doubled to 100 du/ac (dwelling units per acre). This is plenty of growth opportunity for the Winchester Corridor.

A zoning of Urban Residential (UR) would allow a base density of 95 du/ac, which could be doubled under the State Density Bonus Law to 190 du/ac. That is way too much density for this area, and the increased traffic would be overwhelming and exacerbate the already existing parking problems as it is right next to Valley Fair.

Cars will be required by the 100's of new residents per building of added density in this zone. The claims that cars will not be needed for these new residents is ludicrous. There are no grocery stores in walkable distance. The Safeway closed in 2023. One cannot go grocery shopping on a reasonable budget in Valley Fair nor Santana Row! And the claimed Valley Fair Transit Center on Forest closed in 2021! The new residents will also need cars to commute to their jobs. Buildings with inadequate parking just do not work. Look at the Fay and other struggling sites recently in the news.

Rejecting UR zoning does not mean no growth. It is not a binary decision between outrageous growth or no growth. Please support reasonable growth — MUN zoning!

No other neighborhood has been targeted with these continued attacks on their ability to maintain its character and to survive as a livable community. It is not fair and should be reined in.

Best regards,
Ken Hittleman

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

Provedor, Jennifer

From: Kelvin Y [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 12:51 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Subject: Letter of Support for Missing Middle Housing

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Dear Planning Commission,

As a resident of San Jose, I appreciate the analysis led by the Planning Department to unlock more housing capacity in the city. Housing has become increasingly unaffordable, and it's unsustainable to continue this way. Reassessing our public/quasi-public lands and increasing density in mixed-use and residential neighborhoods are necessary steps the city must take to support its existing population and build new homes for new families. I support staff's recommendation to city council, although I wish the residential density standard is much higher.

Thank you,
Kevin

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

Provedor, Jennifer

From: Lindy Hayes [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 12:35 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Cc: Ken Hittleman; Greg Carlson; Joey Mauro; Mulcahy, Michael
Subject: 24 June 2026 Planning Commission meeting

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more<<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

I am writing on behalf of the Concerned Cory Neighbors group.

We are deeply worried about the latest proposed rezoning map of the Winchester corridor, as recently published by the Planning Dept.

staff. The Urban Residential zones are now extended from Beechwood to Woodland/Cory Avenues, promising destruction to a host of small businesses that keep our neighborhood vibrant and provide needed tax revenue to the City. This is a scatter-shot approach, and not a plan.

The idea is that individual landowners may decide to convert to housing, or not decide, and that this will all take place over a number of decades. This is hardly the way to meet the state deadlines for housing.

Our greater objection is that once this rezoning is done, it cannot be undone. Urban Residential is the most extreme of the three options available. The City cannot rezone down afterwards. We accept the idea that the City needs housing, that the parcels at 600 N. Winchester and

826 N. Winchester are vacant and cry out for the land to be well used.

We advocate for Mixed Use Neighborhood in our area.

thank you Lindy Hayes

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

Provedor, Jennifer

From: Lisa Miller [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 4:33 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff; District 6; City Clerk
Subject: Agenda Item 8, General Plan Public Hearing, Planning Commission Meeting on June 24, 2026

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

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

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We are long-term homeowners in the Cory Neighborhood and have some comments on the General Plan update.

-We oppose Urban Residential zoning and instead favor more housing at heights of up to 4 or 5 stories on the Winchester Corridor. A 4 or 5 story height limit matches existing structures in the area and better fits the scale and character of our neighborhood while allowing more density. Urban Residential zoning will also threaten long-term neighborhood businesses. Density should not be achieved on the back of the Cory Neighborhood.

-We oppose the special Urban Residential status for 826 N Winchester. It should be limited to 4 or 5 stories, as we favor for the rest of the corridor.

-The 4 or 5 story height limit is all the more important given that state laws allow developers to override the limit.

-We want to encourage affordable housing, but increasing densities and height limits in all of the city--especially on Winchester and in the Cory neighborhood--allows developers to build more luxury housing, whether single-unit McMansions or high-end multi-unit structures.

Thank you,

Lisa Miller & Paula Jabloner
San Jose CA 95128

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

Provedor, Jennifer

From: roldanluis0425 [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 7:06 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Subject: Letter of Support for Missing Middle Housing

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from roldanluis0425@protonmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commission,

As a resident of San Jose, I appreciate the analysis led by the Planning Department to unlock more housing capacity in the city. Housing has become increasingly unaffordable, and it's unsustainable to continue this way. Reassessing our public/quasi-public lands and increasing density in mixed-use and residential neighborhoods are necessary steps the city must take to support its existing population and build new homes for new families. I support staff's recommendation to city council.

Thank you, Luis Roldan

Sent from [Proton Mail](#) for Android.

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

Provedor, Jennifer

From: Lucas Spicer [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 10:49 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Subject: Letter of Support for Missing Middle Housing

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

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

Dear Planning Commission,

I am a resident of San Jose district 3, Naglee Park.

I appreciate the analysis led by the Planning Department to unlock more housing capacity in the city. Housing has become increasingly unaffordable, and it's unsustainable to continue this way. Reassessing our public/quasi-public lands and increasing density in mixed-use and residential neighborhoods are necessary steps the city must take to support its existing population and build new homes for new families.

I support staff's recommendation to city council.

Thanks,
Luke Spicer

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

Provedor, Jennifer

From: Melissa Miller [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 12:06 AM
To: GeneralPlanStaff; PlanningSupportStaff; District 6; City Clerk
Cc: MayorandCouncil@santaclaraca.gov; lgillmor@santaclaraca.gov; Kelly Cox
Subject: Oppose Rezoning on Forest and Winchester for high-density/high-rise housing

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more<<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

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

Ladies, Gentlemen,

I am a resident of the neighborhood across Winchester at Pruneridge. This means I am in Santa Clara, not San Jose, but that doesn't mean I won't be affected by the proposed zoning changes to the properties on the San Jose side of Winchester.

As I understand it, there will be a great number of lots zoned for high-density, high-rise housing. I also understand that there will be little to no requirement that the new housing be required to accommodate the cars of the new residents of these buildings.

Apparently the powers that be expect the new residents will go everywhere by public transit, and will not need cars. In the real world, in San Jose/South Bay, people have and use cars because they need to get around town on surface streets, and to go places on our freeway system. Our existing public transit system is barely adequate to the demands of the existing population. The reasonable estimated number of cars per apartment is somewhere between one and two. You can do the math to get an idea of just how many more cars will come with each new building—and there are so many new buildings proposed.

Many, if not all, those new residents will bring their cars with them when they move into their new high-rise homes, and will want access to their cars at will. They will park as close to their apartments as possible; if there is no parking at the apartment building, they will look for on street parking nearby. We can expect they will explore the neighborhood across Winchester to find available on-street parking spaces.

That's my neighborhood. My neighbors and I will not be pleased to have increased vehicle traffic on our quiet streets, parked cars jamming our curbs and driveways, and people walking through at whatever hours of the day and night. The choices made by the San Jose Planning Commission will affect us, the neighbors across Winchester, in Santa Clara as well.

The proposed zoning changes will profoundly change the character of our neighborhood, and not in ways that I look forward to. Furthermore, the proposed zoning changes don't seem to consider the impact on existing natural and municipal resources of clean air, clean water, sewage, capacity for road traffic, and congestion at peak hours.

The rezoning proposed is unsuitable for our neighborhood. Please withdraw this proposal.

Melissa Miller
Concerned Cory Neighbor

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

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: Michele Hittleman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 11:28 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff; GeneralPlanStaff; Rosario, Carlos; Bickford, Melissa; Barocio, Louis; Bhandal, Dilpreet; Cantrell, Charles; Cao, Daniel; Casey, Lawrence; Escobar, Aimee; Nguyen, Khoi; Oliverio, Pierluigi; Young, Michael
Subject: Planning Commission June 24, 2026 meeting, agenda item 8 - Winchester Corridor

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

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

At the June 3rd Planning Commission meeting, commissioners may not have intended to, but they spoke condescendingly to Cory residents who have never mentioned they don't support housing, and certainly have explained how they understand the need for more housing and how challenging it is to afford housing in San Jose. Cory neighborhood includes apartment dwellers, young adults living with their parents, multigenerational families, renters of houses, renters of ADUs (we have many ADUs!), renters of rooms inside houses, and more. We have babies/toddlers, children, teens, and older adults. It is folly to assume that Cory residents are all homeowners, all over 50 years old—although that may be the faces you saw at the last Planning Commission meeting because most residents, especially parents or those juggling multiple jobs and responsibilities, are dealing with busy everyday-life and could not easily attend the meeting.

I was further frustrated and disappointed in my city government during the June 3rd meeting when the Planning staff repeatedly mentioned a transit “hub” off Forest Avenue that no longer exists. This is the area inside the Valley Fair side off Forest between Beechwood and Redwood. It is unbelievable to me that the staff would not understand the truth about this—they obviously have never visited it on the ground or they would see that it is abandoned in 2021. This fact had been pointed out in previous communications from neighborhood residents to the staff! Prior to the pandemic, there were a couple of bus lines that ran through that area. For nearly 6 years that has not been the case. There is only a single bus line, Local 59, that runs along Forest with bus stops at the curb of Forest, and stops not more than every 30 minutes during commute hours and every 45-60 minutes at night Mon through Fri, and every 50-60 minutes during the weekend daytime hours. It is insulting to neighborhood residents to repeat the lie of a “transit hub” on Forest.

It is clear that planning staff and commissioners have not recently visited the locations that are proposed to change zoning to Urban Residential, or they would see how crazy this proposal is. 826 Winchester is another example -- come and see the two legs of this L-shaped property and you will realize how this lot cannot support Urban Residential zoning. We understand the need for more housing, but that doesn't justify trying to put it all in our neighborhood with a change to Urban Residential zoning simply because that is the only neighborhood you are currently considering.

After trying to be open-minded to the Planning Staff proposals, the only rezoning I now support for the properties in question in the Cory neighborhood is **Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN)**. This is because I care about the residents of Cory -- current residents in the existing housing structures and future residents in any proposed new structures -- and I care about the businesses along Forest and Winchester, how they contribute to the quality of life, and the tax revenue they bring to the city. Rezoning to anything other than MUN would have serious negative consequences for the neighborhood. It is not smart planning, and cannot be justified with the arguments that have been presented.

--Michele Hittleman

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

Proveedor, Jennifer

From: Seth Barberee [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 7:52 PM
To: PlanningSupportStaff
Subject: Letter of Support for Missing Middle Housing

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

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

Dear Planning Commission,

As a resident of San Jose, I appreciate the analysis led by the Planning Department to unlock more housing capacity in the city. Housing has become increasingly unaffordable, and it's unsustainable to continue this way. Reassessing our public/quasi-public lands and increasing density in mixed-use and residential neighborhoods are necessary steps the city must take to support its existing population and build new homes for new families. I support the staff's recommendation to the city council.

Thank you,
Seth Barberee - District 1 Resident

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