

FW: Jan. 27 2026 item 8.6 (afterthoughts)

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Wed 1/28/2026 8:09 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Nancy DePalma [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 6:57 AM
Subject: Re: Jan. 27 2026 item 8.6 (afterthoughts)

[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](#)

Thank you for hearing our concerns last night. I just wanted to share a few things with all of you. The forum of these meetings is so frustrating. Yes, you get to hear us, but.....not being able to respond to your committee conversation is so maddening.

I live at [REDACTED]. It is lovely. I feel like the owners take good care of the property, and the homeowners are full of pride in how they care for their homes.

That being said, the owners knew what they were getting into when they decided to take on this business. These are very well educated people.

When I moved into my home I believe my space rent was maybe 700.00 ish. It is now 1,122.83. We get increases every year of 3%. We pay our own utilities, etc. We manage.

When we only get a social security raise of (last three years) 3.2, 2.5, 2.6, we live with it. We have no one out there fighting for us to apply for help with our home improvements. AND, the 10% when the home is sold is so unfair. In most cases, this is our legacy. Homes are sitting for a long time before being sold because of the now high rents and the very high income information that is required. While sitting, the original homeowner is paying the monthly rent.....

So now, because this has been brought before you, will there be some compromise? Will our space rent go up 5% when we sell, that seeming like a good compromise? No, no mandated increase is where we should be. AND,

If park owners want to raise our rents for improvements, they must show us the real need and open their books. We need to know that this is a legitimate need and expense.

There was a lot of talk last night about affordable housing, even in the meetings prior to ours. Please, please do what is right vote no on these proposals.

Respectfully,

--

Nancy DePalma



FW: PUBLIC COMMENT: Opposing 10% Mobilehome Rent Increase on Turnover

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Wed 1/28/2026 10:34 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Tracy Fowler [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 10:06 AM
To: The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; 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>
Cc: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; vice.mayor@sanjoseca.gov
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT: Opposing 10% Mobilehome Rent Increase on Turnover

[**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 [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Mahan and Members of the San Jose City Council,

I am writing as a long-term San Jose mobilehome owner to express my opposition to the proposed amendment to the Mobilehome Rent Ordinance that would allow a one-time rent increase of up to 10% upon home turnover.

I purchased my home and moved into my park in October 2016, when my space rent was \$1,350. Today, that same space rent is \$2,199.75—now significantly higher than my monthly house payment, which is approximately \$1,200. These increases have already outpaced cost-of-living growth and materially affect housing stability for residents like me.

I am particularly concerned that the proposed 10% increase does nothing to address San Jose's unhoused population, despite housing affordability being a central justification for many recent policy changes. Allowing large rent increases at turnover does not create new housing, does not preserve affordability, and does not open pathways for people currently without housing.

In practice, this policy risks accelerating a troubling trend already occurring in many mobilehome parks: corporate buyers purchasing homes above list value in order to rent them to employees or hold them as investment properties. These buyers can absorb higher space rents in ways that individual home seekers cannot, pricing real prospective homeowners out of the market. Over time, this undermines mobilehome ownership as an affordable housing option and shifts the benefit almost entirely to park owners.

Too often, "market value" is invoked to justify rent increases without acknowledging how that market is being artificially inflated. When corporate entities purchase homes above list value—often to hold as rentals or employee housing—they distort pricing in ways individual residents cannot compete with. If the City relies on

“market value” as a rationale for policy, then the City must also play a role in setting reasonable boundaries to ensure that market dynamics serve public housing goals rather than undermine them.

This is a losing proposition for residents, for would-be homeowners, and for the City’s broader housing goals. It concentrates value upward while eroding one of the few remaining forms of naturally occurring affordable homeownership in San Jose.

I urge the Council to reject the proposed 10% turnover increase and to maintain CPI-based limits that balance fair returns with resident stability. I also support continued, meaningful engagement with mobilehome residents before any ordinance changes move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,
Tracy Fowler
San Jose

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

Fw: Your Constituency Says NO to "Housing Day" (Agenda Item Nos. 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, and 8.6)

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Thu 2/12/2026 9:18 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Sorry! I just found this in the Junk email.

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Raiyan Seede [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2026 4:00 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Your Constituency Says NO to "Housing Day" (Agenda Item Nos. 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, and 8.6)

[**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](#)

City Clerk Toni Taber,

Dear City Clerk, Mayor Mahan, and Members of the San José City Council,

I am writing to voice my public comment regarding the agenda items for consideration on the upcoming "Housing Day" (San Jose City Council agenda item nos. 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, and 8.6 respectively for the official records - please include my comments under each of the relevant agenda items). My specific reasons for asking for your opposition and adjustments are outlined below.

On the same day that you consider a vote to extend the Local Emergency for the Homeless Shelter Crisis; at a time when San Jose residents have listed affordability as the single most important issue; when homelessness has risen 4% since 2023 despite the city's investment into emergency shelters; the measures for your consideration prioritize market-rate incentives and regulatory rollbacks while failing to require permanent, deeply affordable housing,

deepening San Jose's homelessness, housing, and shelter crises. These measures undermine long-term housing stability and directly contribute to the very crises they claim to address. Please use common sense with your votes.

Ask: Alter Incentive Programs (Downtown Commercial to Residential and Multi-family Housing) So Public Investment Receives Public Benefit (Agenda Item Nos. 8.2 and 8.3)
I urge the Council to oppose the extension and expansion of San José's housing incentive programs as written, which continues to provide substantial public subsidies—fee waivers, tax reductions, and relaxed inclusionary requirements—while producing little to no permanent affordable housing. While adaptive reuse and increased housing production are the right direction, these programs overwhelmingly subsidize market-rate development at 80–100% AMI, often above current market rents; failing to serve the residents most impacted by displacement, homelessness, and housing insecurity. The outcomes of existing incentives demonstrate this flaw: projects cited as successes produced no deed-restricted affordable units, while higher-cost units continue to sit vacant and do not meaningfully reduce rents or homelessness. If the City is going to waive public revenue, it must require real public benefit—deep (30–60% AMI) and permanent affordability, community or nonprofit participation, and outcomes that reduce homelessness rather than expand reliance on emergency shelter.

Ask: Delay Vote & Direct Housing Department re: IHO. (Agenda Item No. 8.4)
I urge the Council to delay the proposed changes to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and require staff to provide data, modeling, and meaningful stakeholder engagement before proceeding. The proposal lacks analysis of how shifting inclusionary units to higher AMIs will affect affordability, feasibility, vacancy, or the City's ability to serve extremely low-, very low-, and low-income residents, and would likely result in units priced above market with little public benefit. These changes depart from the collaborative, evidence-based process used to create the current IHO and instead stem from limited direction in the Mayor's budget message, raising serious concerns about transparency and accountability.

Ask: Oppose Discretionary Changes to MRO. (Agenda Item No. 8.6)
I strongly urge you to oppose the proposed discretionary changes to San José's Mobilehome Rent Ordinance, which would undermine long-term affordability and increase displacement risk for some of the city's most vulnerable residents. Allowing a 10% rent increase upon vacancy or in-place sale—along with new capital improvement pass-throughs and an expanded appeal process—would destabilize mobilehome parks, one of the region's last pathways to entry-level homeownership, while shifting landowner costs onto residents and reducing home resale values. Mobilehome park ownership is widely recognized as one of the most profitable and recession-resistant forms of housing investment, with existing fair-return mechanisms already in place, yet the proposal offers no evidence that additional rent increases or pass-throughs are necessary. These changes contradict the City's housing stabilization goals, were rejected by the Housing and Community Development Commission in a 9–4 vote, and should not move forward.

We cannot continue to pretend that the direction the city is taking on housing is working, not when the data says otherwise. Unsheltered housing might be down, but without permanent, affordable solutions, our investment into temporary shelters becomes the last stop on the train because there is nowhere for these folks to progress to, all while the affordability crisis, unhoused crisis, and shelter crisis worsens. Please take a stand on "Housing Day" and demand we do better for our city.

Raiyan Seede



San Jose, California 95136

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