From:	Hai Chang
To:	Le, Thai-Chau
Subject:	Fw: Project No. PDC19-049 (WAT KHMER KAMPUCHEA KROM TEMPLE - 2740 RUBY AVE)
Date:	Wednesday, June 2, 2021 9:17:09 PM
Attachments:	Buddhist Temple - 300 families.pdf Sylvia Arenas_Temple Position Letter_Feb2020_REPORT CARD.pdf

[External Email]

Dear Thai-Chau,

I wanted to make sure my email below concerning the temple project also reached your inbox. I hope you will strongly consider that the head of the Temple foundation has stated to the media that their membership is roughly 300 families as of January 2020. I expect their membership will continue to grow over time. I ask that you consider that figure of 300 families (which is greater than 300 people; maybe 1000 or more people?) attending that site during major events as part of your analysis. How many cars will 300 families arrive in? Where are they all going to park?

The applicant documentation also states that they have designed the structures with an occupancy load significantly higher than their planned usage by 300 people. If they will only have 300 people max at the site at any time, why don't they significantly downsize the temple and community hall structures for a max 300 person occupancy load? That should make this project much more palatable for the community.

Thanks for your consideration.
Hai

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Hai Chang [redacted]
To: Michelle.Flores@sanjoseca.gov <michelle.flores@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: Sylvia Arenas <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; Patrick McGarrity <patrick.mcgarrity@sanjoseca.gov>; Nancy Le <nancy.le@sanjoseca.gov>; Victoria Lam <victoria.lam@sanjoseca.gov>; Councilwoman Sylvia Arenas <district8@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021, 03:50:14 PM PDT
Subject: Project No. PDC19-049 (WAT KHMER KAMPUCHEA KROM TEMPLE - 2740 RUBY AVE)

Dear Michelle,

I won't be able to join the community meeting tomorrow, so please enter my email comments and attachments into the project record.

I've reviewed the 2nd submittal documents, and as a D8 resident since 1997, I continue to object to this project due to its overbearing size and adverse impact on that residential neighborhood, and its gross design incompatibility with the character and style of the residential structures there. The current R-1-5 zoning and neighborhood character need to be preserved by city planners, and the community

residents must given due respect and vigorous consideration.

I have attached an email exchange with a San Jose Spotlight reporter who interviewed Lyna Lam who stated that the temple has a membership of roughly 300 families. This membership of 300 families was published in a media article about this project. In response to my email asking the reporter whether this number was a typo, she stood by this figure after reviewing her notes. 300 families could easily be the equivalent of well over 1000 people. I ask that planning strongly consider the impact of 300 FAMILIES utilizing the 2740 Ruby Ave site for events and festivities from the perspective of traffic, parking, noise, trash, and general disturbance of the peace in that residential community.

I have also attached a letter that Councilwoman Arenas sent in February last year documenting her clear position about this project after listening to hundreds of community voices. The letter is an excellent general summary of the broad issues, and I have taken the liberty to use it to grade the applicant on each of her points as a "report card" of their 2nd submittal. It is clear that the applicant has not addressed most of the issues in her letter, and I'm very encouraged that our councilmember has taken such a transparent and firm position in not supporting this project until the community's concerns have been fully addressed.

Please share my concerns with the project team in the Planning Department. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Hai Chang
District 8 Resident

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

Re: New Buddhist Temple - 300 families - typo?

From: Katie Lauer [redacted]

To: [redacted]

Date: Monday, September 7, 2020, 12:00 PM PDT

Hello Hai,

Thanks for reading and reaching out! You're correct that Lyna didn't speak at the meeting, but I called her and scheduled an interview ahead of the presentation.

I did check my notes again, and confirmed that she said their membership is around 300 families, so that isn't a typo. She said there are often not many people there during the weekdays, closer to 30 people. From my own experience, this is often a trend in many religious establishments – higher membership than daily/weekly attendance. However, I can't speak to how many are active. If I remember correctly, the fact that their current location is small is part of the reason for the new project, so that makes sense to me.

Thanks,
Katie

On Sun, Sep 6, 2020 at 8:05 PM Hai Chang [redacted] wrote:

Hello Katie, Quick question for you concerning your Temple article from January. I wasn't at this meeting but I watched a video that someone posted on YouTube of this meeting. I didn't see Lyna speak.

You mentioned that Lyna said that they had a membership of about 300 families. Could that be a typo in the article? Maybe it's 30 families? Their current location is very small, and I don't see how they could serve 300 multi-generational families there. And their new temple at 2740 Ruby will only have a capacity of 300 people according to their permit application. 300 people capacity seems to serve 30-60 multi-generational families. It's not adding up.

Please take a look and let me know. 300 families seems too high.

Thank you,
-Hai

[redacted]
D8-Evergreen

San Jose: Proposed Buddhist temple in Evergreen neighborhood met with backlash - San José Spotlight

San Jose: Proposed Buddhist temple in Evergreen neighborhood met with ba...

A proposed Buddhist temple in San Jose's Evergreen neighborhood sparked a contentious, nearly two-hour meeting a...

Re: Project No. PDC19-049, 2nd Submittal, 2740 Ruby Avenue, San Jose, CA
Annotations in BLUE by Hai Chang, Resident of District 8, June 1, 2021

SYLVIA ARENAS

SAN JOSE CITY COUNCIL | EVERGREEN • EASTSIDE

Dear neighbors,

I've done my research, listened to hundreds of concerned community members, and been briefed by the City's planning staff regarding the Watt Khmer Kampuchea Krom Temple project proposal. I've met with the applicant of the temple as well. I appreciate their desire to have their new home in our community, but it cannot come at the expense to our families.

As a Councilwoman, my job is focused on ensuring a fair and open process that supports the right of a landowner to build, but balances that with the right of the community to be part of an inclusive process for the planning of their neighborhood. I avoid taking early positions until I have finished all my homework – which I admit can be frustrating for concerned community members. I've promised you that I've been listening, and I have been.

I'm communicating to the Temple's developers that I cannot support the project as currently proposed – letting them know that there are eight issues of primary concern that would need to be fully addressed if they want my support in the future:

1) A design that more closely matches our family neighborhood feel – especially my concerns about the total size and also the features that undermine the neighborhood feel of the street and sidewalks.

FAIL - size of structures in 2nd submittal is still overbearing on the family neighborhood feel, and the design is still entirely out of character with the surrounding residences

2) The total size of the project needs to be much smaller, and if there is any underground construction it needs to be dramatically reduced and used for purposes other than underground parking. **PARTIAL FAIL - underground garage has been designed out; however, the project size is still too large, and structures are significantly larger than required for the stated 300 person utilization**

3) The clear need for a Construction Plan to minimize impact during the construction process and an Operations Plan that extends into the future. This operations plan would need to cover the number of events per year, the days of the week those events occur on, the size of those events, and the plan for parking. The plans must be comprehensive and enforceable.

FAIL - plans that impact the community adversely have been stated; however, there is no evidence that the plans will be enforced by the city

4) The need for a sound wall and landscaping designed to avoid harm to the neighbors immediately adjacent to the site. **PASS**

5) A significant investment towards street safety at the intersection. **PARTIAL FAIL - while investment in a traffic circle is planned, there's no mitigation for extry/exit congestion or illegal parking**

6) If there are environmental or traffic impacts, they must be successfully mitigated. We know there will be issues if the project goes forward – those issues need to be solved.

FAIL - Single entry/exit driveway from Ruby and parking lot design will create tremendous congestion on Ruby

7) There must be positive impacts in our community, including fair payment of fees. If the originally planned houses were built at this site, there would have been a park fee paid. This current proposal includes housing for 8 people to be living on site. The applicant should pay the same fees they would pay if they were building houses for these 8, which would include park fees that would provide needed funding for improvements at Groesbeck Park.

FAIL - positive impacts to community are still unknown

8) If the applicant wants my support, they need to address the concerns expressed above – and also bring the community into the process. They need to earn community support by incorporating the concerns of the community into the final proposal.

FAIL - there are still many outstanding community concerns in the 2nd submittal

I cannot speak for the City's Planning Department, nor the Planning Commission. The Department will continue reviewing this project for the spring and summer and then make their recommendation. The Planning Commission will either approve or deny the project in the fall. If there haven't been any changes and the project is appealed to the City Council – I will oppose the project.

Everyone deserves a place to worship, and I hope these issues can be resolved. The Planning Department has committed to provide at least two official city-led community meetings before they make their recommendations – and they have committed to me that they will notice much wider than is normally required (at least 1000 feet, not the normal 200).

I also have a commitment from Planning to host a meeting very soon with concerned neighbors and discuss the planning process and next steps.

I hope that the Temple's developers will use this time and process to improve the project and earn the community's support. If they do, I will reconsider.

But I simply cannot support the project as it currently is proposed.

Your Councilwoman,

Sylvia Arenas