From:	Flores, Michelle
To:	'[redacted]"; Le, Thai-Chau
Cc:	The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo; 2740Ruby Concerns; Tu, John; Chang, Chu; Arenas, Sylvia; McGarrity, Patrick; Reed, Jim
Subject:	RE: ref: Project # C20-012 & SP20-024- Email #2
Date:	Wednesday, June 23, 2021 5:37:52 PM

Hi Murali,

Thank you for comments. They will be included as part of the project's record. To follow up to your questions:

1 & 2. We encourage you to continue providing written comments about the project. Comments are shared with the applicant and will be included as correspondence for Planning Commission and City Council to view and use when making their decision. It is not within the purview of staff to advise on petitions or media outreach and their bearing on the review of the project.

3. Staff analyzes the sites proposed for the project. Encouraging the applicant to relocate or purchase another site is not within our purview.

4. The pavement is reviewed as part of stormwater to make sure it drains properly and is not directed to another property. The current plan set shows landscaping along the property lines surrounding the parking lot.

5. The General Plan designation may allow Private Community Gathering Facilities compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood. We need to review and consider the project as proposed for conformance with the City's goals and policies. We understand the housing issues facing California and have implemented or consider additional policies help create denser housing, but if a site may allow more than residential use, we have to consider and analyze those uses as well if it is included as part of the project description.

6. The permit for the project would include a condition for the operation of the temple, which includes special events. If a project is not consistent with the conditions of the project, it may be reported to the Code Enforcement department and the permit may be subject to being revoked.

Kind regards,
Michelle Flores
Planner | Planning Division | City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 3rd floor
http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

From: Muralidhar Pabbisetty [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 6:43 PM
To: Le, Chau <chau.le@sanjoseca.gov>; Flores, Michelle <michelle.flores@sanjoseca.gov>; Tu, John <john.tu@sanjoseca.gov>; Chang, Chu <chu.chang@sanjoseca.gov>; Arenas, Sylvia <sylvia.arenas@sanjoseca.gov>; McGarrity, Patrick <Patrick.McGarrity@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 1 <PlanningCom1@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 6

<PlanningCom6@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 3 <PlanningCom3@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 4 <PlanningCom4@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 5 <PlanningCom5@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 2 <PlanningCom2@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 7 <PlanningCom7@sanjoseca.gov>; Reed, Jim <Jim.Reed@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>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; 2740Ruby Concerns <2740rubyconcerns@gmail.com>
Subject: ref: Project # C20-012 & SP20-024- Email #2

> [External Email]

I had not heard back from the city so wanted to send a follow up to confirm the receipt of the email. I would appreciate an acknowledgement and also I would be happy to provide any clarifications necessary.

I thought of few more concerns that I wanted to bring it to your attention.

4. The parking lot (asphalt surface) close to fence line will create hydration issues for the tall trees in the neighborhood so I would request to project to provide minimum of 20ft setbacks from the fence line from all properties and plant large trees in the setbacks. This ask is consistent to all R-1-5 houses in this neighborhood.

5. Given the housing crises in California and reduced enrollment in public schools, any reason this incompatible non-residential project is being encouraged in a residential neighborhood? If there are ~8 houses built in the same parcel then it would be compatible project and will bring in new families with kids and contribute to the neighborhood.

6. How would the temple restrict attendance to just 300 people into a temple with a capacity of 3500 people?

Look forward to getting guidance and support from our city officials and elected representatives.

Thanks
-Murali

On Wed, Jun 16, 2021 at 8:22 PM Muralidhar Pabbisetty [redacted] > wrote:

> Dear Planning Staff, Councilwoman Arenas, and Representatives,

We have been evergreen residents for the last 14years and our motivation to move from Cupertino to evergreen was to live in a residential neighborhood and enjoy the benefits of staying in the suburbs.

About 2.5yrs ago we were notified about a proposal to build a temple in our residential neighborhood. We are a first-generation Asian family and Vegans so Buddhist temple felt like great news until we saw the scale of the project from the applicant Chris Larsen, a billionaire, and their lobbyist Canyon Snow. Besides dropping their plan to build an acre of underground parking in a residential area, most of the concerns that were expressed 2.5yrs ago still remain as of today.

Here are some primary concerns.

1. Temple has a capacity of 3500 people. (Temple - 750 people, Community Hall - 750 people and Courtyards - 2000 people)

2. The temple is located at an accident-prone busy intersection where accidents happen on monthly basis. This project would bring in 100s of cars creating further safety issues for school children who pass through the intersection to 5 schools within a mile radius, retirees, young toddlers learning to bike, and numerous bicyclists..

3. There are just 56 self-parking spots with an additional 15 valet spots for a temple of 3500 people capacity. The applicant is justifying the limited parking spots by saying they will restrict the attendance to 300 people.

Anyone living near a religious facility knows the impacts of large temples during weekends and religious holidays. We have shared these concerns with the applicant/lobbyist in multiple gatherings organized by D8, City, and 2 initial meetings organized by the applicant in both written and verbal forms.

2 weeks ago, about 2 dozen volunteers spoke with about 400 resident families and most/all of the neighbors expressed similar concerns captured above.

We need your guidance on how to make our collective voices heard and count: against this project funded by billionaire Chris Larsen.

1. Would a written petition with about 2000-3000 signatures from people who reside in the 2-3 mile radius help? Can you provide guidance on a template that would resonate with decision-makers
2. Should we reach out to the media to highlight the issue? would a protest in front of city hall help?
3. How can we convince Applicant to relocate to many other locations(10+ acres) within a 2-mile radius that would allow them to build a temple on the lines of Gurdwara?

I look up to our elected representatives to protect the interests of the residents against a

billionaire who is trying to use his influence and money to seek approval.

Please advice.

-Murali Pabbisetty

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