From: [redacted]
To: Planning Commission 1; Planning Commission 6; Planning Commission 3; Planning Commission 4; Planning Commission 5; Planning Commission 2; Planning Commission 7; Le, Thai-Chau; Flores, Michelle; Tu, John; Chang, Chu; Burton, Chris; Arenas, Sylvia; McGarrity, Patrick; mayormail@sanjoseca.gov
Subject: Environmental impact opposition to the temple construction at 2740 Ruby and re-zoning to allow it
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 10:01:54 PM

[External Email]

Dear San Jose Planning Commission members and other officials making decisions about the 2740 Ruby property:

We Jerry and Vicki Jeska of [redacted], 35-year Evergreen residents are concerned that the environmental impact of the Wat Kymer Kampuchea Krom temple would be extensive and damaging to our community, indeed devastating to the closest residents who have invested heavily in their properties.

We would like to add to the opinion offered below that more than one current homeowner is selling their property because of it. Residents realize congregants will park throughout our neighborhood. Traffic congestion and related noise post-construction in that already dangerous intersection would increase. The intersection area of Norwood & Ruby would have to be revamped to allow entry and egress to the property. Extensive sewage work would need to be done, causing additional misery for the existing neighbors. The quality of life for the residents would be considerably worsened. How can the proponents of the project allege that it will not have a tremendous negative environmental impact on the area? Neither the re-zoning nor the construction of the facility should be allowed. If the city has money to do that work, it has money to clean up Lake Cunningham and make it usable for the local residents who helped finance it.

FYI--With all due respect, please consider that many of the local residents will not be voicing their concerns simply because they feel the city will do whatever deep-pocketed and influential individuals wish anyway. We have heard that from many, such as our own next-door neighbor. We understand that the San Francisco billionaire who financed the land purchase has ingratiated himself with our mayor and the influential Carl Guardino, whose wife is working for the firm representing the congregation. People ask, "Why bother? The city politicians and other

decision-makers don't care about us and will do whatever they want for their personal associates. Politicians are corrupt." Those are the things we hear constantly. Now is the city's chance to prove them wrong, at least once.

Regarding the environmental impact of the project, the "Nextdoor" author of the following is totally spot on:

"NO" to PQP Rezoning/INCOMPATIBLE Residential Land-Use, "NO" to 15,000sf 4-Story High Building, "NO" to racial remarks toward our [already diverse n]eighborhood. Re-zoning to allow and construction of the
By definition, Environmental Impacts could be: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural, Geology, Hazards (traffic, safety, etc), Noise, Quality of Life, Urban Decay, Housing, Etc. This project DOES NOT meet the City of San Jose General Plan 2040 guidelines for land-use on many different levels! Over this past year, especially the few months with, our neighbors have shared their concerns with this project. After several reviews and community meetings, the neighborhood come to the same conclusion! The project has more NEGATIVE Environmental Impacts to this highly dense Residential Neighborhood (RN), than benefits to the community. This project is already driving out one next door homeowner in their 70's, another neighbor is considering selling because, they just don't want to see the value of the property goes down, and that their Quality of Life is threaten[ed] by this project. A group of neighbors of all ethnic background[s] has reviewed the proposal from the Applicant extensively, and it is . . . more clear that the project is completely "INCOMPATIBLE" in the dense Residential Neighborhood Zone fit for "6-home" previously approved. Here are some of the obvious reasons to OPPOSE: 1. The project does not meet several City General Plan Policies for land-use. In a letter from the City to [the] applicant on November 5, 2018. The City stated: "Given the site's location adjacency to existing single-family residence and completely surrounding an existing single-family residence, staff is concerned about the potential impact of the size of the project at points when the use is at full capacity". And that the proposed project may be inconsistent with General Plan Land Use Policy 10.8. 2. The attempt to REZONE a small parcel of land (RN Zone) fit for 5-6 homes to Public/Quasi Public (PQP) zone, to build a MASSIVE 15,000 sf, 4-story (60ft) high, is extremely inappropriate, and simply "OUT-OF-CHARACTER" for the neighborhood. This parcel is approved for 6 homes. 3. The MASSIVE Buildings/Structures with over the top design, and several large visible Garden Sculptures are "AESTHETICALLY" incompatible next to 2500sf homes, and only 14-35ft max high. 4. The facility designed to hold over 4,000 people indoor/outdoor, is definitely a major Environmental impact to this Residential Neighborhood. 5. The fact that the applicant had planned for an underground parking (DEMAND FOR PARKINGS), then added a bus/shuttle for their visitors from nearby elementary schools, MORE THAN SUPPORT the concerns from the neighbors that the scale of project is 10 times bigger than what the applicant led the City and none-neighbors to believe on paper. 6. A small entrance to the temple on Ruby Ave is less than 350ft away from the busy Norwood/Ruby stop signs. Neighborhood traffics, TRAFFIC STACKING, and PARKING overflow the nearby small residential streets are the INEVITABLE. How is this ENVIRONMENTALLY appropriate? 7. Neighbors had documents and complained about a similar similar project nearby that was much much smaller in size. It was even in a location that was not surrounded by DENSE Residential Neighborhood either: Canh Thai Temple 2532 Klein Rd: https://www.buddhistchannel.tv/index.php?id=65,12644,0,0,1,0,

https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2016/01/21/neighbors-say-buddhist-temple-in-san-jose-is-causing-a-disturbance/ 8. The operational plan from the applicant indicates DAILY ACTIVITIES from 9AM-10PM, and most activities are 2-15 days long… The plan also indicates “SMOKING AREA” most likely will be next to another neighbor's fence, and that “ALCOHOL” is allow[ed] on site! These [are] MAJOR HEALTH, SAFETY concerns on top of other ENVIRNOMNETAL IMPACTS that this project would bring. 9. The actual activities vs the plan on paper is 10 times the magnitude. The proposal is extremely deceiving! The temple currently operates at their 55 Sunset Ct, San Jose facility without any recognizable permit. They even had also violated Building Code. Please feel free to youtube search for “Khmer new year in USA” and note all the loud speakers. There are many from the temple @ 66 Sunset Ct and others. 10. Please note a typical activity from this temple previously. Note the stack of speakers ~40min in to the video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E8kJDJ10jGk&t=2403s On paper, the size of the project and the quiet, peaceful practice of this organization want . . . [c]ity [o]fficial[s] to believe is extremely deceiving! PLEASE HELP SUPPORT/PRESERVE our neighborhood. None are against the concept of having a nice, small, peaceful neighbors. THIS PROJECT IS JUST WRONG for the location, and have more environment[al] impacts to the neighborhood than benefits! This project threaten both our environment . . . and financial wellbeing. Unlike the wealthy applicant from out of town, the neighbors can’t afford to buy or take over someone else neighborhood the same way this applicant is.

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