Tsuchimoto, Colleen

7/23/2015

Supplemental Packet
Item # 7

From:	Napier, Michele
Sent:	Wednesday, July 22, 2015 9:10 AM
To:	Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Cc:	Sandhir, Manira
Subject:	FW: Planning Commission supplemental packet - Agenda Item #7 Packet #3

Please add this comment to your packet of supplemental comments for Item 7, Local Serving Uses, PC 7-23, and submit to me with the remaining comments. Thank you.

From: paforst@aol.com [mailto:paforst@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 9:03 AM
To: Napier, Michele
Subject: Re: Planning Commission supplemental packet - Agenda Item #7

Hi:
I am not in favor of further impacting the traffic and population growth of San Martin. This use should be an urban use, not a rural use. I've lived in San Martin since 1977 and served on the SMPAC in the past for 12 1/2 years.

Pat A. Forst
Forst Commercial Real Estate
1885 The Alameda, Suite 100-D
San Jose, CA 95126
408-260-2412
408-260-2413 fax
408-234-8127 cell
BRE # 00779824

-----Original Message-----
From: Napier, Michele <Michele.Napier@PLN.SCCGOV.ORG>
To: Undisclosed recipients:;
Sent: Wed, Jul 22, 2015 8:51 am
Subject: Planning Commission supplemental packet - Agenda Item #7

Dear San Martin Planning Advisory Committee and SMPAC Interested Parties:

Additional public comment letters regarding Local Serving Uses have been added to the supplemental packet at the link below for your review. Hard copies of all comments will be provided on Wednesday at the meeting. I'm attaching copies of the additional public comments referenced in this email as Supplemental Public Comments #2. Please see attached.

https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/Commissions/SMPAC/Pages/SMPAC.aspx

Regards,

Michele Napier, Planning Clerk
Department of Planning and Development
(408) 299-6714

Please Note:

We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 16, 2015. Our public service counter will be out of commission for approximately three days in Early July (tentatively from July 6- July 8, 2015). If you need service during this period, please call and make appointments with the project planner, plan checker or other staff. Thank you for your patience and cooperation.

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Kim Tran <kim_nt_tran@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 10:10 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Cc: Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Cortese, Dave; Supervisor Yeager; Haskell, Tyler
Subject: Thresholds for a Local Serving Use Proposed by Santa Clara County

Dear Ms. Tsuchimoto and Ms. Sandhir:
This e-mail is to urge the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors NOT TO REDUCE THE BUILDING SIZE LIMIT OF THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS for the following reasons:

1. Religion clearly plays an important role in American life. Most Americans believe in a deity, three-fourths pray at least weekly, and more than half attend religious services at least monthly. Increasing in population requires larger churches and temples.
2. Population increases and so do crimes. We need to build more religious institutions large enough to provide spiritual places with comfortable facilities to attract the youths to come after schools and the weekends to meet other good kids. Together they learn compassion in order to love and respect each others, not to fight and kill each others. Hence, the crimes will be reduced and the communities are safer and more peaceful to live. The crime reduction surely saves the county and communities lots of money.
3. Churches and temples are the efficient places for the politicians to visit during the election years. Reducing the building size limit of churches and temples may limit the chances for the politicians to visit the churches and temples since there are not enough rooms.
4. The ordinances are created to serve the communities better in the 21st century, not to impede them .

To serve the communities in the Santa Clara County better we urge the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors not to reduce the building size limit of the religious institutions, and increase it instead.

Wishing you and your loved ones a happy summer.

Best Regards,
Kim Tran
408-242-5427

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Fawnvinh <fawnvinh@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 6:30 PM
To: Sandhir, Manira
Cc: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Eastwood, Rob; Pianca, Elizabeth
Subject: Re: UPCOMING ZONE/SCCOUNTY on 7/23/2015

BTW, our community is curious as to the reasons and/or motivations in this new proposed ordinance. Please help enlighten us. Thank you.

Fawn Vinh

On Jul 21, 2015, at 3:04 PM, Fawnvinh <fawnvinh@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Thank you for responding so quickly. Although, for different purposes and reasons in practicing religion and doing business, we hope that we would not be limited to our neighborhood only. That was probably practiced in the old ages where villagers did not have decent transportation to travel outside if their immediate villages. We have come a long way since then in our abilities to travel, to communicate, to transact business, to practice our faith.

The citizens in this county, the Silicon Valley, takes pride in our advance technology, ability, and intelligence. We can definitely think for ourselves.

Take care.

Fawn Vinh

On Jul 21, 2015, at 2:55 PM, Sandhir, Manira <Manira.Sandhir@pln.sccgov.org> wrote:

Dear Ms. Vinh:

"sized to be local serving" would mean something that is compatible with the neighborhood because it has a size, scale and intensity consistent with the surrounding rural areas. The proposed Local Serving Data document identifies in numerical terms what that should ideally look like in terms of building size and maximum number of people.

Hope this helps. Please let us know if you have further questions.

Best regards,

Manira Sandhir, AICP
Planner II, Santa Clara County
(408) 299-5787

Please Note:
We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 17, 2015.

From: Fawnvinh [mailto:fawnvinh@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 2:39 PM

To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Subject: Fwd: UPCOMING ZONE/SCCOUNTY on 7/23/2015

Hi,

With all due respect, will you explain and help me understand your reference to 'sized to be local-serving in nature' below?

Thank you.

Fawn Vinh

<image001.jpg>
<image002.jpg>
Sent from my iPad

On Jul 21, 2015, at 2:22 PM, Fawnvinh <fawnvinh@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

> Good to hear from you Mike!
> Any help you can provide for us citizens would be greatly appreciated. Take care Mike.
>
> Fawn Vinh
>
> On Jul 21, 2015, at 2:20 PM, Donohoe, Mike <Mike.Donohoe@BOS.SCCGOV.ORG> wrote:
>
> Thanks Fawn!
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jul 21, 2015, at 2:18 PM, Fawnvinh <fawnvinh@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>
> Hi,
>
> In regards to the upcoming meeting on the County-wide Zoning, we asked that you please take into consideration of the following concerns from many of the residents in this County particularly the places of worship:
>
> 1. The limitation of the square footage on the buildings would put a limitation on the when and the amount of people that can go to their place of worship for prayers, services, meditations, reflections, repents, etc...by extension, it would be a huge discouragement for our citizens to practice positive actions, thus may cause said citizens to take actions that would have a terrible and negative impact on themselves and/or their neighborhood and their community.
>
> 2. Different religions have different traditions and practices. For example, people go to churches, sit on the benches to do their worship/prayers...however,

people who attends temples/meditation facilities/institutions, they take bows. Certain practices, the bows are done with the whole body on the ground with their arms and legs stretched out...this type of practices requires much more space. The limitation of square footage in these buildings would then greatly limits the amount of people that can attend their worshipping sessions...more so then the amount of people attending churches...for this simple reason alone, I wonder if it would raise the question of discrimination and/or freedom of practicing one's religion...also, if there is this limitation, then the County may have to allow more land/places for more churches/temples to be built.

3. The idea of limiting the amount of people that a commercial practice/institution can accept on a daily basis is outrageous. This country, this county, this economy is built on the freedom of exercise our rights as citizens. For the government to step in and tell us when/where we can and cannot go/do/practice and/or transact our daily business as well as our personal business is unthinkable. This is a violation of our Amendments of the Constitution.

As representatives of this County, we're sure that you are aware that the people you represent in this County are educated, knowledgeable, intelligent, hard working, etc...they need and deserve your support, your consideration, and your belief in them that they know how to take care of themselves and their families, what is best for themselves and their families, where they can practice their religion and their beliefs to help them build a solid foundation for their families, thus by extension, their community and their county and country.

We urge you to not take away the ability for the people to live their lives and support their families...if anything, encourage the people to attend churches/temples/meditate regularly and more often...this is a tremendously positive practice then imposing limitations...if the people have a good, calm, peaceful spiritual life, then we as the community will also benefit from it.

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Kim-Anh Nguyen <kimanh00.1999@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 6:11 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Cc: Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Cortese, Dave; Supervisor Yeager; Haskell, Tyler
Subject: File 10571-14FCP-15GP-15Z, General Plan & Zoning Ordinance Updates for Local Serving Uses in Rural Districts

Dear Ms. Tsuchimoto, Ms. Sandhir:

We have heard recently of County of Santa Clara's proposed amendments to the county's General Plan & Zoning ordinance addressing local serving policy provisions of the rural unincorporated areas of the county, also known as "Local Serving Data". The proposed ordinance, if adopted, will limit the number of people attending and the building square footage.

Our concern is particularly the impact to all religious institutions this ordinance will create. One of the rights and freedoms we cherish as Americans is the freedom to worship our faith. As taxpayers, it is our expectation that governments at all levels, whether federal, state, county or local, shall support this freedom of worship so that we may attend any churches or temples anywhere we choose to go to, whether to a rural area or a densely populated city, and not be restricted in any way.

Please take our concern into consideration and do the right thing for all the people in our county.

Thank you for your understanding and support in this matter.

Respectfully,

Kim-Anh Nguyen

Santa County resident since 1996

706 West Sunnyoaks avenue, Campbell, CA 95008

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Ivy Nga Vuong <ivyvuong@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 5:57 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira; Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Cortese, Dave; Supervisor Yeager; Haskell, Tyler
Subject: Objection to institutional threshold (75th Percentile) for local-serving - 7/21/2015

Dear Ms. Tsuchimoto, Ms. Sandhir and the planning Committee,

My name is Ivy. I have reviewed the modified exhibits for the RLU57 amendment Local Serving Policy Provisions.

With this modification, our community will not be free to to practice our religion. We won't be able go to the temple as we wish to go. The temple has invested many resources into the construction process and they have revised the architecture drawings.

We are tax payers and want our contributions to be widely used, but the new amendment will ruin our plans.

This is unreasonable and we believe it and violates our right to practice our religion at the location we wish to attend.

We urge the Planning Committee to reconsider all the changes and to avoid all the negative impact.

Respectfully yours,
Ivy Vuong
ivyvuong@gmail.com
408.605.6366

.....
.....
Ivy Vuong | Flowers by Ivy
392 E. Santa Clara St.
San Jose, CA 95113
p: 408.605.6366 | f: 408.993.8280

Follow us on Facebook, Pinterest, and Flickr

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: steven lam-dien tran <steven.tranld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 5:20 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Cc: Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Cortese, Dave; Supervisor Yeager; Haskell, Tyler
Subject: Objection to institutional threshold (75th Percentile) for local-serving

Dear Ms Tsuchimoto, Ms Sandhir et al,

I recently learn about a disturbing zoning ordinance amendment regarding the institutional threshold (75th Percentile) for local-serving. As a Santa Clara resident, I'd like to express my strong disagreement with the amendment. Under this amendment, religious and non-profit institutions will be subject to a limited number of people (50-70 daily and 220-320 for special events) who can attend the institutions. This limitation is unheard of anywhere and I believe it conflicts with my freedom of religion where I should be allowed to attend any religious institution without restriction from the government.

I truly urge the Planning Commission to reconsider the changes to exclude the religious and non-profit institutions from the regulations.

Thank you,

Steven Tran
766 Shetland Ct
San Jose, CA 95127

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Donohoe, Mike
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 3:29 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Cc: Napier, Michele
Subject: FW: Planning Commission Issue
Attachments: JulyPC Supplemento Memo Final 7-13-15(1).pdf

Hi Colleen-
A resident contacted Supervisor Cortese about the Local Serving Policy Provisions. Since he can't attend on Thursday he'd like his comments to be included as part of the original record.

Thanks
Mike

Mike Donohoe
Policy Aide
Office of Supervisor Dave Cortese
(408) 299-5030
Like Dave on Facebook https://www.facebook.com/davecortesegov
Follow Dave on Twitter https://twitter.com/SupDaveCortese

From: ken_bic [mailto:kenbic@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 1:03 PM
To: Donohoe, Mike
Cc: Chon Nguyen
Subject: Re: Planning Commission Issue

Hi Mr. Donohoe,

Since I won't be able to make the hearing on the 23rd., please relay my concern about the religious institution of the Rural Thresholds for Local-Serving indicators (proposed in Table 2.2). It restricts the building footage square to less than 8500 square foot, it also limit to less than 250 people for an event.
A religious institution needs more square foot (>10,000) and more people (larger than 250 people) for a religious event.

Respectfully yours,
Khanh Trieu
2554 Glen Dundee way, San Jose, CA

From: "Donohoe, Mike" <Mike.Donohoe@BOS.SCCGOV.ORG>
To: "kenbic@yahoo.com" <kenbic@yahoo.com>
Cc: "Cortese, Dave" <Dave.Cortese@BOS.SCCGOV.ORG>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 11:40 AM
Subject: Planning Commission Issue

Dear Mr. Khanh Trieu

Thanks for letting Supervisor Cortese know of your concern with the proposal before the Planning Commission on the local serving policy provisions. I want you to understand this is not an item that is before the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission will make a determination on this now. After deliberations by the Commission the next steps will be taken. Are you able to attend the hearing on the 23rd to provide testimony against this? If not you can forward your concerns to me and I will make sure it is added to the public response and becomes part of the official record.

Thanks
Mike

Mike Donohoe
Policy Aide
Office of Supervisor Dave Cortese
(408) 299-5030
Like Dave on Facebook https://www.facebook.com/davecortesegov
Follow Dave on Twitter https://twitter.com/SupDaveCortese

Sandhir, Manira

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 12:44 PM
To: Sandhir, Manira
Subject: FW: Fwd: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet
Attachments: image1.png; JulyPC Supplemento Memo Final 7-13-15.pdf; SMPAC7_22_15.pdf; 7_23_15PCAgenda.pdf

---

From: ken_bic [mailto:kenbic@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 10:44 AM
To: Supervisor Dave Cortese
Cc: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Subject: Fw: Fwd: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

The Rural Thresholds for Local-Serving indicators proposed in Table 2.2 to restrict the building footage square to less than 8500 square foot and less than 250 people for an event is too restricting.

As a current resident of Santa Clara county, I view this law as too restricting against the religious institution. Our household votes in the future will be for the supervisors who vote against this article.

Khanh Trieu
2554 Glen Dundee way, San Jose
Ca, 95148

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Chon <Thaychon@yahoo.com>
> **Date:** July 20, 2015 at 8:51:41 PM PDT
> **To:** "steven.tranld@yahoo.com" <steven.tranld@yahoo.com>
> **Subject: Fwd: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet**
>
> > **From:** "Tsuchimoto, Colleen" <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
> > **Date:** July 13, 2015 at 4:15:47 PM PDT
> > **To:** "Sandhir, Manira" <Manira.Sandhir@pln.sccgov.org>
> > **Subject: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet**
> >
> > Dear Local Serving Policy Provisions Interested Parties mailing list:

Attached for your review is the July 23rd Planning Commission supplemental memorandum with modified exhibits for the RLU57 amendment Local Serving Policy Provisions; as requested 10 days prior to the hearing.

This information will also be available to review online by the end of today at the following weblink: https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/PlansOrdinances/Studies/Pages/RLU57.aspx

Also attached is a copy of the upcoming San Martin Planning Advisory Committee July 22nd agenda, and Planning Commission July 23rd agenda.

If you have any questions or concerns of the report, feel free to contact Manira or I.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Planner III
Santa Clara County Planning Office

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

***Please Note**:*
We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 31 2015. Thank you for your patience and cooperation.

Sandhir, Manira

From: Tulan Luong <tulandalat2003@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 9:10 AM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Cc: Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Cortese, Dave; Haskell, Tyler; Supervisor Yeager; Tulan Luong
Subject: General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Updates for Local Serving Uses in Rural Districts

Dear Ms. Tsuchimoto and Ms. Manira,
My name is Tulan Luong. I am currently working with the Board of Equalization in San Jose office. I am also currently living in San Jose, but I usually go to temples in San Jose, San Martin, Gilroy, Sunnyvale, San Francisco and other cities. Beside working hard and paying taxes to support the country and Santa Clara County, I love to go to temples where I can find peace and relaxation. My children also devote their times in many temples in different cities because they can learn many good things there and they become good children in school. The temples help us to release the stress so that we can serve the taxpayers more effectively.

We left the original country to come to America and we are proud of becoming an American. We always say: America is the best country in the world because of our freedoms, freedom of speech, freedom of religion and other freedom… Recently, **I have heard about the RLU57, amendment Local Serving Policy Provisions; thus, I am writing this letter to protest this amendment. We have rights to go to any temples or churches in different cities to worship. We should not have any limitation of the number of members or people in these places; we should not limit the land space for building of the religious institution.** Our life is very stressful and difficult, we always try to do best job; we should have more temples and churches where people can find their peace and their own spiritual life.

We think this propose is not the right decision. We pay taxes to the government in order to support our county and country; we should be receiving back your supports to our belief. Please take this matter in the consideration and to do thing right for people of our county and please do not limit the number of people in the churches or temples and please do not limit the land space of building of religious institution. The land of the county is not only to serve the rural residents. The spiritual life is very important to us too.

Thank you very much for your understanding and support. I can be reached at (408) 891-3267 for any concerns.

Best regards,

Tulan Luong

Nam Mô A Di Da Phat
****
Nguyen ngay an lanh dem an lanh
Dem ngay sau thoi deu an lanh
Tat ca cac thoi deu an lanh
Xin Duc Tu Bi thuong gia ho
****
Nam Mo Giang Cat Tuong Bo Tat Ma Ha Tat

****

Túlan: (408) 891-3267

Sandhir, Manira

From: tich nguyen <tichvannguyen53@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 9:38 AM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Cc: Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Cortese, Dave; Supervisor Yeager; Haskell, Tyler
Subject: Re: File 10571-14FCP-15GP-15Z, General Plan & Zoning Ordinance Updates for Local Serving Uses in Rural Districts

Dear Ms. Tsuchimoto, Ms. Sandhir:

We have heard recently of County of Santa Clara's proposed amendments to the county's General Plan & Zoning ordinance addressing local serving policy provisions of the rural unincorporated areas of the county, also known as "Local Serving Data". The proposed ordinance, if adopted, will limit the number of people attending and the building square footage.

Our concern is particularly the impact to all religious institutions this ordinance will create. One of the rights and freedoms we cherish as Americans is the freedom to worship our faith. As taxpayers, it is our expectation that governments at all levels, whether federal, state, county or local, shall support this freedom of worship so that we may attend any churches or temples anywhere we choose to go to, whether to a rural area or a densely populated city, and not be restricted in any way.

Please take our concern into consideration and do the right thing for all the people in our county.

Thank you for your understanding and support in this matter.

Respectfully,

Tich Nguyen

706 West Sunnyoaks avenue, Campbell, CA 95008

San Martin Neighborhood Alliance
"Together We Make A Difference"

P.O. Box 886 • San Martin, CA 95046
info@smneighbor.org • **www.smneighbor.org**

July 17, 2015

To the Santa Clara County Planning Commission:

The San Martin Neighborhood Alliance (SMNA) appreciates the diligent effort of the Commission staff to prepare their recommendation, regarding **Agenda Item #7 – Local Serving Policy Provisions**, and wishes to specifically recognize their engagement with the San Martin community to seek and understand our input. We also support the Commission's initiative to clarify the local serving definition, and believe an appropriate definition, with appropriate thresholds, will serve the community well.

We strongly support Staff's first recommendation, to set square footage thresholds separately for the Rural Residential districts. We believe that Staff's rationale well articulates the relevant considerations. In short, the whole reason Rural Residential was created in the first place was in recognition of its special characteristics and sensitivities.

The only significant reason supporting lumping Rural Residential together with the other districts is the small number of data points, *but in our view* there are two reasons why that is not a determining consideration. First, as a simple matter of statistics, adding non-relevant points to a sparse data set does not improve its reliability or usefulness. Second, the sparse data is compensated for by setting the threshold at the 75% threshold (rather than the 66th that we would ordinarily prefer). If anything, the risk is that the **threshold is too high** rather than too low.

We further note that the fact that there are **so few relevant historical data points** is in of itself indicative that Institutional and Commercial uses in the Rural Residential district have traditionally been very limited and proscribed.

The SMNA board of directors would be pleased to respond to any further questions, from either the Commission or the Staff. Again, we appreciate your sincere effort to recognize the unique and valuable character of our community.

Sincerely,

Donna Brodsky, Secretary
On Behalf of the San Martin Neighborhood Alliance

Cc: Manira Sandhir
Rob Eastwood

Sandhir, Manira

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 7:48 AM
To: Sandhir, Manira; Eastwood, Rob; Pianca, Elizabeth
Subject: FW: Local Serving Uses and Governmental Bullying of Non-profits

FYI

From: Dhruv Khanna [mailto:dhruvkhanna2002@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2015 7:02 AM
To: Commission, Planning; Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Girard, Kirk; Wasserman, Mike; Velasco, Roland; Donohoe, Mike; Simitian, Joe; Yeager, Ken; Cortese, Dave; Chavez, Cindy
Subject: Local Serving Uses and Governmental Bullying of Non-profits

Honorable Planning Commissioners,

What is the demographic profile of the current residents **in the unincorporated parts** of Santa Clara County -- broken down by religion, ethnicity, and national origin -- **relative to the incorporated cities** within the County? What is the percentage of Whites, Hispanics, Christians and Asian Americans (Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims) etc. in the unincorporated parts of the County relative to Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Mountain View, San Jose, Palo Alto etc.? I ask the County Staff to immediately publish this data so the public can see clearly what it is the County is discussing here concerning the real impacts of its local serving use amendments. If the percentage of Asian Americans Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims etc in the unincorporated parts of the County is the same as in the cities within the County, that would be a remarkable fact worth sharing with the public -- in particular with individuals such as myself who hunger to be educated with precision on the facts, not fiction.

The current residents of the unincorporated County lands are the primarily proposed beneficiaries of the local serving use requirements in existing and proposed land use regulations. **Every ethnic population that has greater dominance in the cities within the County relative to the County's unincorporated parts have every right to hurl the D word (DISCRIMINATION) at the County of Santa Clara -- right about now.**

It is unfortunate that the Planning Department staff of the County of Santa Clara:
(i) seeks to perpetuate *and increase the ferocity* of its admittedly illegal historical bullying of proponents of non-profits such as religious institutions, schools and sports fields;
(ii) creates the fiction that we are in North or South Dakota;
(iii) lacks a sense that the line between unincorporated Santa Clara County and the cities within Santa Clara County is simply that -- a line; and
(iv) celebrates, perpetuates and **increases the blatant discrimination and racism that is inherent in the current local serving use requirements in the bowels of the County's land use regulations.**

It is beyond dispute that the non-profit organizers of Hindu temples, Buddhist schools, and cricket fields do not have the pocket books of Google, Facebook, Intel or Apple. In the past and on an ongoing basis, these organizers have been subjected to bullying by County staff to limit the size and scope and intensity of their proposed non-profit activities.

Burrowing its head deeply in the sand, the County Planning Department pretends to be entirely oblivious of the actual and intended impacts of its persistently noxious and highly illegal proposals **to tighten the choke hold of existing land use regulations that needlessly confine and discriminate against new-entrant non-profits into unincorporated County lands.**

Why should non-profits on one side (the city's side) of a city boundary in the County be able to serve all ethnic populations fully and fairly and then on the other side of the City boundary line be limited to serving the primarily Christian population? Why should the existing residents of the unincorporated parts of the County be coddled and our Asian populations who live primarily in the incorporated parts be subjected to continued and intensified unlawful discrimination.

I hereby request the County to publish the demographic profiles that I have requested in the first paragraph of this email so we can all have a better idea of the exact nature of the illegal discrimination and racism that County staff has proposed for your consideration. With this data in hand, I look forward to sharing my further thoughts on this matter with you at your July 23, 2015 hearing. Thank you.

Sincerely and respectfully submitted,

Dhruv Khanna
Resident of 742 Alester Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94303
and owner of Kirigin Cellars, 11550 Watsonville Road, Gilroy, CA 95020

Sandhir, Manira

From: Sandhir, Manira
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 10:52 AM
To: 'Jennifer Savage'; Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Cc: Eastwood, Rob
Subject: RE: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

Hi Jennifer,

Please see response below in green.

Thanks,

Manira

Manira Sandhir, AICP
Planner II, Santa Clara County
(408) 299-5787

Please Note:
We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 17, 2015.

From: Jennifer Savage [mailto:jsavage@losgatosca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 4:29 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Cc: Sandhir, Manira
Subject: RE: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

Hi Colleen and Manira,

Thank you for following up. Here are the (minor) items I noticed but I could be wrong:

1. Strategy #1 – Please keep the first paragraph: "Under the "joint urban development policies," . . . the County to allow only nonurban, low density uses." – the first paragraph would remain. There is no change to the text in this section, except for the addition of the local-serving uses paragraph. We will be presenting the information to the Board in a red line format once the Planning Commission makes its recommendation so that its clear.
2. Strategy #1 – The new (underlined) paragraph refers to unique and specialized land uses in Strategy #3 but unique and specialized land uses are discussed in Strategy #1. – we will modify the typo in the next round of revisions and change Strategy #3 to 2 or eliminate the text in that parenthesis altogether. Thanks for catching that!

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Savage, AICP
Senior Planner
Town of Los Gatos Community Development Department
phone: 408.399.5702
website: www.losgatosca.gov/planning

Public Counter Hours: Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 1:00 pm.

Please note the upcoming Town closures:
September 7, 2015 – Labor Day

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen [mailto:Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 9:45 AM
To: Jennifer Savage
Cc: Sandhir, Manira
Subject: RE: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

Hi Jennifer,

We are not sure as to what missing text and typos you are referring to. Can you please clarify? NOTE: These policies do not touch the General Plan policies that refer to infill development within USA boundaries. We start off changing text within the section that discusses uses outside USAs in the rural zones of the County.

You are welcome to submit comments based on the latest exhibits staff is proposing for the upcoming July 23rd Planning Commission hearing. See Exhibits A and B for the proposed modifications to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission will be taking action – preparing recommendation for the Board of Supervisors; and it is the Board of Supervisors decision as to the final adoption of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments regarding local serving provisions for the rural zoning districts of the County.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Planner III
Santa Clara County Planning Office

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please Note:
We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 31 2015. Thank you for your patience and cooperation.

From: Jennifer Savage [mailto:jsavage@losgatosca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 6:59 AM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Subject: RE: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

Good morning,

The missing text and typo still exist. Do you want to update those? Or will the county leave the text as is?

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Savage, AICP
Senior Planner
Town of Los Gatos Community Development Department
phone: 408.399.5702
website: www.losgatosca.gov/planning

Public Counter Hours: Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 1:00 pm.

Please note the upcoming Town closures:
September 7, 2015 – Labor Day

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen [mailto:Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org]
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 4:16 PM
To: Sandhir, Manira
Subject: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

Dear Local Serving Policy Provisions Interested Parties mailing list:

Attached for your review is the July 23rd Planning Commission supplemental memorandum with modified exhibits for the RLU57 amendment Local Serving Policy Provisions; as requested 10 days prior to the hearing.

This information will also be available to review online by the end of today at the following weblink:
https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/PlansOrdinances/Studies/Pages/RLU57.aspx

Also attached is a copy of the upcoming San Martin Planning Advisory Committee July 22nd agenda, and Planning Commission July 23rd agenda.

If you have any questions or concerns of the report, feel free to contact Manira or I.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Planner III
Santa Clara County Planning Office

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 31 2015. Thank you for your patience and cooperation.

Sandhir, Manira

From: Sandhir, Manira
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 10:01 AM
To: 'Piu Ghosh'
Cc: Colleen Tsuchimoto (Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org); Eastwood, Rob
Subject: RE: File 10571-14CP-15GP-15Z

Hi Piu:

The proposed amendments are applicable to the Rural Residential, Agricultural, Hillsides, and Agricultural Ranchland areas in unincorporated Santa Clara County, in addition to the San Martin Commercial and Industrial Use Permit Areas.

As currently written, the General Plan policies identified have practical challenges for implementation of the current traffic standards language as end users and their origin are nearly impossible to determine. The proposed changes are staff's approach to try and create a practicable method to measure rural size, scale and intensity of commercial, industrial, and institutional uses. The policy language modifications would attain a two-fold purpose: to represent the intent of the policies, which is to regulate such uses so they are scaled to suit the rural character, and to document the County's review approach, which is to compare the proposed size, scale and intensity of the use with existing uses.

The modifications do not represent any shift in the County's policy framework, however it incorporates zoning tools and findings for ease of implementation and clarity. Please also note that these amendments do not affect General Plan policies that refer to infill development within USA boundaries.

You are welcome to submit comments based on the latest exhibits staff is proposing for the upcoming July 23rd Planning Commission hearing. See Exhibits A and B for the proposed modifications to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission will be taking making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, hopefully the July 23rd meeting; and then it'll be up to the Board of Supervisors regarding the adoption of the proposed General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments for local serving provisions in the rural areas of the County.

Please feel free to email or call us if you have further questions.

Best regards,

Manira Sandhir, AICP
Planner II, Santa Clara County
(408) 299-5787

Please Note:
We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 17, 2015.

From: Piu Ghosh [mailto:PiuG@cupertino.org]
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 4:48 PM
To: Sandhir, Manira
Subject: RE: File 10571-14CP-15GP-15Z

Manira

Thank you for this link. I am interested in finding out the areas where the changes to the General Plan will apply to. Is the impact of this language limited to the South County area and San Martin? Is there a map or some place you can direct me to?

Regards
Piu

From: Sandhir, Manira [mailto:Manira.Sandhir@pln.sccgov.org]
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 11:31 AM
To: Piu Ghosh; Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Cc: Eastwood, Rob
Subject: RE: File 10571-14CP-15GP-15Z

Hi Piu:

Here's the link to the project webpage and all previous staff reports and presentations. We will also have the Planning Commission Staff Report for the July 23rd hearing posted to this website shortly, along with the revised amendments and documents.

https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/PlansOrdinances/Studies/Pages/RLU57.aspx

Please feel free to let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Best regards,

Manira Sandhir, AICP
Planner II
County of Santa Clara - Department of Planning and Development
70 W. Hedding Street, 7th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5787
manira.sandhir@pln.sccgov.org

Please Note:
We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 17, 2015.

From: Piu Ghosh [mailto:PiuG@cupertino.org]
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 11:07 AM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Subject: File 10571-14CP-15GP-15Z
Importance: High

Hello!

I am trying to find more information on item regarding amendments to the Santa Clara County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance addressing local serving policy provisions of the rural unincorporated areas of the County and recommend adoption of the proposed "Local Serving Data."

I haven't been able to find the staff report etc. on the subject online. Could you please point me in the right direction? I am specifically interested in the changes that are proposed on county property that abuts or is in close proximity to the City of Cupertino.

Thank you in advance for your time.

Regards
Piu

Piu Ghosh, AICP
Senior Planner
City of Cupertino

Supplemental Packet
Item # 7
Packet # 4

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 9:21 AM
To: 'Georgine'
Cc: Sandhir, Manira; Rob Eastwood (Rob.Eastwood@pln.sccgov.org)
Subject: RE: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

Georgine,

As explained in the Local Serving Data document, all Use permits for the applicable institutional uses approved by the County from November 1980 to December 2014 are included within the dataset. It is possible that a number of institutions may have decided to not operate any more after a certain period of time. The data is based on permit approvals.

Thanks for the inquiry.

Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Planner III
Santa Clara County Planning Office

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please Note:
We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 31 2015. Thank you for your patience and cooperation.

From: Georgine [mailto:gvscott@garlic.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 5:11 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Subject: Re: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

Colleen, Manira:

In reference to the Local Serving Policy provisions, specifically Referring to Table A.1. Instutional Uses - Why are you using instutions in Los Gatos and out of the current San Martin area? Are you

saying these instutions are currently in use? If so, why wasn't I able to find several of them on the internet?

Thanks,
G. Scott-Codiga

----- Original Message -----
From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
To: Sandhir, Manira
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 4:15 PM
Subject: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet

Dear Local Serving Policy Provisions Interested Parties mailing list:

Attached for your review is the July 23rd Planning Commission supplemental memorandum with modified exhibits for the RLU57 amendment Local Serving Policy Provisions; as requested 10 days prior to the hearing.

This information will also be available to review online by the end of today at the following weblink:
https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/PlansOrdinances/Studies/Pages/RLU57.aspx

Also attached is a copy of the upcoming San Martin Planning Advisory Committee July 22nd agenda, and Planning Commission July 23rd agenda.

If you have any questions or concerns of the report, feel free to contact Manira or I.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Planner III
Santa Clara County Planning Office

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From:	Dhruv Khanna <dhruvkhanna2002@yahoo.com>
Sent:	Thursday, July 23, 2015 9:07 AM
To:	Commission, Planning; Girard, Kirk; Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Wasserman, Mike; Donohoe, Mike; Velasco, Roland; Yeager, Ken; Simitian, Joe; Cortese, Dave; Chavez, Cindy
Cc:	Shrish Kulkarni; Vijay Datt; Sudhir Borikar; Kishore Nandyala; Arjun Bhagat; Sandeep Gopisetty; Murali Chirala
Subject:	Unincorporated parts of County are more White and less Asian than Countywide
Attachments:	Santa Clara County Ethnicity etc census.pdf

Honorable Planning Commissioners,

Please see the one-page attached demographic data which breaks out race-data for 1990, 2000 and 2010 for the Unincorporated parts of the County and Countywide.

This data shows:

1. White population is 62.6% in the Unincorporated parts of the County relative to 47% Countywide. This means that the White population in the incorporated parts of the County is substantially less than in the Unincorporated parts. The opposite is true for the Asian population -- 32.5% Countywide but only 14.2% in the Unincorporated parts of the County.

2. A comparison of the data from 1990 to 2010 clearly shows that the Asian population Countywide has almost doubled from 17.5% in 1990 to 32.4% in 2010 (**an increase of 14.9%**). But in the Unincorporated parts of the County the Asian population has increased from 9.7% to only 14.2% or *a **less than 5% increase***.

Please understand the implications of this data. I respectfully submit that the County's Asian population is rightfully concerned already that policies of individual private and public colleges and universities discriminate inappropriately against Asians. Now, we have **the attached data that suggests that land use policies already in place inappropriately restrict the growth of Asian populations in the Unincorporated parts of the County.**

I respectfully ask you today to follow up on what I understood one Planning Commissioner to suggest at the Planning Commission's last meeting on this subject: I respectfully ask you to instruct the Planning Department staff to undertake the task of **deleting from each and every sentence of all Santa Clara County land use codes** (General Plan, zoning ordinances etc.) each and every requirement that a non-profit or other land use be subject to a local serving use restriction or requirement.

In the alternative, if you decide not to take the action I have request in the immediately preceding paragraph above today, I respectfully ask you to instruct the County Planning Department staff to provide a copy of the attached data and a summary of the existing and proposed local serving use restrictions and requirement to every Asian civil rights advocacy group in the County so that their input may be received.

To do anything different, would be . . . un-American. Thank you.

Dhruv Khanna, 742 Alester Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94303 (650) 906-3537
Also owner of Kirigin Cellars, 11550 Watsonville Road, Gilroy, CA 95020

RACE AND ETHNICITY

Santa Clara County 1990 - 2010

Racial Composition Year	Race	Countywide Number	Countywide Percent	Unincorporated Number	Unincorporated Percent
2010	White	836,616	47.0%	56,344	62.6%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	577,584	32.4%	12,748	14.2%
	Black	46,428	2.6%	1,750	1.9%
	American Indian	12,960	0.7%	899	1.0%
	Other	220,806	12.4%	13,357	14.8%
	More than One Race	87,248	4.9%	4,862	5.4%
	Total	1,781,642		89,960	
2000	White	905,660	53.8%	66,912	66.7%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	435,868	25.9%	11,362	11.3%
	Black	47,182	2.8%	2,144	2.1%
	American Indian	11,350	0.7%	990	1.0%
	Other	204,088	12.1%	14,128	14.1%
	More than One Race	78,437	4.7%	4,764	4.7%
	Total	1,682,585		100,300	
1990	White	1,032,190	68.9%	82,139	77.3%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	261,466	17.5%	10,302	9.7%
	Black	56,211	3.8%	2,698	2.5%
	American Indian	9,269	0.6%	784	0.7%
	Other	138,441	9.2%	10,270	9.7%
	Total	1,497,577		106,193	

Ethnicity Year		Countywide Population	Countywide Percent	Unincorporated Number	Unincorporated Percent
2010	Hispanic	479,210	26.9%	30,085	33.4%
	Not Hispanic	1,302,432	73.1%	59,875	66.6%
	Total	1,781,642		89,960	
2000	Hispanic	403,401	24.0%	28,444	28.4%
	Not Hispanic	1,279,184	76.0%	71,856	71.6%
	Total	1,682,585		100,300	
1990	Hispanic	314,564	21.0%	23,678	22.3%
	Not Hispanic	1,183,013	79.0%	82,515	77.7%
	Total	1,497,577		106,193	

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 8:16 AM
To: 'Dhruv Khanna'
Cc: Rob Eastwood (Rob.Eastwood@pln.sccgov.org); Girard, Kirk; Sandhir, Manira
Subject: RE: Demographic data

Dhruv,

See below weblink to the census data that the County Planning Dept. has compiled based on US census data last published in 2010.

https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/AboutUs/CountyInfo/Pages/Census-Insights-Project.aspx

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Planner III
Santa Clara County Planning Office

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please Note:
We are undergoing a Floor Remodel Project with upgrades to the 7th Floor Front Counter and customer service areas. Please bear with us during the ongoing construction between April 27 to July 31 2015. Thank you for your patience and cooperation.

From: Dhruv Khanna [mailto:dhruvkhanna2002@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 2:06 PM
To: Girard, Kirk; Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Subject: Demographic data

Kirk and Colleen,

Do you have the data I requested about the ethnic, racial, religious, and national origin populations broken down for each of (a) the incorporated portions of Santa Clara County and (b) the

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Khanh Minh Ha <kha@ccicms.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 4:43 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Subject: vote no for RLU57

vote no for RLU57

Kind Regards

Khanh Minh Ha
Compass Components, Inc
d/l: 510-661-6630
fax: 510-656-0603
kha@ccicms.com
www.ccicms.com

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: David Pham <davidpham888@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 4:41 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Subject: Vote no for this one.

Hi.
Vote no for this one.

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Katherine Truong <kat0y02@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 4:40 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Cc: Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Cortese, Dave; Supervisor Yeager; Haskell, Tyler
Subject: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet
Attachments: image.png; image.png; JulyPC Supplemento Memo Final 7-13-15.pdf; SMPAC7_22_15.pdf; 7_23_15PCAgenda.pdf

Dear Santa Clara County;

I just heard about this Provision to our local serving community, as I am one of the local community has rural parcel that can potentially build house/businesses over 10K+ or institutions that I would like to attend in the future shouldn't be object or reject people that attend the service or whatever the gather may be; and I am sure any gather functions should be a community benefits not to limitation to this Provisions. I am oppose to this provision that you have gathered and decided on your own. I am not sure how the county decided to make this provision on their own without the community knowledge.

Santa Clara Community should and its people should be informed of these types of Provision Plannings. As we elected you to be our voice and public ordiance to do right by the people. We should work together to be treated fairly.

Best regards,

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From:	Andy Tai Tang <andrewtang3124@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, July 23, 2015 2:33 PM
To:	Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sandhir, Manira
Cc:	Wasserman, Mike; Chavez, Cindy; Cortese, Dave; Supervisor Yeager; Haskell, Tyler
Subject:	Fwd: Local Serving Policy Provisions - July 23rd Planning Commission staff report packet
Attachments:	image.png; JulyPC Supplemento Memo Final 7-13-15.pdf; SMPAC7_22_15.pdf; 7_23_15PCAgenda.pdf

Santa Clara July 23rd, 2015

REF: GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING ORDINACE UPDATES FOR LOCAL SERVING USES IN RURAL DISTRICTS

Dear Mr. Tsuchimoto & Ms. SanDhir,

After we have read carefully the attach Proposal of "General Plan And Zoning Ordinance Updates For Local Serving Uses in Rural District", we noted that Santa Clara County has proposed to limit the Religious Believers in the County to travel out of City for Religious Worship, Also to limit the land space for the building of the Religious Institutions. So, Both of you accidentally or deliberately not respect and violated the U.S. Constitution on the Law" Religious Liberty"!

As U.S. Citizens, we have right to attend any Mass at any churches/Temples we want! No other Country in the World has Legislation limiting the faithful to attend Mass at the Churches/Temples and limited land spaces for the building of Religious institution even The Communist Dictatorship Countries !....We are the Citizen who work hard to pay taxes to Government in order to receive in return the support to our belief. We voted for you to protect & support us, not to against our Belief!

Please spend time to re-review your plans, take this matter to concern and "**DO THE RIGHT THING** " for the residents of Santa Clara County .

Much thanks for your support and understanding.

Andrew T.

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: quyen@quyen.org
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 12:04 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Subject: DO NOT PASS RLU57 Local Serving Policy

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am writing to you as a concerned citizen of Santa Clara County.

The RLU57 Local Serving Policy, as written, is an unfair and discriminatory policy.

All land in the county should be used for the benefits of all county residents (and even more), and should not be limited to the use of just those living in the immediate vicinity.

My home is in Santa Clara City. I've been living there for many years, and now they just built the Levi's stadium there. They put in measures to minimize the traffic disruption, but I still have to live with the noise. We are asked to "take one for the community" as the stadium will bring about many benefits to my fellow county residents, tangible and intangible.

I'm sure many residents in San Martin area come up to the Levi's stadium and attend religious services in San Jose area. So why can't we go to religious services held at temples or churches in San Martin area?

The RLU57 Local Serving Policy also discriminates against religion and faith-based organizations.

If you were to build a hospital down there, would the county limit the use of the hospital to just residents of San Martin area? Why is it that San Martin residents can go to county hospital in San Jose area, and we cannot go down there?

If a business were to be set up in San Martin area where weddings and large conference/conventions are held, would you be able to limit the guests to just those living in the San Martin area? I suppose not.

So then the RLU57 Local Serving Policy seems to be targeting and restricting just the faith-based organizations.
The RLU57 Local Serving Policy, as written, is an unfair and discriminatory policy. We are living in Silicon Valley where innovations are spawned based on freedom in so many ways, including the freedom to pursue our religion.

I urge you to NOT PASS this ordinance as it will set our county back many years

Thank you for your consideration

Quyen Vuong
2370 Lass Dr
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Connie Ludewig <cludewigs2@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 10:48 AM
To: Sandhir, Manira; Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Subject: July 23 meeting

RE: Re-zoning -Agenda 7

Dear Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

I am a long-time resident of the unincorporated community of San Martin. We enjoy our equestrian community without sidewalks. We are conveniently located between Morgan Hill and Gilroy (within 10 minutes) with ample nearby public shopping, dining, schools, churches, sports fields & aquatic center, health clubs, Lions & Elks clubs, post offices, funeral homes and 2 cemeteries. We are all reliant upon our residential wells to sustain our health and well-being.

It is the responsibility of our elected representatives to speak for all the people of whom you represent. In this case, this specifically pertains to those (we) who live in the unincorporated rural Santa Clara County, including the very unique community of San Martin. It is the residents of the unincorporated areas that will be directly impacted with significant increased traffic & noise pollution (if you do not live in San Martin you do not understand how the noise carries for miles within this valley nestled between the tall hills).

There is a reason why the Integrated Design Plan was written-- to include 'local serving' because the community is so unique--strictly dependent upon residential wells to sustain our livelihood. There are creeks that must be protected from potential development that could bring contaminants to our aquifers. There are non-permeable lands that have been vacant for years because they are non-suitable for development; they only flood. It is insulting to have the planning department continue to explain that 'it is unacceptable to expect a headcount of who lives locally', and whether they can attend or frequent a local establishment. This is a ridiculous analogy, and frankly offensive.

Facts:
- The Lions Hall is presently the largest facility in San Martin- please do not allow larger facilities than this
- Noise Travels - Please initiate the legal policy of NO amplified noise before 10am, or after 10pm (Sunday-Saturday)
- Local Serving DOES NOT mean tracking who lives where, it refers to minimizing traffic and noise and protection of local resources such as creeks and aquifers
- Religion is not mentioned anywhere in the present or revised zoning--Do Not let those who wrote about their interpretation of religious freedom sway you--it has nothing to do with this
- I too am a tax payer (same as all those who wrote you letters--from outside the unincorporated areas)

I am hopeful that you will ignore the comments from those (who do not even live in San Martin or other rural areas). Do not let their biased intentions and that mention their religious freedom sway you--We All Have Religious Freedom, not just them. Nowhere in the re-zoning discussion is there any mention of religion. For this reason, I feel their intent has nothing to do with concern for the rural areas of Santa Clara County, but they are rather strictly self-serving.

Please do not neglect the importance of taking a stand for what is right. Stand firm in favor of the needs of the people residing in the rural communities, it will be apparent that the county is running from obligation, with fear

of those who wrote letters expressing their religious beliefs. It would be further insulting that the county representatives assume that San Martin residents, and community at large, are ignorant or just plain dumb. We are not. We want a voice, to be be heard, and we want your representation. We want clean water. We want to reside in the serene community without impacts of additional traffic and noise. We are relying on your informed, concerned, and intelligent representation on behalf of the residents of unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County.

Thank you,

Connie Ludewig, San Martin

"Every flower is a soul blossoming in nature". Gerard DeNerval