



# Appendix J: Comment Summary Table



<b>Public Comment Summary Table</b>			
#	Comment Group	Details	Response
1	Fair Housing	<p>A comment letter was received from the Law Foundation of Silicon Valley and the Public Interest Law Project, advocating for increased analysis, new and stronger programs, and more specific timelines in the Housing Element, specifically centering the needs of tenants, unhoused or at-risk residents, and historically marginalized communities. The included recommendations can be summarized as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen assessment of fair housing;</li> <li>• Improve affordable housing availability by analyzing and removing constraints;</li> <li>• Identify adequate sites to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation;</li> <li>• Strengthen programs; and</li> <li>• Strengthen special needs housing analysis and goals.</li> </ul>	<p>The commenters provide detailed feedback and recommendations, and County staff continue to carefully review and consider the policy and program recommendations advocated for in this letter. Moreover, the County has engaged two consulting firms to bolster the assessment of fair housing and to provide support in evaluating how the County might further support fair housing in the region.</p>
2	Tiny Homes / Vista Ave.	<p>25 emails and several phone calls were received on the topic of tiny homes or otherwise housing the unhoused, particularly regarding one property on Vista Ave. in San José (APN 599-39-047). Concerns revolved around potential impacts to the neighborhood from housing the unhoused. Some comments voiced concerns more generally around any additional housing development and potential impacts to their neighborhood character, property values, and quality of life.</p>	<p>The County Housing Element does not include any proposal to develop tiny homes. The origin of this misunderstanding is not clear, but it seems specific to residents in one neighborhood. The County is working to clarify the role and function of the Housing Element and is conducting additional outreach to this specific neighborhood to alleviate such concerns and rectify any misunderstanding.</p>
3	Constraints Analysis	<p>One email was received regarding the Constraints Analysis of the Housing Element, positing that County development standards place an undue constraint on new housing development in rural areas. The comments specifically address road standards, site improvements, and electrification requirements for new single-family homes in rural areas, as well as the review process for such development. The commenter also acknowledges Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan mitigation fees as a potential hindrance to rural development.</p>	<p>Additional information and context have been added to the Constraints Analysis, where appropriate. The commenter discusses certain constraints outside the realm of analysis for the Housing Element.</p>

County of Santa Clara – Draft Sixth Cycle (2023-2031) Housing Element Update  
Public Comment Summary Table

4	Inclusion of Rural Properties	Two comment letters were received from property owners/groups advocating for the inclusion of their properties in the rural unincorporated parts of South County; one suggests that the inclusion of their property could advance fair housing goals by promoting development in rural areas.	Several challenges and concerns have resulted in County staff determining that the development of higher-density housing in the rural unincorporated areas is prohibitively difficult and unlikely to occur during the 2023-2031 planning period. Significantly, this is due to rural unincorporated properties lacking the ability to access municipal services like water and sewer. Furthermore, such development would be in conflict with numerous State goals and local policies.
5	Exclusion of Rural Properties	Two comment letters were received, one from the Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority and one from Green Foothills, supportive of the exclusion of rural properties from the site inventory, due to potential negative effects from sprawl development and the loss of natural and working lands.	Comments acknowledged; no revisions necessary.
6	Stanford	Two comment letters were received specific to development on the campus of Stanford University, one from the City of Palo Alto and one from the University. The City's letter consists of several specific requests regarding the preparation of the Draft EIR. The University's letter consists of several clarifying questions and requests for additional information.	County Staff has responded to the commenters and made clarifications in sections of the Housing Element pertaining to Stanford. The City's comments are directed at the Draft EIR and County Staff is considering these comments under the CEQA process.
7	Assistance	Two emails and several phone calls seeking assistance with accessing information and/or additional time to review and comment on the draft Housing Element.	Comments acknowledged; no revisions necessary.
8	Burbank	Three emails were received regarding potential development in the Burbank area, expressing concerns about the neighborhood character, historic interest, and visual impact of multifamily housing development.	Comments acknowledged; no revisions necessary.
9	Pleasant Hills	Three emails were received regarding the Pleasant Hills site (APNs: 649-23-001 and 649-24-013). One commenter expresses a concern with potential parking and vehicle traffic impacts. Another commenter expresses concern that the development of this site could result in accelerated poverty and economic segregation and that the site is only suitable for low-density without increased public transportation options. Another commenter advocates for the inclusion of publicly accessible open space in the development plans for this site.	Comments acknowledged; no revisions necessary.

County of Santa Clara – Draft Sixth Cycle (2023-2031) Housing Element Update  
Public Comment Summary Table

10	Cambrian Park	One comment letter was received representing three property owners concerned with the potential development of a specific parcel in the Cambrian Park area (APN 419-12-044), adjacent to their properties. Concerns revolved around compromised privacy and property values resulting from a taller structure being developed. Another email was received regarding this area and concerns about increased traffic.	Comments acknowledged; no revisions necessary.
11	Alum Rock / East Foothills	One email was received about the properties listed in the site inventory within the Alum Rock / East Foothills area, expressing concerns that these sites are not suited to high-density housing, for very low-income households, or for further development of any kind.	Comments acknowledged; no revisions necessary.
12	Eminent Domain	Two emails were received by property owners concerned about the seizure of their property, by eminent domain, for the production of new housing.	Comments acknowledged; no revisions necessary. The County Housing Element does not propose or consider seizure by eminent domain. Furthermore, these property owners received a notice due to their proximity to a parcel in the site inventory and their property itself is not included in the site inventory.
13	Comment Form Submissions	<p>Comments have been continuously received via the online webpage form that accompanies the ability for individuals to sign up for future updates on the County Housing Element. During the 30-day comment period for the draft Housing Element, six comments were received on the draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two state interest in receiving general information and further updates;</li> <li>• One is a duplicate of a letter received by email;</li> <li>• One comments that traffic is already bad and inquires as to what traffic-relieving measures will accompany plans for new housing;</li> <li>• One is supportive of excluding rural properties from the site inventory, comments on the need for housing in urban areas near amenities, and advocates for Stanford to provide affordable housing for all of its employees on or adjacent to its campus;</li> <li>• One asks how many County-owned assets could be used for affordable housing or shelter/emergency facilities with services and advocates for such use.</li> </ul>	Comments acknowledged; no revisions necessary.