

From: Sheryl Poulson <sheryl.poulson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 4, 2020 10:52 AM
To: Planning Comment <PlanningComment@losgatosca.gov>; jpaulson@losgatos.gov
Cc: James Poulson <jrpoulson@gmail.com>
Subject: North 40 parking

Joel, and all at our planning commission, my family and I live in the Highland Oaks neighborhood and like the majority, if not all, of our neighbors are vehemently opposed to the proposed elimination of the underground parking space. This change, if allowed to go through, will very likely force visitors, shoppers & residents to find parking elsewhere ending up creating further degradation to the surrounding communities and businesses. This is so typical of large projects like this in where the developers interests in reducing their cost, post contractual agreements, begin to eliminate promised features. **We must not allow** the elimination of the already minimally planned agreed upon parking or another changes to the plan.

Your concerned citizens,
James & Sheryl Poulson and family

Please reply.

From: Joan Oloff <lgfootcntr@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 4:27 PM
To: Eric Christianson <EChristianson@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: 14225 Walker

Hi Eric,

I hope you are doing well during these crazy times!

I am reaching out to you regarding the proposed modification of 14225 Walker St (removal of underground parking).

I apologize, as I could not attend the planning commission meeting.

Eric, this development already under-estimates the parking needs for the development. Allowing them to proceed without building out the parking grade would be a huge problem and greatly impact the surrounding community.

Please help me express my concerns to the appropriate people on the Planning Commission. I am very interested in the outcome of the meeting.

Again, my apologies for not being able to participate on 8/26.

All my best,
Joan Oloff, D.P.M., F.A.C.F.A.S.
lgfootcntr@aol.com
408-356-2774

Barbara Dodson

239 Marchmont Drive
Los Gatos, CA 95032
September 3, 2020

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

SUBJECT: ELIMINATION OF THE UNDERGROUND GARAGE IN THE NORTH FORTY

I oppose the elimination of the underground parking garage. I think it will result in an insufficient amount of parking, and while looking at the SummerHill proposal I think I've come across the fact that SummerHill's provision of parking for the Transition District A, B, & C, with the elimination of the garage, will be below the Town's required number of parking stalls.

I think that SummerHill's proposal has focused on parking for the Market Hall and argued that without the underground garage SummerHill would still be fulfilling the Town's requirements for parking. However, the Market Hall parking in the garage is just one component of the parking for the entire Transition District A, B & C. With the elimination of the parking garage, SummerHill **will not** meet the Town's requirements for the Transition District A, B & C.

According to Sheet A.11 in SummerHill's proposal, the Town's requirement for parking stalls in the Transition District A, B, & C is 354. With the elimination of the underground garage, SummerHill will be providing only 330 parking spots. The bottom line for me is that we can't approve the SummerHill proposal because it provides 24 fewer parking spots than required by the Town.

I hope I have my numbers correct in the explanatory material below.

Just as a note: SummerHill has provided inconsistent numbers, making it confusing to figure out exactly what is being proposed. In some places, SummerHill says it's providing 330 spaces for the Transition District A, B, & C; in other places it says it's providing 331.

As another example, in the table titled "Market Hall-Parking Requirements," SummerHill gives the required number of parking spaces for the Community Room as 5, but in A.11 the required number of parking spaces for the Community Room is listed as 4. In the table titled "Market Hall-Parking Requirements," SummerHill gives the required number of parking spaces for the Market Hall as 62 as 5, but in A.11 the required number of parking spaces for the "Specialty Market" is listed as 55.

- 1. SUMMERHILL'S NUMBERS SHOW THAT IT IS NOT PROVIDING THE AMOUNT OF HOUSING THAT THE TOWN REQUIRES FOR THE TRANSITION DISTRICT (Areas A, B, C).**

- **In the adopted Developer's Phase 1 Plan from 2016:** Based on the table titled Transition District Area A, B & C Building Area and Parking Tabulations (Table 3.22, page 58), the required number of parking stalls was 354 for the Transition District Area A, B & C (69 residential stalls/residential guest stalls + 285 commercial stalls). The original developer committed to providing more than that: 458 (389 commercial stalls (total for the specialty market, retail, restaurant/café, bar/tavern, and community room); and 69 residential/residential guest stalls.

TOTAL ADOPTED IN 2016 FOR THE TRANSITION DISTRICT Area A, B & C:
458 PARKING STALLS

- The SummerHill proposal provides for only 330 parking spaces for the Transition District A, B & C. (See A.11: Transition District Building Area and Parking Tabulations on page 62 in the Agenda Packet. This is SummerHill's revised version of Table 6.22.)
- By eliminating the underground garage, SummerHill would provide 24 fewer parking spaces than required by the Town for the Transition District A, B & C. (354-330=24)
- Both Table 6.22 in the Developer's proposal and Table A.11 in SummerHill's proposal show that the Town requirement for commercial stalls is 285. Table A.11 shows that under SummerHill's proposal, SummerHill would provide only 261 commercial parking stalls.
- Under its proposal, SummerHill would provide 24 fewer than the required number of commercial parking stalls (285-261=24) for the Transition District A, B & C.

THE MATH using numbers from Sheet A.11

Town required number of parking spaces for the Transition District A, B & C:
354

285 **required** commercial spaces + 39 **required** residential stalls +
30 **required** residential guest stalls = **354 required parking spaces**

Number of total spaces proposed by SummerHill: 330
261 commercial spaces + 39 residential stalls +
30 residential guest stalls = 330 provided parking spaces

OTHER MATH using numbers from Table 6.22 on page 58 of the Developer's Proposal, which is the proposal adopted by the Town

Parking spaces in the adopted plan in 2016: 458
Parking spaces SummerHill wants to eliminate: 127
Number of total spaces proposed by SummerHill
for the Transition District A, B, & C: 331

The Summerhill proposal drops the number of total parking spaces for the Transition District A, B & C below the Town's requirement of 354. SummerHill is

shortchanging the Town by 24 (or 23, depending on which Table you use) parking spaces.

2. SUMMERHILL SAYS IT IS PROVIDING EXCESS PARKING. HOW DID SUMMERHILL COME UP WITH ITS (I believe, incorrect) NUMBERS? SUMMERHILL APPEARS TO HAVE CONFUSED THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL PARKING SPACES WITH THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF TOTAL PARKING SPACES. (See the notes in red in A.11 on the right -- p. 62 in the Agenda Packet.)

- In the red notes next to the section outlined in red called Retail, SummerHill implies that it will provide a TOTAL OF 330 parking spaces for retail.
- SummerHill does its math to reach 330 *commercial* stalls by including 39 *residential* stalls and 30 *residential* guest stalls.
- SummerHill has a deficit of 24 parking stalls below the requirement of 285 commercial stalls. It does not have 45 extra commercial stalls as is claimed.

Also note on Sheet A.11 that in the column headed "Total. Required Number of Commercial Stalls." SummerHill lists 285. Then, just 2 columns to the right, under "Provided Commercial Stalls," it lists 261. In its own chart, SummerHill clearly shows that there is a deficit of 24 commercial parking stalls.

3. THE PARKING GARAGE ALREADY HAD AN INSUFFICIENT NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES. The developer wants to drop the number of parking spaces in the garage from 303 to 176. But there was already a lack of parking in the garage in the adopted plan. Specifically, the parking for the 50-unit senior complex wasn't realistic. The allotment was 1 space per senior unit for a total of 50 spaces-- $\frac{1}{2}$ space for each resident and $\frac{1}{2}$ space for guests. The developer said most of the seniors wouldn't be able to afford cars. It also assumed each senior unit would have just one resident.

In fact it's possible that each senior unit will have two or even more residents. There may be one or more cars connected to each unit for a possible total of more than 50 cars. This uses up all the unit spaces and then some without accounting for guests. Suppose the residents of the 50 senior units use their 50 parking spots. 126 spaces remain for the Market Hall, Bakery, and Community Room. Let's say 10 seniors and their guests use 30 additional spaces. We're down to 96 spaces. How about employees at the Market Hall and bakery? Let's say they use 20 spaces. We're down to 76 spaces for shoppers and people using the community room. Is this enough???

How about overflow parking from other areas? There will be 71 one-bedroom units with one garage each. Suppose two people live in these units and each person has a car. We now have 71 more cars that will be seeking parking. The garage would be a logical space for these residents to use.

4. **WE NEED AN EXPLANATION FOR WHY THE DEVELOPER THINKS THE NEW PARKING ALLOCATIONS ARE ADEQUATE.** The developer claims to be justifying the new lowered parking allocations using city code and the specific plan. Logic and common sense have clearly not been applied here. For example, the 2,032 square foot bakery has 7 spaces. Is this for employees as well as patrons? Will there be seating within the bakery? If yes, 7 parking spaces are hardly enough. How about the community room? It gets 4 parking spaces for its 2,772 square feet. Obviously more than 5 people can easily attend a meeting in such a space. Where are they supposed to park?

5. **PARKING WILL STILL BE NEEDED FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT.** The SummerHill proposal states that “The Market Hall was originally designed with a basement level by Grosvenor, with the intent to use the excess parking for future development in Phase II of North 40. With Grosvenor no longer involved in Phase I of the project, SummerHill has no need for parking beyond what is required by Town Code and the specific plan.”

But the need for parking for future development has not changed. There will still be future development and thus still a need for parking.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dodson

From: Fremont Bainbridge <fbainbridge58@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 7:03:43 PM

To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>

Subject: North 40 Underground Parking

Joel,

I read on Nextdoor that the developer of the North 40 area wants to eliminate previously agreed upon underground parking. I object to this, both on principle and practically. This is not a trivial change, and I don't think there is any reason to believe that parking requirements are now substantially less originally planned for. I hope this will be rejected.

Sincerely,
Fremont Bainbridge

Sent from my mobile phone.

From: awnalee visalli <awnaleevisalli@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 8:55:50 PM
To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>
Cc: Planning Comment <PlanningComment@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Parking at North 40

I live across Lark from the North 40 and urge you to make sure that MAXIMUM parking is allocated for. Parking is always an issue, especially in such highly populated areas.

Less parking at the North 40 means me and my families health, home and happiness will be affected negatively. Please push for as much parking as possible and MORE.

Thank you,

Awnalee Visalli
LG resident of 13 years.

From: Henry Richards <hrichards@rxdox.net>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 3:11 PM
To: Planning Comment <PlanningComment@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Underground Parking at "North 40"

Dear Planning Commission,

I was concerned to learn that the current owner/developer of the "North 40" project will now seek a waiver from the requirement to provide the additional underground parking originally required by the Planning Commission in the permit process. Although I understand the argument that "plans have changed", that was not a part of the original agreements. This argument is only valid if the original agreement stipulated some sort of "change order" accommodation.

There is already sufficient and reasonable concern regarding the impact on traffic congestion at an already busy corridor and intersection. The costs associated with the underground parking was "built in" to the original "Grosvenor" proposals by which the Planning Commission approved the project. SummerHill would argue that the underground parking requirement was part of the Grosvenor plan and that they shouldn't be responsible to live up to it. This does not reflect customary business practices of mergers and acquisitions in which the buyer (SummerHill) assumes all debts, obligations, and contractual agreements of the seller (Grosvenor). That is to say that costs, profit margins, and liabilities were all accommodated by the original agreement. Hence, "they bought it" and "they own it" including all original requirements... otherwise they should've renegotiated with the Town for a waiver or variance.

They are saying that the additional parking is no longer needed... but, what if it is? I would argue that building for "excess capacity" (when it should not impact the value of the project) far outweighs falling short and letting the rest of us suffer the consequences.

Henry Richards
Los Gatos Resident

From: Philippa Alvis <philippaalvis@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2020 5:40:07 PM
To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: underground parking in North 40

Dear Mr. Paulson

Although I am not a resident of Los Gatos, I do live in the area affected by the North 40 development. I urge you to flatly deny the applicant 's request for elimination of the underground parking. The planned development is totally under allocated for all parking as provided. Since many of us in the area will patronize the commercial sector of this development--bringing tax dollars to Los Gatos-- we need convenient parking that will NOT impact the housing development nor the adjacent local streets. No matter how the current developer howls and cries about his loss of partnership, or any other excuse, as a reason or cause for his request to omit the underground parking, I strongly urge you to deny this request. The North 40 development is bad enough as it is---no need to make it worse by eliminating essential parking !

Philippa and Jack Alvis
17664 Blanchard Dr.
Monte Sereno 95030

From: Erin Kasenchak <ekasenchak@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2020 9:02:59 AM

To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>

Subject: North 40 parking

Hello - as a long time LG resident who was not pleased with the handling of the North 40 community awareness to begin with, I must adamantly request that the town ensure the developers stick with their commitment to underground parking. As everyone is aware, parking is an issue in downtown LG and will likely be at the North 40 if it's as successful as everyone hopes. Part of that success will depend on whether people want to visit and feel they can easily find parking. Think of Santa rows terrible parking. The need for adequate parking that does not take away from planned open space was agreed to by the developer. Please make them honor that.

Erin Kasenchak

From: Lou Albert <loua@mac.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 29, 2020 5:28:04 PM
To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Please deny the N40 parking change petition

Hi Joel

I'm a longtime LG resident and I am urging the planning commission to deny the North 40 developer's petition to eliminate the current slated underground parking garage. This project is already going to bring many unhelpful issues to our town. Having parking spill over and/or create more surface parking once this development is finished is avoidable and not in the best interest of our community.

Thank you

Lou Albert

Sent from my iPhone

From: Diane Dreher <ddreher@scu.edu>

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 4:48:19 PM

To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>; Laurel Prevetti <LPrevetti@losgatosca.gov>; Planning <Planning@losgatosca.gov>

Cc: Diane Dreher <ddreher@scu.edu>

Subject: Concern about proposed elimination of 127 parking spaces in North 40

Diane Dreher, Ph.D.
223 Arroyo Grande Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Re: proposed elimination of 127 parking spaces in North 40 underground garage

I ask you to reject SummerHill's request to eliminate these 127 parking spaces, maintaining the original contractual agreement for the following reasons:

1. **Concern for senior residents.** Earlier Town Council discussions pointed to the lack of adequate parking in the Market Place complex. The original plan was for one-half space per unit, based on the assumption that many low-income seniors would not own cars, and one-half space for guests for a total of 50 spaces devoted to the 71 one-bedroom units of senior housing. The current request to reduce the number of available spaces would cause additional hardship to those seniors with cars who would need ADA accommodation by elevator to accessible parking of their cars in the underground parking garage.
2. **Concern about the math.** The developers also assumed that for the 71 one-bedroom units there would be only one senior resident per unit, when, in fact, there may be quite a few couples in a single unit. It is also possible that there would be one car connected to each unit, using all 50 spaces, leaving no room for guests to park. These guests might include essential caregivers as well as family members.
3. **Concern about the math re: shoppers.** If all 50 resident spaces are used, then guests would need to park in the remaining 126 parking spots planned for the Market Hall, Bakery, and Community Room. Where, then, would the shoppers park? The reduction in parking spaces would likely sabotage the Market Hall, discouraging away potential customers.
4. **Concern about developers keeping their word.** The reduction of parking places seems like a "bait and switch" to me. During the original hearings, the developers sounded reluctant to build the underground parking structure but agreed to 303 spaces for the garage. Now they want to reduce the number to 176. The number of parking spaces was part of the original contractual agreement approved by the Town Council. Any change would be a violation of that contract. Letting the developers arbitrarily change their plans would set a bad precedent, opening the way for further changes by SummerHill that would break their word and betray the interests of the citizens of Los Gatos.

I, therefore, urge the Planning Commission to reject the developer's request to eliminate these 127 parking places in the proposed underground garage.

Sincerely,

Diane Dreher

--

Diane Dreher

Professor of English

Associate Director, Applied Spirituality Institute

<https://www.scu.edu/ic/about/affiliated-works/asi/>

Santa Clara University

500 El Camino Real

Santa Clara CA 95053

(408) 554-4954

ddreher@scu.edu

Follow my Tao of Inner Peace page <https://www.facebook.com/TaoOfInnerPeace/>

Get the Tao of Inner Peace

newsletter <https://www.facebook.com/TaoOfInnerPeace/app/141428856257/>

<http://www.dianedreher.com>

<https://www.northstarpersonalcoaching.com/>

"Our greatest natural resources are our hearts and minds, together with those of the people around us."

The Tao of Personal Leadership

Check out my blogs:

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/your-personal-renaissance>

<https://blogs.scu.edu/writeherewritenow/>

From: Liana Palmer <lianapalm@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 7:31 PM
To: Jocelyn Shoopman <jshoopman@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: North 40 don't scratch below garage parking

Hi again,
This is
Liana Palmer
16345 Los Gatos Blvd, #30
Los Gatos, CA 95032
408-455-2582

Please do not let Summerhill off the hook for this parking that in original plan provides spaces for future Phase II. Grovsner developers made this below surface parking and Summerhill just wants to reduce costs despite their stated reasons that are phony.

Thank you, Liana Palmer

From: Liana Palmer <lianapalm@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 7:26 PM
To: Jocelyn Shoopman <jshoopman@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: North 40 don't scratch below garage parking

The justification of SummerHill is weak. It is a **bait and switch**. This lot was intended to provide some parking that would be used by the Phase II structures. Eliminating it would put more parking on the surface of Phase II.

From: Suzi Hellwege <sjhellwege@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 5:56:33 PM
To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: north 40 changes

Hello Joel:

I just heard that underground parking for the North 40 project is being removed from builder plans. I live near 85/17 and about a mile away from the project, and feel strongly that the developer should be held to the original plan. Without adequate parking cars may spill out to neighborhoods or impede parking for residents of that project. Also, the traffic impact will be greater if cars have to circle to find parking.

Please register my opinion as a 30+ year resident of Campbell and soon to be resident of Los Gatos.

Thank you,
Susan Hellwege
White Oaks Court, Campbell

From: Amy Despars <amydespars@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 4:17 PM

To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>; Laurel Prevetti <LPrevetti@losgatosca.gov>; Planning <Planning@losgatosca.gov>

Subject: Fw: Just Say No to the North 40 Developers

To the Los Gatos Town Council

Please do not allow Summerhill to change the final agreement between the Town and Grosvenor/Summerhill. This agreement was also part of the very lengthy deliberations and discussions between Grosvenor, the Planning Committee, Town Council, and the community members throughout the process.

Below is how I understand the original plan to work.

The senior housing only has 25 parking spaces for 50 units. What if a couple has two cars or visitors? The bakery only has 7 required parking spaces. Where do they expect the employees to park along with the customers? The community center has 5-7 parking spaces. Where are all of the people going to the community center, going to park?

It is my understanding that residential units that are part of the North 40 project are being allotted minimal parking spaces and, therefore, this underground parking lot can potentially serve as overflow residential parking when needed.

The 127 spaces of underground parking is needed to provide additional parking for this development. This is much needed parking that will be utilized. It is common sense to follow the plan and put in the underground parking now and have enough spaces for all needs. Los Gatos Blvd. cannot handle more parked cars. The neighborhoods, who fought against this project in the first place, do not want cars from the North 40 in their neighborhoods, including ACE Hardware or Office Depot. These neighborhoods already have too many cars parked on their streets from medical offices, Trader Joe's and pre-Covid Google bus commuters.

The PAMF building on Gateway and Los Gatos Blvd. was originally slated to be mixed use with medical, retail, restaurant. To our disappointment the agreed upon plan at the time got changed thanks to the developers. Please do not let this happen again. Developers do not live in our neighborhoods and are not looking out for the communities best interest. They just want to make money.

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW ANY CHANGES TO THE ORIGINAL PLAN.

Thank you for your time.

Amy Despars

267 Longridge Rd.

Los Gatos, Ca 95032

From: Teresa Siguenza <t62siguenza@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 3:54 PM

To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>

Subject: North 40 disgrace

Hello,

I am a 15 year resident of 118 Highland Oaks Way, Los Gatos, CA 95032. We are on the first cul de sac as you turn off of Lark Avenue. This means that the cars for the North 40 will be parking on our street and along the connecting streets as well. Now, I find out that the developers are changing the parking plan to cut the amount of parking. THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE!

There are 6 houses in our cul de sac. All six houses have older children who are drivers themselves which means that all of these houses have at least 4 cars. There are ONLY 6 spaces of parking on our street. Therefore, if any one of us has guests, they must take one of those 6 street spaces. But, if the North 40 has less parking, then those cars will be taking up our guest spaces. This is not fair!

Our children have never felt safe with the amount of cars that pull in just to turn around (and they go extremely fast) or to circumvent the long line to turn right at Los Gatos Blvd. Cutting parking in the North 40 means more cars to enter Highland Oaks Drive and Highland Oaks Way (and the cul de sacs further down). They won't be looking out for kids! They want the closest space to park with the quickest way to get to their North 40 residence/ shopping.

The developers of the North 40 made a big deal about "owing the owners of the North 40" and "the town already gave the approval to the development in the first place" as an excuse to bring a lawsuit to the town for not going through with the development. So, I think it's only fair to discuss what the developers OWE us, the townspeople, who they want to shop in their shops and buy their houses. Develop the parking structures as was originally planned and do not change it! We could possibly take up a lawsuit to them for going back on their word.

My children MUST stay safe! Adding more cars to our streets because developers want to make more money is NOT keeping my kids safe! The potential for children getting hit in our neighborhood increases 100 fold with every car that is now going to be driving through our streets because of the lack of parking!

Please stop their changes to the parking structures on the North 40 and keep our neighborhood safe. This practice of changing plans is not in good faith and should be sold out as such!

Sincerely,
Teresa Siguenza
Los Gatos resident

From: Patricia Ernstrom <pernstrom@me.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 11:58 AM

To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>; Laurel Prevetti <LPrevetti@losgatosca.gov>; Planning <Planning@losgatosca.gov>; Council <Council@losgatosca.gov>

Subject: North 40 Parking and Lighting

Dear Los Gatos Town Council Members and Town Staff:

It has been brought to my attention that the developer of the North 40 has returned to the Town in an attempt to change the approved plan for underground parking.

While I am still very disappointed in the overall outcome and approved plans for the North 40 related to a host of considerations including density, traffic and impact on existing downtown businesses, the idea that Summerhill is now trying to remove a key element -- the underground parking -- should not be allowed. Even with the parking that is already part of the plan, it may be insufficient.

Please do not allow Summerhill to change the plan regarding the agreed provision of parking.

As an additional note (that I have made before Council previously), Los Gatos and the region are experiencing the many negative effects of LIGHT POLLUTION. I would continue to ask the Council and Staff to be vigilant in ensuring this major project as well as all new construction and projects, take into account and ONLY permit LOW IMPACT LIGHTING. Our night sky is one of Los Gatos' treasures, and slowly but surely, the ability to see stars and enjoy the quietness of the evenings, are now getting overshadowed by blaring "city lights", street lights and exterior residential light schemes.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to ensuring the TOWN of Los Gatos retains its unique charm. You are the stewards working on the residents behalf, and we are asking for your help.

Warm Regards,

Patricia Ernstrom

From: Hua Jiang <hua@huajiang.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 11:41 AM
To: Joel Paulson <jpaulson@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: North 40 Underground parking

Dear Mr. Paulson,

My name is Hua Jiang. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed plan to remove underground parking of the North 40 project. The removal would lead to vehicles circling around already congested LG/Lark intersection, and force overflow traffic to park in adjacent residential areas.

If the underground parking level was not necessary, why would the builder propose it in the first place? Such bait-and-switch strategy deserves a sound defeat. I am respectfully asking the commission to reject the proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

-Hua Jiang
Linda Ave, Los Gatos

*This Page
Intentionally
Left Blank*