

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Russ Van Dyne 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:08:01 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:29 PM  
**Subject:** Russ Van Dyne 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

***We vote for you so do t deny we the public from the ability to comment. AND LISTEN TO THE COMMUNITY. Otherwise it's***

***Just politics as usual demonstrating a lack of respect for the citizens you represent!***

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The

city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Russ Van Dyne  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Barbara A Espinoza 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:08:09 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:36 PM  
**Subject:** Barbara A Espinoza 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Barbara A Espinoza  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Vixchel Estrada 95116 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:08:35 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:37 PM  
**Subject:** Vixchel Estrada 95116 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Vixchel Estrada  
95116

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Tony Silva 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:08:40 PM

---

You don't often get email from [district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:40 PM  
**Subject:** Tony Silva 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Tony Silva  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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



**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Tina Rivers 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:08:54 PM

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:48 PM  
**Subject:** Tina Rivers 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

***I am just so tired of the East side of San Jose not being a true part of our city. This belief that our voices do not need to be heard and our input is not necessary for healthy development is outdated and is segregated thinking. We on the East Side need to be valued as much as those in Willow Glen and Almaden area and our personal knowledge of what our area needs has got to be part of any use/reuse of land. Thank you, yours Tina Rivera***

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Tina Rivers  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Debbie Locke 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:08:47 PM

---

You don't often get email from [district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:41 PM  
**Subject:** Debbie Locke 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Debbie Locke  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Marine Chapelier 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:01 PM

---

You don't often get email from [district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:55 PM  
**Subject:** Marine Chapelier 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Marine Chapelier  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Tina Rivers 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:08:54 PM

---

You don't often get email from [district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:48 PM  
**Subject:** Tina Rivers 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

***I am just so tired of the East side of San Jose not being a true part of our city. This belief that our voices do not need to be heard and our input is not necessary for healthy development is outdated and is segregated thinking. We on the East Side need to be valued as much as those in Willow Glen and Almaden area and our personal knowledge of what our area needs has got to be part of any use/reuse of land. Thank you, yours Tina Rivera***

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.

5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Tina Rivers  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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



**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Jennifer Miranda 95122 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:08 PM

---

You don't often get email from [district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 8:56 PM  
**Subject:** Jennifer Miranda 95122 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Jennifer Miranda  
95122

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Vina Valencia 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:24 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **District 5 United** <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 9:11 PM  
**Subject:** Vina Valencia 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Vina Valencia  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Veronica Frausto 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:15 PM

---

You don't often get email from [district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 9:08 PM  
**Subject:** Veronica Frausto 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Veronica Frausto  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Claudia Quinonez 95148 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:31 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 9:18 PM  
**Subject:** Claudia Quinonez 95148 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

***I have lived for the past 25+ Yrs just a few steps away from the gold course and I DO NOT WANT anything done without the community ,the people, that live around the land acknowledgement. It is our homes that would be at risk and I demand transparency!!***

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The

city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Claudia Quinonez  
95148

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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



**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Andres Quinonez 95148 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:40 PM

---

You don't often get email from [district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **District 5 United** <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 9:19 PM  
**Subject:** Andres Quinonez 95148 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Andres Quinonez  
95148

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Norma Zuniga 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:43 PM

---

You don't often get email from [district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 9:35 PM  
**Subject:** Norma Zuniga 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Norma Zuniga  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Paul Zuniga 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:55 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 9:46 PM  
**Subject:** Paul Zuniga 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Paul Zuniga  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Christine azzopardi 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:09:49 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 9:45 PM  
**Subject:** Christine azzopardi 95127 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Christine azzopardi  
95127

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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



**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Minh Pham 95116 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:10:00 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 10:04 PM  
**Subject:** Minh Pham 95116 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Minh Pham  
95116

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Trudy Ellerbeck 95227 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:10:15 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 10:08 PM  
**Subject:** Trudy Ellerbeck 95227 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

***East San Jose needs to preserve its open space.***

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Trudy Ellerbeck  
95227

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United

<https://www.district5united.org>

Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,

District 5 United

[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Danny Garza 95116 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:10:21 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 10:28 PM  
**Subject:** Danny Garza 95116 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

***Dear Community,***

Community input before Developers increase their profits.

Community Health before Developers Wealth.

No 501c3's without Community Accountability first.

Answers to Required and Individual Questions before we answer yes to Development.

In Community Spirit,  
Danny Garza

President  
Plata Arroyo Neighborhood Association and Gateway East N.A.C.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven

and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Danny Garza  
95116

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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

**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Edith Villanueva 95121 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:10:39 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 10:31 PM  
**Subject:** Edith Villanueva 95121 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community

engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Edith Villanueva  
95121

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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



**From:** [District 5 United](#)  
**To:** [Espejo, Gina](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Danny Garza 95116 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**Date:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 8:10:21 PM

---

You don't often get email from district5united@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** District 5 United <[admin@district5united.org](mailto:admin@district5united.org)>  
**Date:** Sat, Aug 27, 2022 at 10:28 PM  
**Subject:** Danny Garza 95116 - Agenda Item (d)1, CC 22-167, 8/29/22, Council Policy 5-1, Don't Take Open Space w/o community visioning  
**To:** <[district5united@gmail.com](mailto:district5united@gmail.com)>, <[city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District2@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District2@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District5@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District5@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District6@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District7@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District7@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District8@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District8@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District9@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District9@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov)>, <[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)>

Dear Transportation and Environment Committee,

As a community member, I reject the proposed significant policy change that would allow a developer to convert the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site with no clear process or plan for meaningful engagement by the community in visioning the future uses of the land.

***Dear Community,***

Community input before Developers increase their profits.

Community Health before Developers Wealth.

No 501c3's without Community Accountability first.

Answers to Required and Individual Questions before we answer yes to Development.

In Community Spirit,  
Danny Garza

President  
Plata Arroyo Neighborhood Association and Gateway East N.A.C.

Do not implement a policy change to accommodate a single property and the corresponding developers. If you decide to allow development of a 114 acre property, do so via a city-driven

and very robust community engagement and visioning process like you are doing for sites a fraction of the size.

1. I understand that staff are not recommending this policy change.
2. A policy change should not be driven by a single property, in this case the Pleasant Hills Golf Course. If it is, that should be disclosed for transparency.
3. The policy change would have implications for other areas. It could be used as a model that could be applied down the road to other types of zoning.
4. Any future plans for this site must include dedication of a significant percentage of the site for public open space.
5. If the city would like to explore what should happen with this 114 acre site, it should be through a city-led community based process instead of developing a policy to lay that out. The city and community should drive that process, not a developer.

The city is already doing visioning for other locations, including a 15-acre site, throughout other council districts and our community demands the same due process, community engagement, and requirements that are already in place to ensure our neighborhood growth and development align with the city's general plan and the community open space initiatives.

Danny Garza  
95116

--

This mail was sent on behalf of a San Jose resident via District 5 United  
<https://www.district5united.org>  
Community Working Together

--

Sincerely,  
District 5 United  
[www.district5united.org](http://www.district5united.org)

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