



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6056
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
--

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 1223 Shamrock Dr, Campbell CA 95008

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 414-01-022

REASON OF PROTEST

I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

Use separate sheet if necessary

The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: *(describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)*

1223 Shamrock Dr, Campbell CA 95008
414-01-022

and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)

The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:

- Fee Interest (ownership)
- Leasehold interest which expires on _____
- Other: *(explain)* _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME	Joanne Sancedo	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	650/903-6501
ADDRESS	1223 Shamrock Drive	CITY	Campbell
		STATE	CA
		ZIP CODE	95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Joanne Sancedo		DATE
			9/22/10
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	
		STATE	
		ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	
		STATE	
		ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	
		STATE	
		ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	
		STATE	
		ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M James Notary Public, personally appeared Sharonne Saucedo who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M James
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF _____) ss.

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____ who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
--

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	<u>1235 Shamrock Drive</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	<u>414-01-023</u>
REASON OF PROTEST	I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>
Use separate sheet if necessary	

The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	<u>1235 Shamrock Drive</u> <u>414-01-023</u>
and is now zoned	<u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)

The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership)
<input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold Interest which expires on _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME	Charles B. Davis			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-933-8778	
ADDRESS	1235 Shamrock Dr.,		CITY	Campbell	STATE	CA
					ZIP CODE	95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Charles B. Davis			DATE	9-22-10	
PRINT NAME	Deborah A. Davis			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-933-8778	
ADDRESS	1235 Shamrock Dr.,		CITY	Campbell	STATE	CA
					ZIP CODE	95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Deborah A. Davis			DATE	9-22-10	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS			CITY		STATE	
					ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE		
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS			CITY		STATE	
					ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE		
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS			CITY		STATE	
					ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE		

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.


On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James, Notary Public, personally appeared Reborah Ann Davis, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.


On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M. James, Notary Public, personally appeared Charles Bruce Davis, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James
Notary Public

(Seal)



service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San Jose, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
--	--

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	<u>1236 Shamrock Drive, Campbell, CA 95008</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	<u>414-01-052-00</u>

REASON OF PROTEST

I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

Use separate sheet if necessary

The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: *(describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)*

1236 Shamrock Drive, Campbell, CA 95008
414-01-052

and is now zoned RI-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)

The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:

Fee Interest (ownership)

Leasehold interest which expires on _____

Other: (explain) _____

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME	Jeanette Renee Margo			DAYTIME TELEPHONE #	408.410.0501	
ADDRESS	1236 Shamrock Drive			CITY	Campbell	STATE ZIP CODE CA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	9.27.10	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS				CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE		
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS				CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE		
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS				CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE		
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS				CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE		
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS				CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE		

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.


STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA) ss.

On 9/27/10 before me, M. S. LUCIO, Notary Public, personally appeared JEANETTE R. MARRAS, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

M. S. Lucio
Notary Public



(Seal)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF _____) ss.

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6056
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE _____
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	BY _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			
TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)			
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED <u>1047 ERIN WAY, CAMPBELL, CA 95008</u>			
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) <u>414-010-68</u>			
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>			
Use separate sheet if necessary			
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) <u>1047 ERIN WAY, CAMPBELL, CA 95008</u> <u>414-010-68</u>			
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)			
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership) <input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold Interest which expires on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____			

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

X

PRINT NAME	JIANWEN PI	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	(408) 371-5628
ADDRESS	1047 ERIN WAY	CITY	CAMPBELL
		STATE	CA
		ZIP CODE	95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	<i>Jianwen Pi</i>	DATE	09/27/2010
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	
		STATE	
		ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	
		STATE	
		ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	
		STATE	
		ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	
		STATE	
		ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

Zoning Protest Application Rev. 6/2/2008

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF Santa Clara)

On 9-27-10 before me, Michelle Antonowicz, Notary Public, personally appeared Jian Wen Pi, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Michelle Antonowicz
Notary Public



STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF _____)

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	
REZONING FILE NUMBER			DATE _____ BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
--

* ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 1055 ERIN WAY, CAMPBELL, CA, 95008

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)
41401041 ~~41401041~~ ~~41401041~~

REASON OF PROTEST
 I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

Use separate sheet if necessary

The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)

* ~~41401041~~ 1055 ERIN WAY, CAMPBELL, CA, 95008
~~41401041~~ 41401041

and is now zoned RI-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)

The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:

- * Fee Interest (ownership)
- Leasehold interest which expires on _____
- Other: (explain) _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

577
CAMPB

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)			
<p>This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.</p>			
* PRINT NAME LYNNE M. DE HART	DAYTIME TELEPHONE # 408-460-5245		
ADDRESS 1055 ERIN WAY	CITY CAMPBELL	STATE CA	ZIP CODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Lynne M. De Hart</i>	DATE 9-25-10		
PRINT NAME <i>Lynne M. De Hart</i>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
Use separate sheet if necessary			

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.

On Sept 25, 2010 before me, Diane M. James, Notary Public, personally appeared Styrene Marie Dehart who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF _____) ss.

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____ who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER	COUNCIL DISTRICT		DATE _____ BY _____
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	
REZONING FILE NUMBER			

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
--

* ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 1067 ERIN WY

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 414-01-042

REASON OF PROTEST
 I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

 Use separate sheet if necessary

* The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)
1067 ERIN WY
414-01-042

and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)

* The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:

Fee interest (ownership)

Leasehold interest which expires on _____

Other: (explain) _____

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)			
<p>This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.</p>			
PRINT NAME <i>Rubén Batuz</i>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <i>408 930-8346</i>		
ADDRESS <i>106 Erin Wy</i>	CITY <i>Campbell</i>	STATE <i>CA</i>	ZIP CODE <i>95008</i>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>[Signature]</i>	DATE <i>9.25.10</i>		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
Use separate sheet if necessary			

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF San Jose) ss.

On Sept 25, 2010 before me, Diane M. James, Notary Public, personally appeared Rethen Anthony Balrez, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF _____)

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF				
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____	

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	1079 Erin Way, Campbell, CA 95008
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	414-01-043
REASON OF PROTEST	
I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>	
Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
<u>1079 Erin Way, Campbell, CA 95008</u>	
<u>414-01-043</u>	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)	
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____	

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME JEFFREY PATTON DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 408.202.0428

ADDRESS 1079 Erin Way CITY Campbell STATE CA ZIP CODE 95008

SIGNATURE (Notarized) Jeffrey P Patton DATE 9/25/2010

PRINT NAME NANCY VILLALPANDO DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 408.204.7535

ADDRESS 1079 Erin Way CITY Campbell STATE CA ZIP CODE 95008

SIGNATURE (Notarized) Nancy Villalando DATE 09/25/2010

PRINT NAME _____ DAYTIME TELEPHONE# _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SIGNATURE (Notarized) _____ DATE _____

PRINT NAME _____ DAYTIME TELEPHONE# _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SIGNATURE (Notarized) _____ DATE _____

PRINT NAME _____ DAYTIME TELEPHONE# _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SIGNATURE (Notarized) _____ DATE _____

PRINT NAME _____ DAYTIME TELEPHONE# _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SIGNATURE (Notarized) _____ DATE _____

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF Santa Clara)
) ss.

On Sept 25, 2010 before me, Diane M. Jones, Notary Public, personally appeared Jeffrey P. Patton, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. Jones
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF Santa Clara)
) ss.

On Sept 25, 2010 before me, Diane M. Jones, Notary Public, personally appeared Nancy A. Villalpando, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. Jones
Notary Public

(Seal)



service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6056
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF

FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT		DATE _____ BY _____
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		
REZONING FILE NUMBER				

**TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT
 (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)**

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 1094 Erin Way Campbell ca 95008

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 41402028

REASON OF PROTEST
 I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

 Use separate sheet if necessary

The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: *(describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)*

1094 Erin Way Campbell ca 95008
41402028

and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)

The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:

- Fee Interest (ownership)
- Leasehold interest which expires on _____
- Other: *(explain)* _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)			
<p>This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.</p>			
PRINT NAME <i>Wendy H. Petrak</i>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <i>408-879-0139</i>		
ADDRESS <i>1094 Erin Way</i>	CITY <i>Campbell</i>	STATE <i>Ca</i>	ZIP CODE <i>95008</i>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Wendy H Petrak</i>	DATE <i>9/22/10</i>		
PRINT NAME <i>NICOLE PETRAK</i>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <i>408 896 2424</i>		
ADDRESS <i>1094 ERIN WAY</i>	CITY <i>CAMPBELL</i>	STATE <i>CA</i>	ZIP CODE <i>95008</i>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>[Signature]</i>	DATE <i>9/24/10</i>		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
Use separate sheet if necessary			

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.


STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA) ss.

On 9/22/2010 before me, M.S. LUCIO, Notary Public, personally appeared WENNY H. PETRAK, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

M.S. Lucio
Notary Public



(Seal)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.

On 9-24-2010 before me, Michelle Antonowicz, Notary Public, personally appeared NICOLE PETRAK, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Michelle Antonowicz
Notary Public



(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San Jose, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER	COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE _____	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	BY _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
--

X
X
 ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 866 Stonehorst Way, Campbell 95008

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 412-40-025

X
 REASON OF PROTEST
 I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

 Use separate sheet if necessary

X
 The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)
866 Stonehorst Way, Campbell, CA 95008

412-40-025
 and is now zoned RI-8 District (in Santa Clara County)

X
 The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:
 Fee interest (ownership)
 Leasehold interest which expires on _____
 Other: (explain) _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

X

PRINT NAME	Karen D. Balcanas			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-377-5003
ADDRESS	866 Stonehurst Way	CITY	Campbell	STATE	CA
				ZIP CODE	95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Karen D. Balcanas			DATE	9/27/10
PRINT NAME	Alan P. Balcanas			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-377-5003
ADDRESS	866 Stonehurst Way	CITY	Campbell	STATE	CA
				ZIP CODE	95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Alan P. Balcanas			DATE	9/27/2010
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	
				ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	
				ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	
				ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	
PRINT NAME				DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY		STATE	
				ZIP CODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)				DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.

On 9-27-10 before me, Michelle Antonowicz, Notary Public, personally appeared Alan P Balcunas & Karen D. Balcunas, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Michelle Antonowicz
Notary Public



STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
)
COUNTY OF _____) ss.

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
--

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 865 STONEHURST WAY CAMPBELL CA 95008

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)
41239002

REASON OF PROTEST
I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

Use separate sheet if necessary

The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)
865 STONEHURST WAY CAMPBELL CA 95008
41239002

and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)

- The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:
- Fee Interest (ownership)
 - Leasehold interest which expires on _____
 - Other: (explain) _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME CHRIS NOYER DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 408 371-5110

ADDRESS 865 STONEHURST WAY CITY CAMPBELL STATE CA ZIP CODE 95008

SIGNATURE (Notarized) Chris Noyer DATE 9/22/10

PRINT NAME Delaine Noyer DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 408-371-5110

ADDRESS 865 Stonehurst Way CITY Campbell STATE CA ZIP CODE 95008

SIGNATURE (Notarized) Delaine Noyer DATE 9/22/10

PRINT NAME _____ DAYTIME TELEPHONE# _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SIGNATURE (Notarized) _____ DATE _____

PRINT NAME _____ DAYTIME TELEPHONE# _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SIGNATURE (Notarized) _____ DATE _____

PRINT NAME _____ DAYTIME TELEPHONE# _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SIGNATURE (Notarized) _____ DATE _____

PRINT NAME _____ DAYTIME TELEPHONE# _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

SIGNATURE (Notarized) _____ DATE _____

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

)

) ss.


COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

)

On 9/22/10 before me, M. S. LUCIO, Notary Public, personally appeared CHRIS NOYER AND OKLAINE NOYER who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.



M. S. Lucio
Notary Public

(Seal)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

)

) ss.

COUNTY OF _____

)

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____ who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	COUNCIL DISTRICT
QUAD #			DATE <u>9-22-10</u>
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED	<u>873 SYDNER DRIVE, Campbell, CA 95008</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)	<u>412-4-012</u>
REASON OF PROTEST	
I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>	
Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
<u>873 Sydnor Drive</u>	<u>412-4-012</u>
<u>Campbell, CA 95008</u>	
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u>	District. (in Santa Clara County)
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fee Interest (ownership)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Leasehold Interest which expires on _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (explain) _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME MARYLOUISE FRANK		DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 408-200-1014	
ADDRESS 8799 Sydney Drive		CITY Campbell	STATE ZIP CODE CA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Mary Louise Frank</i>		DATE 7-22-10	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS		CITY	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 595-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.

On Sept 22, 2010 before me, Diane M James, Notary Public, personally appeared Mary Louise Grant, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M James
Notary Public



(Seal)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF _____) ss.

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
--

* ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 833 Sydney Ave

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S)
413 41 010

REASON OF PROTEST
 I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

 Use separate sheet if necessary

* The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)
833 Sydney Ave
413 41 010

and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)

* The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:
 Fee Interest (ownership)
 Leasehold interest which expires on _____
 Other: (explain) _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)			
<p>This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.</p>			
PRINT NAME <i>Matthew Walsh</i>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <i>408 656 0233</i>		
ADDRESS <i>6077 Vera Cruz</i>	CITY <i>San Jose</i>	STATE <i>CA</i>	ZIP CODE <i>95120</i>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>[Signature]</i>			DATE <i>9/25/2010</i>
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
Use separate sheet if necessary			

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.

On Sept 25, 2010 before me, Diane M. James, Notary Public, personally appeared Matthew James Walsh, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Diane M. James
Notary Public



STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF _____) ss.

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San José, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			BY _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
--

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED <u>945 SALERNO DRIVE CAMPBELL, CA 95008</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) <u>412-39-041-00</u>
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u>
Use separate sheet if necessary

The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: <i>(describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)</i> <u>945 SALERNO DRIVE CAMPBELL, CA 95008</u>
<u>PARCEL # 412-39-041-00</u>
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)

The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Interest (ownership)
<input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>(explain)</i> _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME JOYCE N. PHILLIPS		DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 408-559-4809	
ADDRESS 945 SALENO DRIVE	CITY CAMPBELL	STATE CA	ZIP CODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Joyce N. Phillips</i>		DATE 9/22/2010	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
Use separate sheet if necessary			

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA


)
) ss.
)

On 9/22/10 before me, M.S. LUCIO, Notary Public, personally appeared JAYCE N. PHILLIPS -, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) ~~is~~ are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/~~she~~ they executed the same in his/~~her~~ their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/~~her~~ their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

M.S. Lucio
Notary Public



(Seal)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF _____

)
) ss.
)

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE _____
QUAD #	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	BY _____
REZONING FILE NUMBER			

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED <u>986 SALERNO DRIVE</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) <u>412-40-006-00</u>
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because <u>See Attachment A</u> _____ _____ <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">Use separate sheet if necessary</p>
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) <u>986 SALERNO DRIVE</u> <u>412-40-006-00</u>
and is now zoned <u>R1-8</u> District. (in Santa Clara County)
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is at: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee interest (ownership) <input type="checkbox"/> Leasehold interest which expires on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (explain) _____ _____ _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)			
<p>This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.</p>			
PRINT NAME <i>KATHERINE HECKART</i>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE # <i>408 354 0217</i>		
ADDRESS <i>986 SALERNO DRIVE</i>	CITY <i>CAMPBELL</i>	STATE <i>CA</i>	ZIP CODE <i>95008</i>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Katherine Heckart</i>	DATE <i>9-27-10</i>		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE #		
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
Use separate sheet if necessary			

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.

On September 27, 2010 before me, Helen Charette, Notary Public, personally appeared Katherine Heckart, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Helen Charette
Notary Public

(Seal)



STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF _____) ss.

On _____ before me, _____, Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE
 Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
 200 East Santa Clara Street
 San Jose, CA 95113-1905
 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055
 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF

FILE NUMBER _____		COUNCIL DISTRICT _____	DATE _____ BY _____
QUAD # _____	ZONING _____	GENERAL PLAN _____	
REZONING FILE NUMBER _____			

**TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT
(PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)**

* ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 946 Salerno Dr.

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 412-40-009-00

REASON OF PROTEST
 I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A

 Use separate sheet if necessary

* The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: *(describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)*
946 Salerno Dr.
412-40-009-00

and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)

* The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:

Fee Interest (ownership)
 Leasehold Interest which expires on _____
 Other: *(explain)* _____

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME <i>Denise Lowrey</i>		DAYTIME TELEPHONE# <i>408 377 3679</i>	
ADDRESS <i>946 Salerno Dr</i>	CITY <i>Campbell</i>	STATE <i>CA</i>	ZIP CODE <i>95008</i>
SIGNATURE (Notarized) <i>Denise Lowrey</i>		DATE <i>9-27-2010</i>	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Rezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Rezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

1. Rezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Rezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
2. Rezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Rezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 -- an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning *de-annexation*), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
3. Rezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Rezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

4. Staff Analysis of Rezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Rezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Rezoning on my property.

5. Environmental Review of Rezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Rezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Rezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.

6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Rezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Rezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Rezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).