

Alberto Quintanilla

From: vamy@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, March 6, 2023 4:36 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Non-agenda Item; 3/7/23 city council meeting

Dear Mayor Lei, Vice-mayor Keng and Council members Campbell, Kassen, Shao, Salwan and Cox,

I am a Fremont resident and am writing to raise awareness of the lack of dedicated pickleball courts in Fremont. There is a large community of Fremont pickleball players and we are asking for free regulation sized courts to play on 7 days a week. Currently the City offers quasi-pickleball courts at the Tennis Center, with faint court lines and nets of improper width and height. As you can see, not true regulation sized facilities.

I and 200+ other Fremont PB players strongly advocate the conversion of the 3 tennis courts at Centerville Community Park into pickleball courts. The reason this is the preferred location is:

1. It is centrally located; players come from all areas of Fremont, making this location the most convenient
2. There is enough open space around the courts to mitigate noise complaints from neighbors
3. There are lights for night play
4. There are restrooms and parking available

Data from the Recreation Department Master Plan currently shows a 124% service level for tennis, while PB is only at 16%. Converting tennis courts at Centerville Park to PB courts still leaves a service level of 116% for tennis and increases PB service level to 49-59%. Many cities (Hayward, Pleasanton, San Jose, Mt. View, Palo Alto & Milpitas) just to name a few have converted tennis courts to PB courts, as they have seen it to be the best and quickest way to provide PB courts to their communities.

While the Fremont Rec dept. has been working on this issue, the plan they are advocating is not seen as the best one by a majority of Fremont PB players. Their plan is to build 4 courts on Civic Center Drive between the library and old police station. There are negative issues at this site, namely:

1. NO lights for night play. The courts at the Tennis Center have become increasingly busy in the evenings due to more players that can only play at night. Courts without lights would be a bad decision.
2. Lack of convenient restrooms. For seniors this is important.
3. The yield of fewer number of courts to be built(4) versus a conversion of the 3 Centerville tennis courts. Conversion would yield a minimum of 6 courts but would likely be able to yield 9 courts or even more depending on design.
4. Expediency- a new build will most likely take longer than converting existing tennis courts.
5. A new build will possibly be more expensive than a conversion.

Thank you for the chance to present my views. I really hope the City Council can see the greater benefits of the conversion of tennis courts to PB courts at Centerville Community Park.

Sincerely,
Virginia Moy

Alberto Quintanilla

From: Nathiya Prathnadi <nathiya.prathnadi@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 9:26 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Public Comment for the Upcoming 7pm City Council Meeting 03/07/23

> Good morning - Submitting my comments below to be read out at the City council meeting today. Thank you!

>

> My name is Nathiya and live in district 1. I wanted to submit a statement because I would like our City to have an urban forest organization like countless cities have - San Jose has Our City Forest, Palo Alto has Canopy. While I understand Urban Forest Friends (UFF) is young - there is much potential to grow it into an organization that will make our City proud. Having met Lynn (the founder) at the earth day event last year and going through the process of being block leader (getting neighbors to plant trees in front of their homes and also the elementary school). Our neighborhood (Northgate) now have these beautiful Oak trees that will grow and provide shade for students who wait to be picked up. Shade for the neighborhood when we take our daily walks and shade for a car parked on a driveway as one of my neighbors wanted. Some of these neighbors I talked to for the first time ever and now when we see each other we say hi and talk. It feels good. I am now helping UFF with social media and just wanted to say - we (all of us volunteers) are members of the community - we live here, raise our families here, we walk these streets and care deeply for our City . Please support us, include and partner with us. We have trees and ideas ready to go now. Most urgently, we need spots to plant trees this month as the tree planting season is almost over. I'd also like to ask (as I'm sure many others will be doing tonight) that Lynn be included in the UFMP working group and that we can create an MOU together this year. Thank you.

March 7, 2023

Written Communication

We are asking that the City Council and Mayor review City of Fremonts Planning Departments actinons on Planning Commission Report 4104., for submitting a false document to Planning Commission. I will be listing some of the falsehood of this report.

Please refer to Pages 3 and 4

Community Character 4-3.7

FALSE- Entire paragraph is false, the massing is not consistent with adjacent structures. Privacy on side and backyards impact should be avoided through building design and orientation. This is completely false, they designed just the opposite. They designed and orientated the project so every balcony and large window on buildings #7 & #8 are front facing our property, having direct site line into our private backyard, as if we are a courtyard for the project.

Please refer to Page 4

Analysis

FALSE- There is no clerestory windows facing our backyard. They placed 6 balconies, 12ft away from our property. How does that give us more privacy? they have a 4ft 8in planter along our property line from wall. They only have 12ft from wall to building and balconies. It will be impossible to plant trees large enough to provide any sort of privacy.

Please refer to Pages 4 & 5

Compliance R -3-18 FMC development standards

FALSE- Noncompliant , side yard is 10ft as stated on approved site plan, but as built side yard is 8ft from structural wall and front yard is 12 ft to structural permitted wall. But 15ft is required for front yard per approved site plan on building #8.

Private Open Space

R-3-18 requirements have been altered. 18.90.050. Patios or private yards (at ground level) minimum 100 sq ft the least interior dimension of which is 10ft or minimum of 200 sq ft with an interior dimension between 6 and 10ft.

Grading and Drainage

FALSE – Our back yard has been flooding due to concrete wall blocking drainage,

Findings for Approval

Site Setting and Content

FALSE – Our property borders project northeast. Our property is not listed or mentioned anywhere. So, it was never addressed in discretionary design review or mandatory design rules.

Among the violations we also believe there is a violation of the Brown Act notification which states: Each agenda must be posted in a place that is freely accessible to the public.

This was impossible since we were under a shelter in place requirement by Alameda County,

There are too many other violations to list them all. We are asking this project not be finalized until all the privacy issues and setbacks are compliant. We are asking that the City Council and mayor review the Planning Department competency, and their violation of law of submitting a false document to a public agency (Planning Commission and City Council)

After many letters, emails, phone calls and letter of demand from attorney to many different departments, we have had very little responses or resolution.

We would appreciate a review by the City Council and will be waiting on your response

Sincerely,

Thomas and Frankie Cabral