Date: February 17, 2023
From:
Rhoda Fry (and Cupertino Residents Doe 0 – 100)
10351 San Fernando Avenue
Cupertino, CA 95014-2832
fryhouse@earthlink.net
408-529-3560



RECONSIDERATION PETITON

NOTICE: Reconsideration petitions are only accepted for adjudicatory matters that are quasi-judicial decisions by the City Council. The reconsideration petition is subject to the requirements of and must comply with section 2.08.096 of the Cupertino Municipal Code, available in the City Clerk's office or online at http://www.amlegal.com/cupertino_ca/. Please review this form carefully and provide a detailed explanation for each item. Failure to meet the requirements of section 2.08.096 may result in rejection of the reconsideration petition.

1. **Project for which you are requesting reconsideration**:
Application No.: EXC-2022-003
Applicant(s) Name: David Ford, All Sign Services; Location: 20565 Valley Green Dr.; APN: 326-10-044

3. **Contact information for party requesting reconsideration**:
Name: Rhoda Fry (and Cupertino Residents Doe 0 – 100)
Address: 10351 San Fernando Avenue, Cupertino CA 95014-2832
Phone: 408-529-3560
Email: fryhouse@earthlink.net

4. **Date of Council meeting considering the project for which you are requesting reconsideration**:
February 7, 2023
Reconsideration petitions must be filed within ten (10) calendar days of the date of the Clerk's notice.

5. **Details of grounds for reconsideration (Cupertino Municipal Code Section 2.08.096).** A petition for reconsideration must specify, in detail, each and every ground for reconsideration. Failure to specify the particular ground(s) for reconsideration will preclude any omitted ground(s) from being raised or litigated in a subsequent judicial proceeding.

In addition, the grounds for reconsideration are limited to the criteria listed below. Failure to meet these grounds may result in rejection of the petition for reconsideration. Check all grounds that apply and provide detailed explanations of the facts supporting each ground for reconsideration (provide supporting documentation and attach additional sheets if necessary):

By this statement, all information on the City of Cupertino website pertaining to the 10/21/22 Planning Commission meeting and the 2/7/2023 City Council meeting and other documents pertaining to the Public Storage site, the General Plan, the North De Anza Boulevard Special Center plan, and the CMC are included in this document.

✓An offer of new relevant evidence which, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced at any earlier city hearing.

Explanation of new evidence and why it could not have been produced earlier:
The City was likely unaware of Public Storage's updated image policies that tout that "the building *is* the sign." Public Storage's architect said in this blog post: "We had seven different types of signs," she said. "Now, not only do we now have a consolidated sign, the new building *is* the sign." https://www.publicstorage.com/blog/public-storage/public-storage-locations-get-a-new-look In spite of the following business hours, Office Hours Mon-Sun 8:00am to 7:00pm and Gate Access Hours Mon-Sun 6:00am to 9:00pm, the Cupertino Public Storage building is illuminated 24x7. If the building is indeed the sign, it must not be illuminated 24x7. Moreover, it is much too large to have that much illumination. Interestingly, two sides of the building that are visible from the freeway are illuminated – the backside that faces offices remains dark. Additionally, the illuminated sign that faces the adjacent condominiums remains illuminated after 11pm which is a code violation. The excessive light is a public nuisance to residents. See also EXHIBIT 1.

✓ An offer of relevant evidence which was improperly excluded at any prior city hearing.

Explain relevant evidence and how, when it was excluded at a prior hearing:
A. The council packet did not show the setting of the building within the community and how it looked from various residences/hotel or freeway at different times of day. How could the City Council make an informed decision about freeway-oriented signage without this information? Furthermore, on February 13, I spoke with Planner Martire and lamented that the proposed illuminated freeway-oriented Public Storage sign would be in a line view of many residents' homes. He was surprised and unaware that residents would be facing the signs. If he had known, then perhaps the council would have been given more information. The proposed signs are in a direct line view of the De Anza Forge Condominiums and can be seen from the Markham Apartments and the Cupertino Hotel along with the freeway. The City Council was denied substantial evidence. Refer to EXHIBIT 1 (setting) and EXHIBIT 2 (nighttime photographs).

B. Council was not provided with detailed images or specifications of the proposed illuminated Public Storage sign along with other illuminated signage facing the freeway. In fact, there are no similarly situated properties in the City. The only illuminated sign that somewhat faces the freeway is the Cupertino Hotel. Council was not given any tools to compare the Cupertino hotel sign with the proposed Public Storage sign. Its sign is on the northbound onramp, not on the freeway. It is barely visible driving South on 280 and not at all going North. Nor does it appear to directly face dwelling units in the way that the Public Storage building does. I walked the length of the condo complex adjacent to Public Storage and climbed up to the fence-line and could not see the Cupertino Hotel sign. It is possible that residents on higher floors might have a glimpse of the sign. If council had made a site visit or had images of the Cupertino Hotel sign along with the Public Storage sign (even the one that is installed provides some insight), they would have realized that these two properties are very different and would need to be treated differently (19.104.220 C. The sign shall also be compatible with the aesthetic character of the surrounding developments and neighborhood.)

Council was not provided visuals on the levels of illumination, this would have been needed to provide an informed decision on the subjective criteria in 19.104.220 ("the aesthetic appearance of signs is subjective"). When comparing the illumination between the proposed Public Storage Sign and the Cupertino Hotel Sign, there is no comparison. But the council was not provided a side-by-side comparison. Public Storage is bright white and huge and the Hotel is soothing dark blue and is of modest size. Although the proposed sign is within the foot-lamberts requirements for signage, no explanation of what it means or what it looks like was provided. A foot-lambert refers to the amount of illumination per square foot. So the bigger the signage, the more illumination it will have. Note that the applicant explained that he wants signage to be visible to motorists traveling 70 to 75 miles per hour (which is speeding in our community) past the property. (19.104.220 G. The sign's color and illumination shall not produce distraction to motorists or nearby residents.) In other words, the applicant wants motorists to be distracted by his advertising sign.

If council had gone on an appropriate site visit or been provided appropriate information, they could have made an informed decision to either not allow any illumination or even no signage.

	
Installed sign as viewed from adjacent condo. The illuminated portion of the sign is reportedly 52 square feet. The illuminated portion of the freeway-facing sign would be 165 square feet. This gives an idea as to how bright it would be. The letters appear much brighter than the building's interior lighting. This photo was taken between 10:30 pm and 11:00 pm on 2/15/2023. **IMAGINE A SIGN 3X LARGER THAN THE ABOVE. IS IT COMPARABLE TO THE CUPERTINO HOTEL?**	**CUPERTINO HOTEL**: This photo has been enlarged. Otherwise you would not be able to recognize it. This is a view of Cupertino Hotel from the on-ramp to 280 North from De Anza. On the freeway heading south, the blue sign was sometimes hidden and other times very subdued. I was unable to see the sign from the condos across the freeway having walked the fence line and even climbed up to it. It is unlikely that much of this sign is visible from the condos. Pphoto was taken between 10:30 pm and 11pm on 2/15/2023.

C. Please bear with me on this section – it is rather long but makes a point. The council packet failed to explain that the new public storage building is an intensification of a non-conforming use within the North De Anza Boulevard Special Center. **Consequently, it is even more important that the look of the building and its signage conform to adjacent uses**. Resolution 19-072 describing the architectural and site approval permit included boilerplate text pertaining to signage, "c) The number, location, color, size, height, lighting and landscaping of outdoor advertising signs and structures shall minimize traffic hazards and shall positively affect the general appearance of the neighborhood and harmonize with adjacent development." The document as a whole makes various promises that pertain to the entire building and signage, including but not limited to: (see ATTACHMENT A for the entire resolution)

- "In order to preserve design harmony between new and existing buildings and in order to preserve and enhance property values, the materials, textures and colors of new buildings should harmonize with adjacent development by being consistent or compatible with design and color schemes, and, with the future character of the neighborhood and purposes of the zone in which they are situated" and
- "development should be designed to protect residents from noise, traffic, light and visually intrusive effects" and
- "provide shielding to prevent spill- over light to adjoining property owners"

Regarding the North De Anza Boulevard Special Center: The new building (4 stories 264K square feet per https://www.cupertino.org/our-city/departments/community-development/planning/major-projects/public-storage) is four times the size as the building it replaces and has 2600 units. In 2006, Public Storage proposed a new building in this same location (Application U3-2006-03, ASA-2006-05, EA2006-06. This proposed building (3 stories 155K square feet) was estimated at three times the size of the original and the Planning Department recommended against it and the Planning Commission concurred:

Public Storage is located in the North De Anza Boulevard Special Center in which self-storage is a non-confirming use, the description of the Special Center has not changed in decades. The 2006 recommendation for rejection noted that the replacement building would be substantially inconsistent with the area and would significantly intensify the use of the site,

"The proposed mini-storage facility is a non-office use that does not promote these General Plan policies for maintaining cohesive office parks and, therefore, staff believes that the project, which will significantly intensify the use of the site as a mini-storage facility by almost tripling the amount of existing mini-storage building area, will conflict with these policies. The proposed project will offer very little public and community benefit, as it is anticipated to generate a minimal amount of retail sales tax to the City for its sales of packing/boxing supplies, and is substantially inconsistent with the surrounding uses of the area that include office and multiple-family residential."

Additionally, "Staff is also concerned about the height of the proposed buildings as they will be prominently visible from Interstate 280, the new condominium development currently under construction to the east, the existing residential neighborhood to the west and the two-story office buildings occupied by Apple to the south." The new building has 32 parking spaces and the rejected smaller building had 80 parking spaces. (https://www.cupertino.org/our-city/departments/community-development/planning/major-projects/public-storage)

Because the new building is even more visible than the proposed 2006 building, its visual impacts from I-280 are greater today than they were in 2006. Consequently, every possible measure must be taken to minimize its impacts, including signage, on residents. See ATTACHMENT B for 2006 Public Storage rejection.

D. The Council was not provided information on how the signs are measured. **The way the signage has been measured is deceiving**. The large sign is made up of orange stripes with white lettering on top. Only the outline of the white lettering is measured in determining the sign's size. The rest of the building is silver gray and tan. Here is the new Cupertino Public Storage building with the sign already installed that does not face the freeway.

		
Daytime photo from website of Cupertino building. The sign is made up of orange stripes with white lettering on top. https://www.publicstorage.com/blog/public-storage/cupertino-storage-units-reopen-near-apple-campus	Nighttime photo around 10:30PM as seen from adjacent condo complex. Sign and lights remain on after 11pm. The words even appear brighter than the interior lighting. The proposed freeway-oriented lettering portion of the sign is over three times larger.	Note that the back of the building, which faces Apple office buildings has no orange rectangles. Consequently, the orange rectangles really do look like signs. Also, the back is not illuminated at night.

Following is an excerpt of the plan in the Planning Commission packet. A reasonable person who looks at the outlined portion of the image on the left sees an image similar to the one above: a sign made up of orange stripes with white lettering on top. The measurement of this outlined area is shown on the right. It measures about 800 square feet. The maximum signage area per CMC is 200 square feet. **Effectively, the proposed sign exceeds the 200 square-foot maximum**. The measurement provided to council was the minimum circumference of the illuminated lettering; this is deceiving.

The staff had many creative options at its disposal to show the public and council the true scale of the proposed sign. Next to the right schematic, I've added an approximate 6-foot tall human for illustrative purposes.



BUILDING 1 - NORTH ELEVATION
SCALE: 1"=30'-0"



3 PLACEMENT DETAIL
SCALE: 1/16"=1'-0"

✓ Proof of facts which demonstrate that the City Council proceeded without, or in excess of its, jurisdiction.

Explain facts and how those facts show that the Council operated outside its jurisdiction:

No validation from Caltrans that the proposal was compliant.

✓ Proof of facts which demonstrate that the City Council failed to provide a fair hearing.

Explain facts and how those facts demonstrate failure to provide a fair hearing:

A. The "approval authority" for Freeway Oriented signs is the Planning Commission per CMC Table 19.104.200. It is customary for Planning Commissioners to make site visits. Because the Council became the approval authority for a Planning Commission decision, they should have made a site visit in order to provide a fair hearing.

B. Council was told that the Planning Commission's decision was not valid – but a portion of their denial was based on information in the signage CMC 19.104. The denial stated: "The location of Signs Two and Three along the north elevations of Buildings One and Two could result in a situation that is materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare to the community…" This would imply that the Council was not permitted to vote on the basis of public health, safety, and community welfare which is incorrect. The video meeting shows much confusion on the part of the staff and council members.

C. The council packet lacked clear instructions on what was being voted on and what criteria needed to be used for the vote. This is surprising because this was the second hearing for the sign. During the planning commission, the city attorney told the planning commission that their approval / denial of the sign was discretionary. How did that meeting go wrong and why weren't the issues that created a de novo hearing at the council resolved? Because the council did not have an appropriate rubric, the council could not provide a fair hearing. **The packet failed to explain council could vote for 0, 1 or 2 freeway-facing signs**. **The packet failed to provide the relatively short criteria upon which they would be voting.** At a minimum, Council needed this:

19.104.050 Sign Permit Application–Review Criteria.

The Approval Body shall review the sign application to ensure that the following criteria are met:

A. The proposed sign meets the requirements of this title or any special conditions imposed in the development.

B. The proposed sign's color and illumination is not in conflict with the safe flow of traffic on the City streets.

C. The sign is in conformance with the Design Criteria in Section 19.104.220.

19.104.220 Design Criteria–Permanent Signs.

Although the aesthetic appearance of signs is subjective, the City recognizes that certain basic design guidelines are needed in order to maintain the City's high quality appearance. The following criteria shall be incorporated into the design of signs.

C. All signs shall be architecturally compatible and in harmony with the building with which it is principally associated, by incorporating its colors, materials, shape and design. The sign shall also be compatible with the aesthetic character of the surrounding developments and neighborhood.

E. Sign copy shall be simple and concise, without excessive description of services or products.

F. Internally illuminated signs shall not have a directly visible light source.

G. The sign's color and illumination shall not produce distraction to motorists or nearby residents.

D. The lack of clarity in the packet was further muddied by conflicting instructions from the City manager, attorney, and planner. Examples include, the attorney gave an explanation and the city manager said no, let me explain. The planner's presentation failed to mention that the City Council had the discretion reject all freeway-oriented signs per CMC 19.104. Councilmember Chao asked whether council can uphold the planning commission decision to deny both signs and the City Manager Wu said no, but then explained that the council could deny both signs or allow one (two signs were not provided as an option). The council could not come to the same conclusion as the planning commission? The City Attorney said that the Planning Commission decision was not legally justifiable but did not describe how. The council would need to find a

legally justifiable basis to deny the sign – but what were the specifics of the basis? He wound up being interrupted by the manager. Council would need to find a legally justifiable basis to deny the sign, but what would have basis be? The council could approve additional signs – but could they deny all freeway facing signs? And there are design criteria that all signs must meet – and what are they? Chao asks if staff thought there was justification to deny both signs. City manager implies no. City Attorney stated that grounds for denial is if design criteria is not met, but Council is not provided the criteria. City manager says that once you have a freeway facing sign that it is subject to planning commission's approval. You just have to watch the video. It is just too confusing.

The planner said the sign met requirements for size and lighting but failed to spell out that there were additional criteria, some of which is subjective. After council struggled in its deliberation and were obviously confused, staff requested a break. They came back in another failed attempt to clarify instructions. The planner showed only the text of 19.104.050, not 19.104.220. The planner told council that the signage was compliant with 19.104.050 which incorporated 19.104.220, leading council members to believe that they had to vote in favor of the signage. But it was up to the council to make that determination. The City manager corrected the planner. Who is the council supposed to listen to? The attorney, the city manager, the expert planner? **The three staff members did not reconcile clear direction to the council even after having called for a break**. Further, the text of 19.104.220 was not shown in the packet or at the council meeting. Even after Councilmember Moore asked that 19.104.220 be displayed, it was not. **Council needs clear instructions in the packet and during meetings in order to provide a fair hearing.**

E. It bears repeating that the City Attorney stated that the council decision needed to be made on design criteria but staff never provided the City Council Design Criteria (CMC 19.104.220), which is relatively short.

F. Had the neighbors across the freeway been notified, the council would have received significant input from neighbors about the proposed signage. It is appropriate to extend notification when there are special circumstances that cause unexpected impacts. We know that freeway-oriented signage is special because approval authority is assigned to the planning commission instead of the Community Development Director for other signs. See EXHIBIT 3 for the types of letters they would have received – these are letters that we sent after the hearing when residents learned of council's decision. Because of this, council was incapable of providing a fair hearing.

G. Recall, the City Council was being asked to make a decision that normally has the Planning Commission as Approval Authority. Specifically, the Planning Commission is the Approval Authority for Freeway-Oriented signs (19.104.200). Councilmember Moore, is the only councilmember with Planning Commission experience and mentions distracting spillover lighting. She asked that the short text of 19.104.220, upon which the decision would be rendered, be displayed for all councilmembers to see. It was not. She also asked for a continuation of this agenda item and gave her reasons. It was not. Consequently, council was unable to have a fair hearing and was hampered in its ability to make an informed decision.

H. It is hard to understand the fairness of a hearing when a building that has not even received its final inspection report is considered an existing building. The original plan set did contain signage that is very similar to the current proposal.

I. The council's lack of planning commission experience and access to the municipal code that explains the intent of the sign ordinance outlined in 19.104.010 hindered their ability to have a fair hearing. Was this intent fulfilled? The Planning Commission understood that the purpose of

the sign was mainly advertising. The council did not understand how to balance the needs of the community with the desires of the business to advertise per 19.104.010.

19.104.010 Purpose and Intent.

A. The purpose of the sign ordinance is to identify and enhance businesses while maintaining the aesthetic appearance of the City.

B. A good sign program will provide information to the public concerning a particular business or use and will serve the visual and aesthetic desires of the community.

C. The City has adopted this title with the intent to:

1. Provide architectural and aesthetic harmony of signs as they relate to building design and surrounding landscaping;
2. Provide regulations of sign dimensions and quantity which will allow for good visibility for the public and the needs of the business while providing for the safety of the public by minimizing distraction to the motorist and pedestrian;
3. Provide for sign regulations that will be compatible with the building, siting, and the land uses the signs are intended to identify;
4. Provide for maintenance of existing signs and a program for bringing nonconforming signs into conformance with the standards of this title as changes are made to the signs or businesses;
5. Provide procedures which will facilitate the efficient processing of sign applications; and
6. Provide design criteria which will promote attractive and effective signs for Cupertino residents, businesses, employees and visitors.

✓ Proof of facts which demonstrate that the City Council abused its discretion by:

- (a) Not preceding in a manner required by law; and/or
- (b) Rendering a decision which was not supported by findings of fact; and/or
- (c) Rendering a decision in which the findings of fact were not supported by the evidence.

Explain facts and how those facts demonstrate abuse of discretion related to items (a)-(c):
When council was told that the Cupertino Hotel sign also faced the freeway, some lept to the conclusion that it was similar to the proposed Public Storage sign. As shown earlier in this document, it is not. Council relied on the assumption that the signs and locations of the signs are similar but they are not. Council decision was not supported by facts.

6. Signature(s) *Rhoda Fry* (and other Cupertino Residents)

PS – per code, I respectfully request refund of fees. Thank You.

Please complete form, include reconsideration fee of $356.20 pursuant to Resolution No. 22-049 payable to City of Cupertino and return to the attention of the City Clerk, 10300 Torre Avenue, Cupertino, California (408) 777-3223.

Acceptance of a petition by the City Clerk is for timeliness purposes only and does not constitute a determination that the petition meets the requirements for reconsideration under section 2.08.096 of the Municipal Code. The City reserves the right to review petitions after submission and reject those that do not meet the criteria set forth in Cupertino Municipal Code Section 2.08.096.

PAYMENT PROOF



EXHIBIT 1 – Residents and Hotel Guests who will see the Illuminated Public Storage Sign





	View of Public Storage from the Cupertino Hotel Parking Lot. Imagine what the guests will see from their guestrooms from a sign that is over three times larger facing the freeway. It is likely that hotel guests from the onramp side and the backside could be impacted.

EXHIBIT 2 –Existing Public Storage Sign, Cupertino Hotel Sign, Views from De Anza Forge

<table>
<tr>
<td>
</td>
<td>
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installed sign as viewed from adjacent condo. The illuminated portion of the sign is reportedly 52 square feet. The illuminated portion of the freeway-facing sign would be 165 square feet. This gives an idea as to how bright it would be. The letters appear much brighter than the building’s interior lighting. This photo was taken between 10:30 pm and 11:00 pm on 2/15/2023.

IMAGINE A SIGN 3X LARGER THAN THE ABOVE. IS IT COMPARABLE TO THE CUPERTINO HOTEL?</td>
<td>CUPERTINO HOTEL: This photo has been enlarged. Otherwise you would not be able to recognize it. This is a view of Cupertino Hotel from the on-ramp to 280 North from De Anza. On the Freeway heading north, it was sometimes hidden and other times very subdued. I was unable to see the sign from the condos across the freeway having walked the fence line and even climbed up to it. It is unlikely that much of this sign is visible from the condos. This photo was taken between 10:30 pm and 11:00 pm on 2/15/2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View from a lower unit in a De Anza Forge condo.</td>
<td>View from a different unit in a De Anza Forge condo.</td>
</tr>
</table>

These photos were taken between 10:30 pm and 11:00 pm on 2/15/2023 at the De Anza Forge Condominiums along the various areas that face the freeway. The sign would be installed at the highest point on the building. In all cases, the photos are taken from a vantage point that is further away from the Public Storage building than a view from a condo.	
	
	

EXHIBIT 3 – EXCERPTS LETTERS RECEIVED BY CITY CLERK/COUNCIL FROM NEIGHBORS WHO WOULD BE AFFECTED BY SIGNAGE BETWEEN 2/8 and 2/16 (names/addresses redacted)

My name is [redacted] and I own a condo in the DeAnza Forge community [redacted]

Please do not allow Public Storage to have illuminated signage facing the freeway until 11pm daily. This signage will be visible from my home and disrupt our quality of life. The proposed lighted sign is 165 square feet on an 800+ square-foot orange background. In October, the Planning Commission denied any signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104; in February, the City Council ignored their decision. The City Council should have upheld the Planning Commission's determination; there should be no sign. Alternatively, as a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination. The sign does not help prospective customers to find the building and is big enough for advertising the business during daylight hours.

I am also very concerned about highway/driving safety with that proposed illuminated sign.

Please do not allow Public Storage to have illuminated signage facing the freeway, especially if it is lit until 11pm daily. The lights from the Public Storage are already very bright in the evening. Adding large illuminated lettering onto the side of the buildings would only further increase the buildings brightness and make it an even bigger visual eyesore. Nearby residents don't want a nightlight. It would only further increase the amount of light pollution coming inside our homes. Not to mention, it would make our homes less desirable, if we were to rent or sell it in the future.

The two newly-built, 4-story Public Storage buildings are now the first thing you see when you look out of our bedroom and living-room widows, since they are now at eye level with our condo. We bought our condo in 1985, even before the Cupertino Inn was built, when our condo still had the beautiful unobstructed views of the mountains and there were a lot more planted trees everywhere. I think around that time, the one-story Public Storage facility was originally built in Cupertino, as well. In fact, in all the 40 years that it's been at that location, Public Storage has never had a sign facing the freeway to advertise its location, much less needed one that was illuminated. We don't think it should be necessary for them to have one now. Due to the large size of both buildings and their trademark burnt orange and grey color, they are very hard to be missed from the freeway. Illuminating the name of the company, so that it can further advertise its brand, at the detriment of the neighbors and the driving cars, should not be allowed. Let's leave the bright lights and lit signs for Las Vegas and not Cupertino. The only entity benefiting from the proposed illuminated signage would be Public Storage; not the overall community. I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination.

All view access to the mountains cutoff by building line.

Thank you so much for taking away what little view we had.

Photo; Feb 15, 735a



[redacted]

Dear City Council:

Please do not allow Public Storage to have illuminated signage facing the freeway until 11pm daily. This signage will be visible from my home and disrupt my quality of life. The proposed lighted sign is 165 square feet on an 800+ square-foot orange background.

- The building has already cutoff good views of the mountains. Had it been one story lower, the tops of the mountains would be visible. Maybe it doesn't matter to you but it mattered to me. Public Storage wins. I lose. Poor choice by allowing this.
- Now to make it worse already the hallways are lighted projecting across the highway into bedroom.

Photo : 1020p, Feb 14th, 2023



Views of mountains gone.

- To make matters worse, the illuminated sign will be visible from many of the condominiums at De Anza Forge. We already lost a view to the south of the mountains, there will be a large obtrusive lighted sign directly in the sight-line. This will negatively affect the value of all condominiums in the complex.

- In October, the Planning Commission denied <u>any</u> signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104;
- in February, the City Council ignored their decision. The City Council should have upheld the Planning Commission's determination; there should be no sign.

Alternatively, as a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination. The sign does not help prospective customers to find the building and is big enough for advertising the business during daylight hours.

Furthermore, do you think this building meets the City Council's promise made specifically for this building? Resolution 19-072 stated "In order to preserve design harmony between new and existing buildings and in order to preserve and enhance property values, the materials, textures and colors of new buildings should harmonize with adjacent development by being consistent or compatible with design and color schemes, and, with the future character of the neighborhood and purposes of the zone in which they are situated."

If the new City Council truly cares about the residents of Cupertino, please do not allow Public Storage to have an illuminated signage facing the freeway until 11pm daily. This signage would be visible from home and would disrupt our quality of life. The proposed lighted sign is 165 square feet on an orange background measuring over 800 square feet.

Would you like it if you lived here and you saw that sign each night?

In October, the Planning Commission denied any signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104. In February, the City Council ignored their decision. As a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination. The sign does not help prospective customers find the building and is large enough to advertise their business during daylight hours.

I feel this is a very reasonable request. I am not asking for the removal of the sign. Please reconsider so that the signage is not lit up when it's dark.

Please do not allow Public Storage to have illuminated signage facing the freeway until 11pm daily. This signage will be visible from my home and disrupt my quality of life. The proposed lighted sign is 165 square feet on an 800+ square-foot orange background. In October, the Planning Commission denied any signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104; in February, the City Council ignored their decision. The City Council should have upheld the Planning Commission's determination; there should be no sign. Alternatively, as a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination. The sign does not help prospective customers to find the building and is big enough for advertising the business during daylight hours.

Furthermore, do you think this building meets the City Council's promise made specifically for this building? Resolution 19-072 stated "In order to preserve design harmony between new and existing buildings and in order to preserve and enhance property values, the materials, textures and colors of new buildings should harmonize with adjacent development by being consistent or compatible with design and color schemes, and, with the future character of the neighborhood and purposes of the zone in which they are situated."

Please do not allow Public Storage to have illuminated signage facing the freeway until 11pm daily. This signage would be visible from my property. It will surely disrupt the quality of life.

The proposed lighted sign is 165 square feet on an orange background measuring over 800 square feet. In October, the Planning Commission denied any signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104; in February, the City Council ignored their decision.

As a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination. The sign does not help prospective customers to find the building and is big enough for advertising the business during daylight hours.

Please don't allow public storage to have signage facing the freeway until 11 pm daily.

This signage would be visible from my home and would disrupt my quality of life. The proposed illuminated sign is 165 square feet with an orange background measuring over 800 square feet.

In October, the Planning Commission denied any signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104; in February, the City Council ignored their decision. As a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination. The sign does not help prospective customers to find the building and is big enough for advertising the business during daylight hours.

Please do not allow Public Storage to have illuminated signage facing the freeway until 11pm daily. This signage would be visible from my home and would disrupt my quality of life. The proposed lighted sign is 165 square feet on an orange background measuring over 800 square feet. In October, the Planning Commission denied any signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104; in February, the City Council ignored their decision. As a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination. The sign does not help prospective customers to find the building and is big enough for advertising the business during daylight hours.

Please do not allow Public Storage to have illuminated signage and room lighting facing the freeway until 11p.m. daily. This signage and bright room lighting showing bright orange doors is visible from my home and has been disrupting my quality of life. The proposed lighted sign is 16 square feet on an orange background measuring over 800 square feet.

In October, the Planning Commission denied <u>any</u> signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104; in February, the City Council ignored their decision. As a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination and room lightening will be either shut off or significantly dimmed so that the light pollution will not cause sleep disturbance for the residents. The sign does not help prospective customers to find the building and is big enough for advertising the business during daylight hours and bright ugly room lighting is just wasting precious community electricity.

Please do not allow Public Storage to put up an enormous illuminated sign facing 280. The building, which was recently constructed, already interferes with the quality of my life since it is lit up all night long and the light goes directly into my condo on the other side of the freeway. The proposed illuminated light would only make the problem worse, especially during the summer months when windows are kept open to let cool air in (letting in also the view of a large glowing sign). Where I once had a lovely view of the

mountains, I now have an ugly grey building blocking it, with the threat of an enormous illuminated Public Storage sign being place upon it. Please do not allow this to happen.

In October, the Planning Commission denied any signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.1-4, so it seems like this should not happen.

I look forward to seeing the action you take in this matter.

The newly-built Public Storage building is a problem. I live in a condominium De Anza behind Homestead Square Shopping Center, facing to Freeway 280. Recently the new building was built and the building is a total obstacle for all the residents in my neighbors. We could see the mountains over Freeway 280 but now we cannot enjoy the view. What we see through the windows is just a storage building. It's worse. The building has large windows and the corridors are lit by the light until late at night. But I have never saw a soul in the corridor. The building in front of our residence is ugly at daytime. The building with lighted windows is ugly at night. The Public Storage building is already a problem.

And now.

Please do not allow Pubic Storage to have illuminated signage facing the freeway until 11pm daily. This signage would be visible from my home and would disrupt my quality of life. The proposed lighted sign is 165 square feet on an orange background measuring over 800 square feet. In October, the Planning Commission denied any signage facing the freeway per CMC 19.104; in February, the City Council ignored their decision. As a compromise, I am respectfully requesting that the signage have no illumination. The sign does not help prospective customers to find the building and is big enough for advertising the business during daylight hours.
