



Prepared for the City of Sunnyvale

# City-Wide Parking Study

## City of Sunnyvale

January 16, 2026



**WALKER**  
CONSULTANTS



## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Peer City Review .....	3
Stakeholder and Community Feedback .....	4
Recommendations .....	6
Updates to Municipal Code Section 10.16.120 .....	6
Alternatives .....	8
Study Addressing the Practice of “Vanlording” .....	8
Study an OSV Permit Program .....	9
Study Restricting OSV Parking near Parks/Schools.....	11
Summary of Costs .....	10
Additional Considerations .....	12
Case Law Research .....	13
San Diego .....	13
Mountain View .....	14
Sebastopol .....	14
Appendix 1 - Peer City Review .....	16
Appendix 2 – Community Meeting Minutes .....	27
Appendix 3 – E-mail Comments .....	32



## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

City staff receive regular complaints from residents about on-street parking in violation of Sunnyvale Municipal Code (SMC) Section 10.16.120. While complaints about parking are not unique to Sunnyvale, enforcement of the seventy-two-hour or more restriction is challenging at times and causes confusion with the public. SMC Section 10.16.120 states that “pushing or moving a vehicle a short distance or attempting to rub away the tire marking will not be considered compliance with this section. Additionally, successive acts of parking shall be presumed to be a single act of parking within the meaning of this section when the vehicle is moved merely for the purpose of avoiding the parking limitations prescribed by this section.”

In November of 2023, Sunnyvale City Council proposed a study issue to evaluate the SMC related to parking requirements and restrictions to determine alternative options and best practices utilized by surrounding jurisdictions. They requested the study to strengthen and modernize SMC Section 10.16.120 to include evaluating permit parking for oversized vehicles and restricting oversized vehicle parking near schools and parks.

The primary objective of this project is to research and provide a report on best practices and recommendations for updating and modernizing the existing 72-hour parking ordinance.

## Peer City Review

The following is a benchmark summary of the City of Sunnyvale compared to peer cities, including San Jose, Mountain View, and Palo Alto, as summarized in **Table 1**. A complete summary of the peer city review is included in Appendix 1.

- Population of the City per the U.S. Census.
- County of Santa Clara Point-in-Time (PIT) count, which is a count of sheltered and unsheltered people experiencing homelessness on a single night in January.<sup>2</sup>
  - The PIT unsheltered population.
  - The percentage of the unsheltered population living in a vehicle.
- The distance that a vehicle is required to be moved after being parked for 72 hours.
- The period after which a vehicle is prohibited from returning to its original parking spot after moving.
- Whether the City has an oversized vehicle (OSV) permit program, specifically for RVs or similar vehicles.
- Whether the City has a permit program focused on detached conveyances, such as trailers and campers that are inoperable without being attached.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: City of Sunnyvale City-Wide Parking Study Request for Proposals, IRFP #I25-001, Posting Date: 02/07/2025.

<sup>2</sup> Source: [Point-in-Time count | Office of Supportive Housing | County of Santa Clara](#)

Table 1: Summary of Peer City Review

Factors	Sunnyvale	San Jose	Mountain View	Palo Alto
Population	162,605	969,655	87,316	68,572
2025 PIT Unsheltered	328	3,959	722	399
2025 PIT Unsheltered living in a vehicle	75%	39%	96%	73%
72 hr movement requirement	None	0.1 mi	0.2 mi	0.5 mi
72 hr no return requirement	None	None	24 hours	None
OSV Parking Permit Program	None	None	None	Considering
City reimbursement to tow companies	\$2,500/vehicle, \$13K max/yr*	Towing is provided by a third party	\$5,000/vehicle, \$80K max/yr	\$5,000/tow, \$25K max/yr
Photo Requirement for Complaint	Photo is optional	Yes	Photo is optional	Photo is optional
Prohibit “Vanlords”	No	Yes	No	Considering

\*\$13,000 is the current annual budgeted amount for tow reimbursements

## Stakeholder and Community Feedback

The project included the following outreach activities:

- Community Meetings:** Two hybrid in-person and online meetings (one at 10:00 a.m. and one at 5:30 p.m.) open to the public on September 23, 2025. These meetings were held at Sunnyvale City Hall. Meeting minutes from the Community meetings are provided in Appendix 2.
  - Meeting 1 – Attendance: 20 in person, 22 online
  - Meeting 2 – Attendance: 9 in person, 20 online
- Business Group Outreach:** Participation in business group meetings and outreach. After each of these meetings, the project team followed up with a request for written comments from members on the parking study.
  - Moffett Park Business Group: The project team presented to the Moffett Park Business Group Board Meeting on October 2, 2025, at 12:00 p.m.
  - Sunnyvale Downtown Association: The project team presented to the Sunnyvale Downtown Association on October 8, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.
  - Chamber of Commerce Policy and Business Committee Meeting: Direct e-mail communication and request for comment with the Chamber of Commerce Policy and Business Committee.
- General Request for Comments:** The City issued a request for written comments, provided via e-mail, through the City’s social media channels. The full comments are provided in Appendix 3.



## Summary of Feedback

### Neighborhood and Business Impacts

Residents expressed concerns about OSV parking in neighborhoods and business districts. Participants cited losing curb parking, blocked sightlines, sanitation issues such as waste dumping, and perceived safety risks. Businesses reported that RVs and debris deter tenants and customers. Participants suggested creating designated safe parking zones away from residential neighborhoods and business parks.

### Enforcement Gaps

The current Sunnyvale ordinance is vague because it does not specify how far a vehicle must move or how long it must wait before returning to its original position. This lack of clarity leads to inconsistent enforcement. Residents reported some parkers move vehicles only a few feet or erase tire marks to avoid citations. Many participants called for escalating penalties and towing after repeated violations.

### Movement and Return Requirements

There is broad support for adding a movement distance requirement, ranging from 0.25 to 1 mile, and a return time requirement of 24 to 72 hours. However, some participants expressed concerns about practicality and enforceability. They noted that these measures might simply push vehicles around the city without solving the underlying issue.

### Oversized Vehicle Permit Program

The community feedback was generally supportive of managing OSV parking, while also offering residents options for temporarily parking their OSVs near their homes. However, some community members express concerns about OSV parking in neighborhoods in general.

### OSV Restrictions Near Parks and Schools

Many participants supported prohibiting OSVs near sensitive areas such as parks and schools to improve safety and sanitation. However, they acknowledged challenges, including the need for extensive signage and enforcement, as well as vehicles concentrating in other areas.

### Compassion and a Balanced Approach

Feedback revealed two distinct perspectives. Some participants emphasized the importance of a compassionate approach that prioritizes safe parking programs, housing solutions, and social services. Others advocated for strict enforcement, including bans or overnight restrictions, and viewed OSV habitation as voluntary or exploitative. Most agreed that a balanced solution combining enforcement with alternatives for vehicle dwellers is necessary.

## Additional Suggestions

Participants proposed several additional measures, including establishing safe parking lots through partnerships with large property owners or city land, charging nominal fees, improving infrastructure with red curb painting and clearer signage, and protecting bike lanes. They also recommended a data-driven approach to distinguish between unhoused individuals, commuters, and commercial operators. Several people have called for an explicit ban on big rigs in residential areas.

## Recommendations

The two key recommendations for this parking study include:

1. Updating Municipal Code Section 10.16.120 to address ambiguities related to long-term parking.
2. Prohibiting the commercial practice of renting often inoperable recreational vehicles (RVs) or vans to unhoused individuals on public streets, which raises concerns regarding public safety, health, equity, and use of the public right-of-way (this practice is often referred to as “vanlording”).

## Updates to Municipal Code Section 10.16.120

### State Regulation

The enforcement of 72-hour parking violations is authorized under California Vehicle Code Section 22651 (k), which reads as follows:

*A peace officer, as defined in Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 830) of Title 3 of Part 2 of the Penal Code, or a regularly employed and salaried employee who is engaged in directing traffic or enforcing parking laws and regulations of a city, county, or jurisdiction of a state agency in which a vehicle is located may remove a vehicle located within the territorial limits in which the officer or employee may act, under the following circumstances...*

*...(k) If a vehicle is parked or left standing upon a highway for 72 or more consecutive hours in violation of a local ordinance authorizing removal...*

### Existing Sunnyvale Regulation

The State 72-hour rule is only enforceable if there is a local ordinance authorizing it. The City of Sunnyvale prohibits vehicles from being stored on public streets or in public parking facilities, as outlined in Sections 10.16.120 and 10.16.130 of the Sunnyvale Code of Ordinances. The existing Sunnyvale Municipal Code section regarding long-term parking is as follows:

*§ 10.16.120 Use of streets or public parking facilities for storage of vehicles prohibited. It is unlawful for any person who owns or has possession, custody, or control of any vehicle, including a boat or trailer, to park or leave such vehicle upon any street, alley, or public parking facility for a period of seventy-two*



*consecutive hours or more. The intent of this section is to limit parking of vehicles, boats and trailers to seventy-two consecutive hours. A vehicle or trailer shall be considered to have been parked or left standing for seventy-two or more consecutive hours if it has remained inoperable or has not been moved. An inoperable vehicle is a vehicle that cannot be moved under its own power or a vehicle which cannot operate legally and safely on the highways of the state. Pushing or moving a vehicle a short distance or attempting to rub away the tire marking will not be considered compliance with this section. Additionally, successive acts of parking shall be presumed to be a single act of parking within the meaning of this section when the vehicle is moved merely for the purpose of avoiding the parking limitations prescribed by this section. (Ord. 2435-93 § 1; Ord. 2633-00 § 1; Ord. 2925-10 § 1)*

Key points of the existing regulation include:

- A vehicle is considered to have been parked for 72+ hours if it has remained inoperable or has not been moved.
- An inoperable vehicle cannot be moved under its own power or cannot operate legally and safely on the highway.
- Pushing a vehicle a short distance or attempting to rub away the tire marking is not allowed.
- Successive acts of parking are presumed to be a single act of parking when the vehicle is moved merely for the purpose of avoiding the parking limitations.

## Challenges with Existing Regulation

- Enforcement is often challenging. For example, simply moving a vehicle a short distance or trying to remove tire markings is not considered compliant. These practices have led to confusion and inconsistent enforcement.
- Residents frequently report vehicles violating the 72-hour rule.
- There is no distance requirement for the existing regulation.
- It is difficult to distinguish between a single parking session and a continuous act of parking.

## Proposed Revisions

### Distance Requirement

- **Recommendation:** Sunnyvale should consider adding a distance requirement to Section 10.16.120 of the Code to provide more clarity for the public and for enforcement officials. The requirement should be at least 0.25 miles to ensure the vehicle is parked on a different block and is within the range of other cities.
- **Example Cities:** Other cities in the Bay Area that have a distance requirement include:
  - Palo Alto – vehicle must move at least 0.5 miles.
  - San Jose – vehicle must move more than one-tenth (0.1) of a mile.
  - Mountain View – vehicle must move at least 1,000 feet (0.2 miles).
  - Santa Clara – does not give a specific distance requirement, but the vehicle has to be moved to another street; across at least one intersection on the same street; or to the other side of the street within the same block.
  - Cupertino – vehicle must move 1,500 feet (0.3 miles).



- San Mateo – vehicle must move one city block (approximately 0.1 mile).
- **Considerations:** A distance requirement can be challenging to enforce due to the difficulty in tracking vehicle movement.
- **Community Feedback:** No major exceptions were received, except for one emailed comment suggesting that the regulation should remain unchanged. There was general concern expressed that implementing the distance requirement would result in vehicles moving around the City rather than addressing the overall problem.
- **Fiscal Impact:** None is assumed, as the updated code language would provide clarity to the existing regulations rather than adding signage or enforcement resources.

## Return Time Period

- **Recommendation:** Sunnyvale should consider stipulating that once a vehicle has been moved, it cannot return to the same parking spot for at least 24 hours. A time-to-return requirement would create clarity for the public and enforcement officials and help deter vehicles from storing cars in one location for an extended period. The 24-hour time period is consistent with the requirement in Mountain View, a neighboring city.
- **Example Cities:** Mountain View has a 24-hour no-return requirement. Cupertino has a three (3) day no return requirement. San Mateo has a no-return requirement.
- **Considerations:** A time-to-return window requires regular inspections to ensure compliance.
- **Community Feedback:** No major objection expressed.
- **Fiscal Impact:** None is assumed, as the updated code language would provide clarity to the existing regulations rather than adding signage or enforcement resources.

## Alternatives

### Study Addressing the Practice of “Vanlording”

“Vanlording” refers to the commercial practice of renting often inoperable recreational vehicles (RVs) or vans to unhoused individuals on public streets, which raises concerns regarding public safety, health, equity, and use of the public right-of-way. These vehicles can be inoperable, lack sanitation, and pose fire hazards, exposing vulnerable residents to unsafe living conditions. RV encampments linked to vanlords have led to complaints about blight, environmental hazards, and blocked rights-of-way, creating friction between residents, businesses, and unhoused individuals. Enforcement becomes more complex because these transactions occur outside of formal housing systems, making it harder to apply existing tenant protection laws.

The City of Sunnyvale suspects the practice of “vanlording” occurs in Sunnyvale. The City has received reports of a vanlord renting out at least 5 RVs to individuals and charging \$500 to \$1,000 per month for rent. The tenants reported that the vehicles were not being adequately maintained and that they would be responsible for any parking citations.

Cities like Los Angeles and San Jose have moved to ban vanlording because it exploits people experiencing homelessness by charging them hundreds or even thousands of dollars for substandard shelter without basic utilities or legal tenant protections.<sup>3</sup>

- **Addressing the Practice of Vanlording** – The City of Sunnyvale should consider prohibiting the practice of “vanlording” —the commercial rental of recreational vehicles (RVs), vans, or similar vehicles for habitation on public streets or in unauthorized locations. This prohibition should include penalties for individuals or entities profiting from such arrangements, as they exploit vulnerable populations and circumvent housing and health regulations.
- **Example Cities that Ban Vanlording:** San Jose, Cupertino, and Palo Alto (considering implementing a ban)
- **Considerations:** Identifying vanlords can be challenging.
- **Community Feedback:** The practice of vanlording was not specifically discussed during the community and stakeholder outreach process.
- **Fiscal Impact:** A minimal fiscal impact, as enforcement is assumed to be completed by existing officers.

## Study an OSV Permit Program

### Case Studies

**Table 2** includes examples of cities that have implemented oversized vehicle permit (OSV) permit programs, including Cupertino, Long Beach, and San Diego. The permits are intended to provide residents with opportunities to temporarily park their OSV near their home, subject to permit conditions.

**Table 2: Examples of Cities with Oversized Vehicle Permit Programs**

City	Definition of OSV	General Restriction	Permit Purpose	Permit Details	Annual Limit
Cupertino	>22 ft length OR >6 ft width & 7 ft height	No parking 10 p.m.– 6 a.m. without a permit	Residents who need temporary overnight parking for OSVs near their homes	Free permits, valid for 72 hrs; must move 1,500 ft after expiration	20 permits per household/year
Long Beach	>85 in height OR >80 in width OR >22 ft length	Prohibited on residential streets without a permit	Residents who need temporary OSV parking near their residence, and persons with disabilities who rely on an OSV for transportation.	Free permits, valid for 72 hrs; must park adjacent to residence	12–20 permits/year (36–60 days)
San Diego	>27 ft length OR >7 ft height	No parking 2 a.m.–6 a.m. without a permit	Residents who need temporary overnight parking for OSVs near their homes	\$1.50 per permit; valid 24 hrs; max three consecutive (72 hrs)	72 permits per address/year

<sup>3</sup> Sources: Los Angeles: [Motion](#), San Jose: [San Jose bans homeless people renting RVs- San José Spotlight](#)



## Benefits

Research indicates that implementing an OSV parking permit program can help the City manage oversized vehicle parking and address community feedback related to OSV parking.

## Considerations

Based on the research review:

- An OSV permit program could be seen as unfair to people experiencing homelessness and living in their OSVs if no alternative Safe Parking site or shelter is offered.
- An OSV permit program would likely not address workers who commute to Sunnyvale from long distances and live in their OSV during the week. These workers have a permanent home and are not experiencing homelessness.
- Implementing an OSV permit program would add costs for parking signage and increased enforcement (see the Summary of Costs section for planning-level cost estimates).
- If an OSV is eligible for towing, often the tow yards do not have room for the vehicle.

## Community/Stakeholder Feedback

Some participants supported permits that allow residents to park RVs or trailers temporarily, modeled after Cupertino's recently adopted program. Suggestions included offering low-cost or paid permits to discourage long-term street storage. Some community members expressed concern about allowing OSV parking, even temporarily. Other community members emphasized the importance of a compassionate approach toward people who rely on their vehicles for housing.

## Summary of Costs

The following rough order-of-magnitude planning level cost estimates are for a potential OSV permit program and implementing OSV parking restrictions near parks and schools, as summarized in **Table 3**. The cost items that are included are outlined below<sup>4</sup>:

- **Sign fabrication and installation** – Designing, fabrication, and installation of signs with the OSV parking restriction. It is assumed that a third party will conduct the design, fabrication, and installation of signage under City oversight. All blockfaces: 5,176 block faces, two signs/blockface, estimated at \$400-\$500/sign<sup>5</sup>
- **Traffic Engineer oversight** of signage – Sunnyvale traffic engineering oversight of sign design, fabrication, and installation. 1 TE, 1 TE Tech = total salary (\$330,000-\$350,000). It is assumed that this increased staffing level will be needed for one year.
- **Permit administration** – Costs associated with administering permits for OSVs. Sunnyvale Department of Public Works (DPW) already oversees the City's residential parking permit program. The City should evaluate whether the DPW staffing level would be sufficient to administer an OSV permit program.

---

<sup>4</sup> Cost estimates are based on research and discussions with city officials and are for planning-level purposes only.

<sup>5</sup> Based on City Attorney review, only blocks with signage are enforceable.



- **Annual towing fees** – The City’s costs for towing OSVs, assuming 50-100 vehicles towed/year, are estimated at \$5,000 per tow, \$250,000 - \$500,000.<sup>6</sup>

Table 3: Summary of Costs

Cost Item	Rough Order of Magnitude Cost
Sign Fabrication and Installation	\$750,000 - \$3,000,000 (depending on focus area)
Traffic Engineer Oversight for Signage	1 TE, 1 TE Tech (\$330,000-\$350,000)
Annual Towing Fees	\$250,000-\$500,000

Note: Cost estimates are based on discussions with City staff and are for planning level purposes only.

## Study Restricting OSV Parking near Parks/Schools

The parking study scope included researching OSV parking near parks and schools. Further, this strategy was discussed during the community and stakeholder engagement process.

### Case Studies

San Jose has a temporary tow-away zone program for OSVs at sites that are prioritized based on the severity of parking concerns and associated issues, such as but not limited to:<sup>7</sup>

- How near vehicles are parked to sensitive areas, including schools, parks, waterways, storm drains, and emergency interim housing sites.
- The number of vehicles congregated in an area.
- Site conditions, including levels of observed trash, biowaste, and potential obstructions.
- How near vehicles are parked to Priority Safety Corridors and bike lanes.
- City Council office priorities.

### Potential Benefits

Based on the research review:

- Restricting OSV parking near schools and parks provides potential benefits relative to sight lines for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers.
- The restrictions would promote turnover and greater access to parking spaces around these uses.

### Considerations

- The City of Sunnyvale has a significant number of parks and schools (39 public parks, 10 public schools). Therefore, restricting OSVs near parks and schools can result in vehicles concentrating in other locations, such as business districts.

<sup>6</sup> The City’s current towing reimbursement is \$2,500/vehicle, which towing companies have indicated is not enough to cover the costs of towing OSVs. A \$5,000/vehicle rate is assumed for this analysis.

<sup>7</sup> Source: [Oversized and Lived-In Vehicle Enforcement | City of San José](#)



- Implementing OSV restrictions near parks and schools would add costs for parking signage and increased enforcement (see the Summary of Costs section for planning-level cost estimates).

## Community Feedback

Outreach participants supported prohibiting OSVs near sensitive areas such as parks and schools to improve safety and sanitation. However, they acknowledged challenges, including the need for extensive signage and enforcement, as well as the risk of concentrating vehicles in other areas.

# Additional Considerations

Through the project work, research indicates that the following additional strategies (listed in **Table 4**) could help manage OSV parking in Sunnyvale. These strategies are included for informational purposes and may be considered in the future.

Strategy	Details
<b>OSV Buyback Program</b>	Some cities, such as San Jose, Berkeley, and San Francisco, have implemented an OSV buyback program that offers a financial incentive for individuals to surrender their RVs for placement in designated shelters.
<b>Increase reimbursement to tow companies to facilitate the towing of cited vehicles</b>	The city's current reimbursement to tow companies is \$2,500, but this amount does not cover the actual costs. The Department of Public Safety received an "all-in" estimate of \$11,220 per RV from the main tow providers utilized by the City, which includes a "heavy" tow fee, disposal of items from within the trailer/RV (some require dumpster rentals), a lien fee, and a dismantlers' fee. The City could consider increasing the tow amount.
<b>Photo Requirement for Complaint</b>	Require vehicle submissions to Access Sunnyvale to include a photo to help reduce unproductive field visits. The City of San Jose implemented a photo requirement and reported a decrease in unproductive field visits.



## Case Law Research

The following are research findings from recent litigation in California related to long-term parking and OSV management policies. Walker Consultants does not provide legal counseling. Walker Consultants provides lawsuit case studies for informational purposes only. This information does not constitute legal advice and is not a substitute for professional legal counsel.

### San Diego

#### Background

The City of San Diego enacted two ordinances to address concerns about oversized vehicles and vehicle habitation:

- **Neighborhood Parking Protection Ordinance (NPPO)** - San Diego Municipal Code §§ 86.0139–86.0144 Prohibits oversized, non-motorized, and recreational vehicles from parking on public streets between 2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m., and within 50 feet of an intersection at any time, unless a valid permit is obtained.
- **Vehicle Habitation Ordinance (VHO)** - San Diego Municipal Code § 86.0137(f) - Makes it unlawful to use a vehicle for human habitation on public streets or property between 9:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., or at any time within 500 feet of a residence or school (excluding colleges and universities).

#### Legal Challenge

A class-action lawsuit (Bloom et al. v. City of San Diego) argued that these ordinances were vague, discriminatory, and disproportionately harmed disabled and low-income individuals. Enforcement actions—including fines, towing, and impoundment—were claimed to have resulted in the loss of shelter and undue hardship for vulnerable populations. Plaintiffs contended that the ordinances violated constitutional protections and lacked adequate alternatives, such as safe parking programs.

#### Outcome

The litigation concluded with a \$3.2 million settlement, which included:

- Ticket forgiveness for violations dating back to 2017.
- Damages paid to plaintiffs.
- A three-year moratorium on enforcement unless the city provides sufficient safe parking alternatives.



## Mountain View

### Background

Mountain View enacted two ordinances aimed at improving traffic safety and bike lane access:

- **Narrow Streets Ordinance** - Mountain View Ordinance No. 15.19 - Prohibits parking of oversized vehicles—defined as exceeding 22 feet in length, 7 feet in width, or 7 feet in height—on streets 40 feet wide or less. Approximately 90% of city streets fall under this restriction.
- **Bike Lane Ordinance** - Mountain View Ordinance No. 14.19 - Restricts oversized vehicle parking on streets adjacent to Class II bikeways.

These ordinances were approved by voters through Measure C in November 2020 and intended to address safety concerns, blocked bike lanes, and emergency access.

### Legal Challenge

A class-action lawsuit (Navarro et al. v. City of Mountain View) was filed in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Plaintiffs argued the ordinances were unconstitutional, disproportionately harmed low-income residents, people with disabilities, and communities of color, and effectively banned RVs from most city streets. The lawsuit claimed these measures criminalized homelessness rather than addressing housing needs.

### Outcome

The settlement agreement, finalized in September 2022, required Mountain View to:

- Designate at least three miles of legal parking for oversized vehicles.
- Provide a 72-hour notice before towing any vehicle in violation.
- Distribute maps of legal parking areas and offer reasonable accommodations for disabled residents.

Enforcement of the ordinances resumed on October 1, 2022, following outreach and distribution of multilingual maps to affected residents.

## Sebastopol

### Background

Sebastopol adopted the Recreational Vehicle Parking Ordinance No. 1136 (Sebastopol Municipal Code §§ 10.36 and 10.76) in March 2022. The ordinance prohibits RV parking:

- On residential streets at any time.
- On commercial and industrial streets between 7:30 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.
- Within 30 feet of any street corner at any time.



Exceptions allow short-term loading/unloading (up to 72 hours) for residents or visitors. The ordinance aimed to address public health and safety concerns, ensure adequate street parking, and regulate vehicles used as sleeping accommodations.

## Legal Challenge

A lawsuit (Yesue et al. v. City of Sebastopol) was filed in October 2022 by the ACLU of Northern California, Disability Rights Advocates, and other groups. Plaintiffs argued the ordinance was discriminatory, unconstitutional, and violated the rights of people experiencing homelessness. The complaint alleged:

- The ordinance explicitly targeted vehicles “designed or altered for human habitation.”
- Enforcement was arbitrary and punitive, including a “one strike” policy allowing impoundment after a single citation.
- The ordinance was vague, making it unclear which vehicles were covered.

## Outcome

In November 2024, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California ruled in favor of the City, granting summary judgment and rejecting all claims. The court upheld Sebastopol’s authority to regulate RV parking for public safety and sanitation. Plaintiffs have appealed to the Ninth Circuit, with briefs filed in March 2025. The city continues enforcement while the appeal is pending.



## Appendix 1 - Peer City Review

### San Jose

#### Key Takeaways

- **Long-Term Parking:** The City of San Jose regulates long-term parking by imposing a time limit (72 hours) and a distance requirement (the vehicle must be moved more than one-tenth (1/10) of a mile from its original parking space). The City indicated that it is challenging to enforce the distance requirement.
- **Vehicle Abatement:** The City is enforcing long-term parking violations by focusing on non-operable or blighted vehicles. Before the COVID-19 pandemic, the City would respond to all resident complaints about long-term parking. The City switched policies to require complaints to include photos of the vehicle, and also started proactive enforcement. The City has seen success in its change of approach. Under the updated program, the tow rate increased from less than 7% of reported vehicles to over 24%.
- **Tow Management System:** Inoperable and blighted RVs pose logistical challenges, health risks, and potential financial losses for tow companies, making them less desirable to tow compared to other vehicles. To address these challenges, the City contracted with a tow management system provider to automate its towing and impounding process. The third-party provider can financially incentivize towing companies to take these blighted vehicles.
- **Oversized and Lived-In Vehicle Enforcement (OLIVE) pilot program:** The City has allocated \$1.5 million to establish temporary tow-away zones *focused on concentrations of oversized and lived-in vehicles that are located near areas such as schools, parks, waterways, storm drains, and emergency interim housing sites*. While the temporary restrictions allow the City to clean up impacted areas, the OLIVE program is not a long-term solution to the issue. The City lacks the resources to make all of the high-priority sites permanent tow-away zones.
- **Safe Parking Program:** Safe Parking Programs provide safe locations for individuals who are living in their vehicles to park at night. However, there are significant costs, including up-front capital costs, the property lease, security costs, employment and housing assistance, and meals for residents. The City could be spending up to \$50 million for one Safe Parking site. The property lease accounts for a significant portion of the cost (approximately \$18.9 million), making it advantageous to find a site owned by the City or another public entity. San Jose also operates a site near the Santa Teresa light rail station, and the City has a no-cost license agreement with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) with a term end date of November 2026.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Source: [25-1317- Memorandum](#)



## Long-term Parking

The City of San Jose Code Section 11.36.110 regulates long-term parking on City streets. The two key components of Code Section 11.36.220 include:

- **Time Limit:** Vehicles cannot be parked on a street or alley and remain unmoved for more than 72 consecutive hours.
- **Movement Requirement:** The vehicle must be moved more than one-tenth (1/10) of a mile from its original parking space within 72 hours.

The following key enforcement considerations of the 72-hour rule include:

- The City enforces the time limit by either using chalk or placing a penny on the tire.
- City staff indicated that it is almost impossible to enforce the 1/10 of the mile movement requirement, given the amount of resources that would be needed to monitor vehicle movement.

## Vehicle Abatement Policy

Historically, San Jose's vehicle abatement program was predominantly driven by service requests received from the public through its SJ311 system.<sup>9</sup> Officers responded to the location included in each service request, attempting to locate the vehicle, and, if found, initiated an investigation. In approximately 40-45% of those cases, the vehicle reported had moved upon the arrival of the officer. Less than 7% of investigated vehicles were found to be eligible for tow.

In 2022, the City altered its approach to vehicle abatement. The City stopped investigating cars solely for being "stored" or parked in one spot for too long, and switched focus to the towing of the most egregious vehicles. The City began distinguishing between abandoned vehicles and stored vehicles:

- **Abandoned Vehicle:** One that has been discarded by the owner with the intent not to return or own the vehicle any longer.
- **Stored Vehicle:** One that has been discarded by the owner with the intent not to return or own the vehicle any longer.

Beginning in September 2021, the City required a photo of the vehicle being reported while using SJ311. The photo must show the vehicle meets inoperable, safety, or blight criteria.<sup>10</sup> Photos provided during the SJ311 reporting process are reviewed by staff, and qualifying vehicles are investigated. This helped reduce unproductive field visits by 85-90%.

The City has seen success in its change of approach. Under the hybrid program, the tow rate has increased from less than 7% of reported vehicles to over 24%. Between July 2021 and May 2022, Parking Officers proactively assisted in removing 1,500 unreported vehicles.

---

<sup>9</sup> SJ311 system: <https://311.sanjoseca.gov/>

<sup>10</sup> List of criteria: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/transportation/parking/vehicle-abatement>



In addition to improving efficiency, the updated policy improved equity. Historically, customers in communities of color and low-income areas are less likely to report abandoned vehicles, despite a need for these services. However, officers now proactively patrol all city streets. During these patrols, they look for vehicles meeting qualifying vehicle criteria and pose a health, safety, or extreme blight concern. Even if the public has not reported a qualified vehicle, Officers will still investigate. The updated policy also prevents the towing of vehicles that are not truly abandoned, thereby reducing the financial burden on low-income individuals.

## Tow Management System

The City has had issues with towing inoperable vehicles. Inoperable and blighted OSVs pose particular logistical challenges, health risks, and potential financial losses for tow companies, making them less desirable to tow compared to other vehicles. To address these challenges, the City contracted with Autura, a tow management systems provider, to automate its towing and impounding process. Autura is not a towing company and does not own tow trucks or impound facilities. Autura acts as a central hub that automates and streamlines the process of getting tow companies to pick up vehicles by facilitating communication and, in some cases, providing a platform for the sale of unclaimed vehicles.

## Resident Towing Services

City of San Jose residents can have their inoperable vehicles towed at no cost by the City. The following criteria must be met to receive the service:

- You must be the registered owner of the vehicle being towed.
- The vehicle must be on your property, not on the street.
- The vehicle must be free and clear of liens or loans.
- You, as the vehicle's registered owner, OR an approved authorized representative, must be present at the time of the tow.
- You must show the vehicle's pink slip (Certificate of Title) to the tow service. The resident relinquishes ownership of the vehicle.

## Vehicle Habitation

Parking enforcement officers lack the necessary training to effectively and safely address encampments or vehicle habitation situations. When encountering vehicle habitation, officers refer the reported vehicles and associated issues to the Housing Department for follow-up so services can be offered and/or provided. If other illegal or unsafe activities are occurring in or around a vehicle, the individual observing should report them to the San Jose Police Department (SJPD) immediately so they can be addressed.

## OLIVE Program

The Oversized and Lived-In Vehicle Enforcement (OLIVE) pilot program aims to address environmental and safety issues caused by oversized vehicles, including those that are lived-in and parked on city streets. This program specifically targets congregations of oversized and lived-in vehicles parked near designated sensitive sites,



including schools, waterways, and emergency interim housing sites, and limited exceptions are made at the direction of the City Council. It does not attempt to push vehicles entirely off city streets.

### **Program Funding**

The program had \$1.5 million in funding for FY24-25 and \$1.8 million for subsequent years. The program includes a vehicle inventory, identification of temporary tow-away zones, and evaluation of permanent tow-away zones.

### **Vehicle Inventory and Analysis**

DOT Parking Compliance Officers conducted a citywide vehicle inventory from September to October 2024, identifying a total of 2,071 oversized and/or presumed abandoned vehicles. The full inventory is posted on the City's website.<sup>11</sup> The inventory found:

- 1,014 oversized vehicles (>6ft tall or >7ft wide)
- 960 presumed lived-in oversized vehicles
- 97 presumed lived-in regular-sized vehicles

To identify areas most in need of cleanup and potential enforcement, the City analyzed and aggregated the inventory data with several additional datasets, including available data from the Fire and Police Departments, to identify vehicle clusters and assess their proximity to and impact on key City priority areas and sensitive sites.<sup>12</sup>

### **Site Prioritization**

Parking-restricted sites are prioritized based on the severity of parking concerns and associated issues, such as:

- How near vehicles are parked to sensitive areas, including schools, parks, waterways, storm drains, and emergency interim housing sites.
- The number of vehicles congregated in an area.
- Site conditions, including levels of observed trash, biowaste, and potential obstructions.
- How near vehicles are parked to Priority Safety Corridors and bike lanes.
- City Council office priorities.

The site selection is based on the inventory data collected, supplemented by additional data from the Police and Fire Departments. The City is not taking requests for the establishment of new sites.

### **Temporary Tow Away Zones**

Up to 30 sites will be identified for temporary tow-away parking restrictions (approximately one month in duration) to facilitate the cleanup and street sweeping of the area and encourage people to move their vehicles out of the restricted zone. The program will scale up in Fiscal Year 2025-2026 to include 50 temporary sites.

By law, parking enforcement is required to give people 24 hours' notice to move their vehicles; however, the City attempts to provide people with approximately one week's notice to do so. Staff will attempt to contact vehicle owners to provide them with information on parking rules and restrictions before taking any enforcement action. Vehicles that are not voluntarily moved from tow-away zones will be subject to towing and impoundment.

---

<sup>11</sup> Inventory can be found here: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/transportation/parking/vehicle-abatement/oversized-and-lived-in-vehicle-enforcement>

<sup>12</sup> Details on the site analysis process can be found in a memo to City Council dated 1/6/25: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/117022>



OLIVE is a pilot program designed to test the impact of relocating oversized vehicles away from sensitive sites and to better understand the staffing and resources required to implement such a program. Current City staffing resources are insufficient to monitor and enforce compliance across multiple new parking-restricted sites. Based on the success of the temporary restrictions, up to 10 sites will be considered for permanent parking restrictions.

## Safe Parking Program

### Background

The City of San José offers a safe parking program, the Supportive Parking Program, to provide individuals and couples who sleep in their vehicles with safer overnight parking options. The program is focused on RVs. It offers unhoused individuals and couples living in their vehicles a temporary place to park overnight while they work towards a transition to permanent housing.

### Site Selection

The City regularly evaluates potential supportive parking sites. Key criteria for site selection include:

- The size of the paved area
- Availability of the parking lot during evening hours
- Lighting
- Fencing
- Accessible space for dumpsters and portable toilets
- The property owner's willingness to provide the City with temporary control of the space.

### Existing Safe Parking Sites

The City currently has two safe parking sites, one at the Santa Teresa light rail station and another on Berryessa Road in north San Jose. The Santa Teresa site is owned by the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), and the Berryessa Road site is privately owned. The City contracts with service providers to operate the sites.

#### Teresa Road Light Rail

- *Site Size:* 115,000
- *Location:* Santa Teresa Blvd & San Ignacio Ave, San José, CA 95123
- *RV Parking Capacity:* 42
- *Surrounding Land Uses:* Primarily Industrial, near light rail station
- *Site Ownership:* Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
- *Upfront Capital Costs:* N/A
- *Lease Costs:* none – 2-year lease
- *Annual Operations Costs:* The City has a \$1.5 million/year contract with service provider LifeMoves.

#### Berryessa Road site

- *Site Size:* 6.3 acres
- *Location:* 1300 Berryessa Road, San José, CA 95133
- *RV Parking Capacity:* 86
- *Surrounding Land Uses:* Primarily Industrial, near light rail station



- *Site Ownership:* Terreno Berryessa, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company
- *Upfront Capital Costs:* \$9.7 million to build the site
- *Lease Costs:* \$18.9 million for ten years
- *Annual Operating Costs:* The City has a \$2.8 million/year contract with service provider LifeMoves.

### Site Amenities and Services

Site amenities and services vary by location, but include:

- Amenities include restrooms, shower facilities, potable water, waste management service, and on-site security.
- Services include employment search assistance, housing locator assistance, financial literacy classes, healthcare referrals, substance abuse counseling, and behavioral health services.

### Program Participation

The program serves unhoused individuals and households using their RVs as their primary residence. Participants complete an eligibility screening and must obtain a referral to be enrolled in the program.

At the Santa Teresa site, priority is given to those living in Districts 2 and 10, as well as RV dwellers living near Columbus Park.

At the Berryessa site, the City's outreach teams are conducting priority outreach within a 1.5-mile radius. This outreach is typically conducted 90 days before a site's opening and continues for 30 days afterward. After the priority period ends, referrals can come from anywhere in the City.

### Key Requirements

At the Santa Teresa site, all participating vehicles must have a valid registration, insurance, and be operable before arrival at the site. The City learned that the requirements for the Santa Teresa site were challenging for many people living in their RVs to meet, and the site had low occupancy for a period. Therefore, the City modified this policy for the Berryessa site, which does not require registration, operability, or insurance.

Per fire regulations, the sites must maintain a 10-foot clearance between each vehicle. No tents or exterior structures are permitted, and belongings that encroach on the 10-foot clearance are also prohibited. There is security overnight to monitor the site. Program staff are on-site during the day. Program participants must check in when they arrive, and visitors must check in. Only approved visitors are allowed.

## Mountain View

### Key Takeaways

- **Long-term Parking Policy:** The City of Mountain View's Mountain View PD Policy Manual includes detailed policies regarding the enforcement of 72-hour violations. This helps to provide clarity and consistency for enforcement operations.
- **Inhabited Vehicle Enforcement:** The City Police Department has a unit specifically assigned to homeless outreach and enforcement called the Neighborhood and Event Services Unit (NES). The NES handles street closures/block party permits, coordinates police/public safety support at events, outreach to



unhoused/vehicle dwelling residents, and responds when event or vehicle conditions create health/safety hazards (e.g., RV sewage leak). NES handles 72-hour parking violations when the vehicles are inhabited.

- **Oversized Vehicle Policy and Navarro Settlement Agreement:** The city prohibits oversized vehicle parking on narrow streets and streets with bike lanes. A class action lawsuit was filed against the city, alleging the ordinances violated the constitutional rights of people who lived in oversized vehicles in Mountain View. As a result of the settlement, the city designated at least three miles of city streets where oversized vehicles can park without overnight restrictions. It also requires the city to provide clear maps of legal parking areas and implement a fair ticketing process, including a 72-hour notice before towing, with accommodations for people with disabilities.
- **Permit Parking for Oversized Vehicles:** Mountain View does not have a permit program for oversized vehicles.
- **Parks and Schools:** Mountain View does not differentiate enforcement between parks and schools.
- **Funding for dismantling RVs:** The city sets aside funding for dismantling RVs, as the tow companies lose money on these vehicles and refuse to tow. The city reimburses tow companies \$5,000 per RV. For the Fiscal Year, this program is funded with \$80,000.
- **Staffing:** The City's Police Department Community Services Officers (CSOs) enforce the City's parking regulations. The NES department (which specializes in homeless outreach and enforcement) includes an officer and a sergeant, as well as two police assistants.
- **Overall Approach:** Mountain View takes a balanced approach to outreach and enforcement. They acknowledge that many RV dwellers are workers. They respond proactively to a significant number of complaints. They recognize that it is difficult to track a vehicle's movement. They also stated that it is important to consider the impacts on border cities, as people/vehicles are displaced. It is better to develop partnerships between cities to address regional issues.

## Long-Term Parking

The City of Mountain View Code, Section 9.72, regulates long-term parking. The following are key components from this code language:

- **Maximum Parking Duration:** Vehicles cannot be parked in the same spot on public streets, alleys, highways, or lots for more than 72 consecutive hours.
- **Movement Requirement:** After 72 hours, the vehicle must be moved at least 1,000 feet (0.2 miles).
- **No Return for 24 Hours:** Once moved, the vehicle cannot return to the same spot for 24 hours.

The city established a policy manual regarding the 72-hour violation, with the following key policies:

- While police personnel can proactively check vehicles suspected of a 72-hour parking violation, enforcement of the 72-hour rule is generally complaint-based and processed through the abandoned



vehicle hotline or online reporting system. In the absence of other restrictions, such as street sweeping or posted time limits, vehicles are allowed to park in one spot for up to 72 hours.

- Vehicles parked beyond the 72 consecutive hour limit may be issued a warning, cited, and/or towed.
- A disabled placard or residential parking permit does not provide an exemption from this restriction.
- Vehicles that are parked in a parking spot for less than 72 hours have no restriction to return to the same parking spot.
- Personnel responding to a 72-hour parking complaint should investigate to ensure the vehicle is not associated with a crime, such as an unreported stolen vehicle.

## Enforcement Process

- Vehicles suspected of violating the 72-Hour rule are marked and noted on the Mountain View Police Department 72-Hour Vehicle Warning Card.
- A visible chalk mark should be placed on the tire tread at the fender level unless missing tires or other vehicle conditions prevent marking. Marks may also be placed on the pavement around the tires.
- Additional methods may be used to document the vehicle's position when it is suspected that chalk marks are being removed and the vehicle is not in compliance with the 72-hour rule. Any deviation in markings shall be noted on the 72-Hour Vehicle Warning Card.
- All 72-Hour Vehicle Warning Cards shall be submitted to the Traffic Unit for computer data entry. Vehicles that are inhabited have the 72-Hour Vehicle Warning Cards forwarded to the Neighborhood and Event Services Unit (NES).
- A vehicle marked for a suspected 72-hour violation is checked no sooner than 72 hours later. Barring evidence to the contrary, a vehicle will be presumed to have moved at least 1,000 feet if the visible and/or surreptitious markings indicate the vehicle was moved, or if it is not parked in the same parking spot when checked. Enforcement of violations may include a warning notice, citation, and/or removal.

## Vehicle Habitation Counts

The City conducts an annual street-by-street count of vehicles that appear to be used for living purposes. The most recent map was completed in July 2024.<sup>13</sup>

## Parking near Schools

VIII, DIV 3, SEC. 19.76. - **Parking adjacent to schools.** The city traffic engineer is hereby authorized to place signs or markings indicating no parking upon any street or portion thereof adjacent to any school property when such parking would, in his opinion, interfere with traffic or create a hazardous condition. When official signs or markings are installed indicating no parking upon a street or portion thereof adjacent to any school property, no person shall park a vehicle in any such designated place.

---

<sup>13</sup> Map found here: <https://www.mountainview.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/7945/638646766327630000>



SEC. 19.99.4: No parking zones near schools: Mountain View High School Vicinity and Mariano Castro Elementary School vicinity.

VIII, DIV 3, SEC. 19.79.4. - **Parking of oversized vehicles on certain narrow streets prohibited.**

## Safe Parking Program

- Developed Safe Parking Ordinance and permit program for private lots.
- Funded all necessary site setup and support for a nonprofit start-up.
- Coordinated with the County and partner CBOs to expand on-site services and provide running water, mobile showers, laundry services, and mobile medical unit visits.
- Created a program with 114 parking spaces, which is the largest site in the County, provided in conjunction with the County of Santa Clara; operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

### Services and Amenities

- Restrooms, water, wash stations, and other basic services are provided on the safe parking lots for participants.
- There is 24/7 security that drives through all of our parking lots, as well as staff that monitors the lots daily.
- Move Mountain View provides each client with a case manager who specializes in housing.

### Site Operation

A Safe Parking Operator (MOVE MV) manages the lot, reviews and interviews applicants, links applicants with social services, and provides limited liability coverage.

### Program Participation

The City's Safe Parking Program provides unhoused Mountain View residents with a temporary, safe location to park their vehicle. The City's program participation preferences are:

- Families with students in Mountain View school districts
- Those who live/work in Mountain View
- Seniors (55+)
- People with disabilities

Participants must have insurance, vehicle registration, and a driver's license.

## Palo Alto

### Key Takeaways

- It is challenging to take an "all-out OSV ban" approach. The City took a hands-off approach, but the issue grew.
- The number of OSVs in Palo Alto increased as other cities enacted restrictions.
- The City expressed concerns about litigation if implementing a strict policy.



- The City identified a need to solve the issue of "vanlords."
- The City is taking a phased approach to managing OSVs.

## Long-Term Parking

### Enforcement

- 72 hours – must move 0.5 miles, chalk tires, read odometers, and complete a data worksheet for each vehicle.
- Traffic Team – 1 Dedicated CSO to proactively tag and log oversized vehicles + 2 backup (not enough).
- Special Crime Team – 1 Sargent and 2 Sworn Officers to tow and address nuisance, connect with vehicle dwellers – Addresses more serious crime.

**Outreach Services:** City partners with Life Moves, a local non-profit, to connect with vehicle dwellers and offer services.

## Towing

**Towing:** The City pays for towing abandoned vehicles, but tow yards do not have enough room. The City pays \$5,000 per tow, but the budget is \$25,000 per year, which the City reported is not enough.

### Limit OSV to certain streets.

The City prohibits parking OSVs in residential and public facility zones between 2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. However, while the Code states this regulation is enforceable regardless of signage, preemptive state law bars enforcement without adequate signage to inform parkers of the restrictions.

## Proposed Process

The City is exploring limiting OSV parking to specific streets, with a process and criteria for designating them. The City has outlined a phased approach, summarized as follows:<sup>14</sup>

### Phase 1

- Develop an ordinance to prohibit parking of detached/inoperable vehicles on public streets.
- Develop an ordinance to prohibit the renting of public parking spaces ("vanlording").
- Refine the scope and begin implementation of additional street cleanups and sweeping.
- Return to Council for approvals of ordinances and contract amendments (e.g., street sweeping) as soon as possible, estimated to require up to four (4) months.
- Implementation and enforcement of these actions would follow.
- Work with LifeMoves to consider options, such as a buyback or parking program, to accept RV residents quickly at the Homekey site or other housing options.
- Return to Council for direction for expanded safe parking on privately-owned and congregation-based parking lots, except for any safe parking site that requires undedicating parkland.

Phase 2: Concurrent with Phase 1, staff would initiate work on:

---

<sup>14</sup> Source: Policy and Services Committee Action Minutes, City of Palo Alto, August 25, 2025.



- Design a small-scale enhanced services pilot (e.g., mobile pump outs, additional outreach workers/hours, garbage pickup, etc.)

Phase 3: Following Phase 2, the City Council would:

- Approve pilot and any related contracts and agreements for the small-scale enhanced services pilot.
- Approve a preferred option for expanded safe parking on private or congregational parking lots.
- Identify streets where OSV parking will be allowed and develop necessary ordinances and program design for the “limiting OSV parking to certain streets” approach.
- Implementation of these actions would follow.

Phase 4: Following the completion of related components in Phase 3, staff would:

- Evaluate the enhanced services pilot
- Pursue implementation of expanded safe parking, and
- Obtain related Council approvals for “limiting OSV parking to certain streets” and begin enforcing the new approach.



## Appendix 2 – Community Meeting Minutes

**Meeting Title:** Sunnyvale Parking Study Community Outreach Meeting

**Date:** September 23, 2025

**Time:** 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** City of Sunnyvale Public Safety Department / Online (Hybrid)

### Opening and Introductions

Speaker: Captain Ryan Yin, Sunnyvale Department of Public Safety

Captain Yin welcomed attendees to the Parking Study Community Outreach Meeting, outlined decorum expectations, and introduced consultants Chrissy Mancini Nichols and Tania Schleck from Walker Consultants.

### Presentation by Walker Consultants

Speakers: Chrissy Mancini Nichols and Tania Schleck, Walker Consultants

- Background: Study initiated after community complaints regarding 72-hour parking violations.
- Overview: California Vehicle Code 22651(k) and Sunnyvale Municipal Code 10.16.120 discussed.
- Objectives: Update ordinance, research Oversized Vehicle Permit Program, address oversized vehicles near schools/parks.
- Comparative Findings: Peer cities require vehicle movement between 0.1–1 mile; some require a 24-hour return.
- Challenges: Current vague code hinders enforcement.
- Permit Program: Typically for residents only; resource-intensive to implement.
- Restrictions Near Parks/Schools: Improves safety but requires extensive signage.
- Next Steps: Compile feedback and present findings to City Council.

### Summary of Speaker Feedback

#### Neighborhood Concerns

- Residents reported persistent RV parking and associated sanitation issues.
- Overflow parking from mobile home parks and high-density housing developments.
- Blocked driveways, poor visibility at corners, and fire hazards due to debris.

#### Enforcement Issues

- Current 72-hour rule enforcement is inconsistent; vehicles remain for weeks or months.
- Need for stricter penalties, escalating fines, and towing for repeat offenders.



- Calls for increased staffing for Vehicle Abatement Officers and clearer movement requirements.

## Equity and Compassion

- Speakers emphasized compassionate solutions such as expanding safe parking programs.
- Recognition that many RV dwellers are long-term residents and working individuals.
- Concerns about punitive measures without providing alternatives.

## Business and Property Management Perspectives

- Commercial areas face blight, safety hazards, and leasing challenges due to RV presence.
- Reports of theft, trash accumulation, and tenants feeling unsafe.
- Property managers request long-term solutions and enforcement resources.

## Other Issues and Suggestions

- Support for resident-based oversized vehicle permit programs.
- Suggestions for overnight parking bans, weekly no-parking nights, and clearer signage.
- Concerns about overflow from new developments and environmental issues like oil dumping.

## Speaker Highlights and Affiliations

Speaker Name	Affiliation / Role	Key Highlights / Comments
Sharon	Resident, Cherry Chase Neighborhood	Reported chronic RV parking and sanitation issues; demanded stronger enforcement and financial penalties.
Chris	Resident, Ponderosa Park Neighborhood	Described overflow from nearby mobile homes; requested more parking officers and red curb enforcement.
Courtney Jansen	Resident, North Sunnyvale	Advocated for compassion and investment in safe parking programs for unhoused residents.
Abha Chopra	Resident, Braly Neighborhood	Shared safety concerns about RV parking near home; requested balanced enforcement and awareness.
Geordie McKee	Renault & Hanley Commercial Real Estate	Highlighted impact on commercial leasing and safety due to RV encampments in business zones.
Erika Torres	Property Manager, San Gabriel Area	Reported tenant safety concerns and recent incidents linked to RV encampments.
Hans Bernhardt	Volunteer, Bike Sunnyvale	Recommended coordinated curb painting and signage consistency to support enforcement clarity.
Steve	Resident	Urged enforcing parking rules in new high-density housing developments to prevent street overflow.



Washington Park Neighborhood Association	Neighborhood Organization	Supported safe parking zones outside residential areas; called for more enforcement officers and transparency.
--	---------------------------	--

**Meeting Title:** Sunnyvale Parking Study Community Outreach Meeting

**Date:** September 23, 2025

**Time:** 5:30 p.m.

**Location:** City of Sunnyvale Public Safety Department / Online (Hybrid)

## Opening and Introductions

Speaker: Captain Ryan Yin, Sunnyvale Department of Public Safety

Captain Yin welcomed attendees to the Parking Study Community Outreach Meeting, outlined decorum expectations, and introduced consultants Chrissy Mancini Nichols and Tania Schleck from Walker Consultants.

## Presentation by Walker Consultants

Speakers: Chrissy Mancini Nichols and Tania Schleck, Walker Consultants

- Background: Study initiated after community complaints regarding 72-hour parking violations.
- Overview: California Vehicle Code 22651(k) and Sunnyvale Municipal Code 10.16.120 discussed.
- Objectives: Update ordinance, research Oversized Vehicle Permit Program, and address oversized vehicles near schools/parks.
- Comparative Findings: Peer cities require vehicle movement between 0.1–1 mile; some require a 24-hour return.
- Challenges: Current vague code hinders enforcement.
- Permit Program: Typically for residents only; resource-intensive to implement.
- Restrictions Near Parks/Schools: Improves safety but requires extensive signage.
- Next Steps: Compile feedback and present findings to City Council.

## Summary of Speaker Feedback

### Neighborhood Concerns

- Residents report persistent RV parking, often for years.
- Residents cite quality of life impacts: inability to walk safely, blocked driveways, noise from generators, and sanitation issues (waste dumped in gutters).
- Overflow parking from mobile home parks and neighboring cities (e.g., Mountain View) exacerbates the problem.
- Reports of repeat offenders who ignore warnings and exploit lax enforcement.

## Enforcement Issues

- Current 72-hour rule enforcement is inconsistent; vehicles often remain for weeks or months.
- Lack of follow-up after tagging; predictable enforcement patterns allow RV owners to game the system.
- Calls for:
  - Escalating fines and towing for repeat offenders.
  - Clear movement requirements (e.g., 1,000 feet or more).
  - Increased staffing for Vehicle Abatement Officers (VAO).
- Concern that neighboring city bans push RVs into Sunnyvale, creating enforcement challenges.

## Equity and Compassion

- Multiple speakers emphasized compassionate solutions:
  - Expand safe parking programs and designate legal overnight parking zones.
  - Partner with churches or commercial lots for managed spaces.
- Recognition that many RV dwellers are long-term residents and working individuals, not transient outsiders.
- Warnings against policies that criminalize poverty or treat unhoused residents as threats.
- Suggestion to balance compassion with accountability: offer services, but impose consequences if repeatedly refused.

## Business and Property Management Perspectives

- Commercial areas face:
  - RVs on blocks, unregistered vehicles, theft of water, and illegal waste disposal.
  - Tenants feel unsafe; leasing activity negatively impacted.
- Property managers report blight and public safety hazards, including dogs, trash, and open flames.
- Concern that the lack of towing options worsens the problem; towing companies avoid RVs due to cost.

## Other Issues and Suggestions

- Permit Programs:
  - Strong support for resident-based permits for oversized vehicles.
  - Suggestions for paid permits to discourage abuse.
  - Consider height-based restrictions (e.g., 6-foot limit in some zones).
- Commercial Vehicles:
  - Calls for stricter enforcement of no big rigs in residential areas.
- Policy Ideas:
  - Overnight parking bans (e.g., 10 p.m.–6 a.m.).
  - Weekly no-parking nights.
  - Clearer signage and curb painting to reduce ambiguity.

- Broader Perspective:
  - Remove free overnight street parking entirely; issue limited paid permits.
  - Address root causes: housing affordability and homelessness.

## Speaker Highlights and Affiliations

Speaker	Affiliation / Role	Key Points & Concerns
Steve	Resident and RV owner	Supports regulation but requests flexibility for residents who own RVs; opposes excessive movement requirements.
Mike Cerrone	Livable Sunnyvale	Calls for compassion; references Safe Parking Program; supports regulated, sanctioned lots rather than bans. Shares 2025 Santa Clara homelessness data; advocates safe-parking lots as a humane solution.
Amar	Resident of Sunnyvale	Reports rising RV concentrations, petty crime, and reduced safety; requests stronger enforcement and alignment with nearby cities. Clarifies not anti-RV but seeks better neighborhood quality; cites examples of RV-based businesses.
Ken Cook	Resident	Endorses parking-permit system modeled on Los Gatos; supports permits for oversized vehicles and restrictions on narrow streets.
Unnamed Resident	Local resident	Proposes mandatory 1000-ft relocation rule; escalating fines and towing; cites See's Candy closure due to RVs.
Bryce	Resident	Suggests eliminating free overnight parking citywide; recommends a paid permit system for fairness.
Alice Holmes	Property Manager	Reports unregistered RVs, theft, and sanitation issues; warns of commercial tenant losses due to urban blight.
Riley	Online participant	Supports simple residential parking permit; requests a clear oversized vehicle definition.
Chakravity	Resident near the Mountain View border	Reports sewage dumping and threats; accuses non-residents of exploiting Sunnyvale's lax enforcement; supports paid permits and tracking repeat offenders.
Susan	Online Resident	Advocates balance of compassion and enforcement; supports fines for violators rejecting city services.
Additional Resident	Cherry Chase neighborhood	Notes long-term RVs, ignoring citations; reports waste disposal and animal welfare issues.
Unidentified Resident	Resident	Recommends height-based definition (6-ft limit); opposes motorhomes on residential streets.



## Appendix 3 – E-mail Comments

## Schleck, Tania

---

**From:** Christine Velasquez <CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 4:24 PM  
**To:** Michael Klein  
**Cc:** Schleck, Tania; Mancini Nichols, Chrissy; Ryan Yin; Peter Hoang; Christian Pellecchia  
**Subject:** RE: Request for Feedback - 72 Hour Parking Study

**CAUTION:** External Email: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Mike,

Thanks for sharing the Sunnyvale Chamber of Commerce's input on the 72-Hour parking policy. I'm copying Public Safety and their consultants Walker Consultants so they have a copy of your comments and can connect with you directly if needed.

Best regards,



**CHRISTINE L. VELASQUEZ** (pronouns: she/her/hers)  
**Economic Development Manager**  
Office of the City Manager

Office Phone: 408-730-7908  
Mobile Phone: 408-992-5116  
Email: [CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

[Sunnyvale.ca.gov](http://Sunnyvale.ca.gov)

Follow us on:



---

**From:** Michael Klein <michael.klein.hldr@statefarm.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 2:36 PM  
**To:** Christine Velasquez <CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov>; Michael Klein <michael.klein.hldr@statefarm.com>; Christian Pellecchia <Christian.Pellecchia@jedunn.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Request for Feedback - 72 Hour Parking Study

**WARNING** - This email came from an **EXTERNAL** source. Confirm the sender and its contents are safe before responding, opening attachment or links.

Hello Christine,

Took a minute to get feedback from our group. Been an active two weeks.

We got feedback from several of our member businesses. Common feedback includes looking at incorporating into the plan:

1. Adding a list of prohibited business areas (El Camino Real, Downtown, Mathilda, Moffett Park, Kifer Ave, E Arques Ave., other areas where large business campuses are present or planned). Allowing a permitting process for construction and development.  
Example: Mountain View has signs in their downtown area on the side streets adjacent to Castro St prohibiting oversized vehicles
2. Researching current oversized vehicle tenants and disaggregating the data on whether these are unhoused individuals or transitory workers for local construction sites - to further pair social services to these individuals based on need (NOVA for employment, County social services)
3. Create a designated parking area adjacent to City facilities for those permitted vehicles for a longer permitted time to supplement workforce housing (Monday to Friday for those tenants who are construction workers at local job sites)

Please pass along to any interested party. This is more a brainstorm session than an official policy position so happy to discuss with anyone.

Mike

Please forgive any typos or incorrect auto words. Small keyboard. Big guy.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Christine Velasquez <[CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:53:32 PM  
**To:** [mike@mikekleinsf.com](mailto:mike@mikekleinsf.com) <[mike@mikekleinsf.com](mailto:mike@mikekleinsf.com)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fw: Request for Feedback - 72 Hour Parking Study

Hi Mike,

Here you go. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks for circulating this to the group.

Best,  
Christine

---

**From:** Schleck, Tania <[TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 12:21 PM  
**To:** [kat.filley@svcoc.org](mailto:kat.filley@svcoc.org) <[kat.filley@svcoc.org](mailto:kat.filley@svcoc.org)>  
**Cc:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy <[cmancini@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:cmancini@walkerconsultants.com)>; Ryan Yin <[RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>; Peter Hoang <[PHoang@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:PHoang@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>; Christine Velasquez <[CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Request for Feedback - 72 Hour Parking Study

**WARNING** - This email came from an EXTERNAL source. Confirm the sender and its contents are safe before responding, opening attachment or links.

Hi Kat,

I received your contact information from Christine Velasquez with the City of Sunnyvale. We are working with Sunnyvale on a parking study regarding the City's 72-Hour parking policy and oversized vehicles. Attached are the PowerPoint slides that we presented at the community meetings we held on September 23, 2025.

Below are questions that we have for the Policy and Business Committee. You can request that members send written feedback directly to my e-mail address. **We are hoping to gather feedback by October 31, 2025.** Thank you for your assistance in seeking input for this study!

- 72 Hour parking policy
  - Do you support adding a distance requirement of 0.25 miles (minimum distance a vehicle must be moved to comply with the 72-hour limit)
  - Do you support a time to return requirement of 24 hours (minimum time between parking sessions to be considered compliant with the 72-hour limit?)
- Oversized vehicle (OSV) permit program
  - Do you support restricting oversized vehicles and/or detached trailers/campers to permit only? The goal of the permit would be to allow residents to park their OSVs for a short period of time with a permit.
- Restricting oversized vehicles (OSVs) near parks and schools
  - Do you support restricting parking of OSVs in certain parts of the city, such as near parks and schools?
- Any other feedback on the 72-hour parking rule or OSV restrictions?

Thank you!



**Tania Schleck**  
Consultant  
*Employee/Owner*

**New Address:** 3415 S. Sepulveda Blvd, Suite 650 | Los Angeles, CA 90034  
213.335.5849 | [walkerconsultants.com](http://walkerconsultants.com) | [LinkedIn](#)

## Schleck, Tania

---

**From:** mahmood saljooqi <moods.winebar@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 20, 2025 12:41 PM  
**To:** Schleck, Tania  
**Subject:** DSA business survey

**CAUTION:** External Email: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender.

- 72-Hour Parking Rule Questions:
  - Do you support adding a distance requirement of 0.25 miles (minimum distance a vehicle must be moved to comply with the 72-hour limit)? YES
  - Do you support a time to return requirement of 24 hours (minimum time between parking sessions to be considered compliant with the 72-hour limit)? YES
- Oversized vehicle (OSV) permit program Questions:
  - Do you support restricting oversized vehicles and/or detached trailers/campers to permit only? The goal of the permit would be to allow residents to park their OSVs for a short period of time with a permit. NO
- Restricting oversized vehicles (OSVs) near parks and schools Questions:
  - Do you support restricting parking of OSVs in certain parts of the city, such as near parks and schools? YES
- Any other feedback on the 72-hour parking rule or OSV restrictions? it is unclear to me how the 0.25 mile distance will be measured and tracked, as well as the 24 hr min time to return to a prior parking space. Could you please share additional information?

**Schleck, Tania**

---

**From:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy  
**Sent:** Monday, October 13, 2025 6:28 AM  
**To:** Schleck, Tania  
**Subject:** FW: City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule

Hi Tania,

I'll forward you any comments I receive from the public on Sunnyvale. Here's the first one.



**Chrissy Mancini Nichols**

National Director of Curb Management and New Mobility  
*Employee/Owner*

601 California St, Suite 820 | San Francisco, CA 94108  
415.830.8464 | [walkerconsultants.com](http://walkerconsultants.com) | [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/in/chrissymancinichols/)

---

**From:** Bharat Patel <bpatel7878@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 11, 2025 11:31 AM  
**To:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy <CMancini@walkerconsultants.com>  
**Cc:** Bharat Patel <bpatel7878@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Fwd: City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule

**CAUTION:** External Email: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender.

---

Please keep current law in place

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

**From:** **Christine Velasquez** <[CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Date:** Fri, Oct 10, 2025 at 3:26 PM  
**Subject:** City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule  
**To:**

Good afternoon, Sunnyvale business stakeholders.

City staff regularly receives complaints from businesses and residents regarding vehicles parked on the street in violation of the 72-hour rule ([SMC Section 10.16.120 – Use of streets or public parking facilities for storage of vehicles prohibited](#)).

At the request of City Council, a study is underway to evaluate the following aspects of on-street parking:

- **Updating the 72-hour parking policy** in the municipal code

- **Exploring a potential Oversized Vehicle Parking Permit** program
- **Considering restrictions on oversized vehicle parking** near parks and schools

We welcome your thoughts on how to improve the 72-hour parking policy and related issues.

Please share your feedback directly with Chrissy Mancini Nichols with Walker Consultants at [CMancini@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:CMancini@walkerconsultants.com).

Your input is important to help shape future parking policies in our community. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,



**CHRISTINE L. VELASQUEZ** (pronouns: she/her/hers)

**Economic Development Manager**

Office of the City Manager

Follow us on:



Office Phone: 408-730-7908

Mobile Phone: 408-992-5116

Email: [CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

[Sunnyvale.ca.gov](http://Sunnyvale.ca.gov)

**Schleck, Tania**

---

**From:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:58 AM  
**To:** Melody Garland  
**Cc:** Debbie Long; Schleck, Tania; Ryan Yin; Peter Hoang  
**Subject:** RE: City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule

Hello Melody,

Thank you for your input on the study. We will track it as part of the engagement process.

All the best,  
Chrissy



**Chrissy Mancini Nichols**

National Director of Curb Management and New Mobility  
*Employee/Owner*

601 California St, Suite 820 | San Francisco, CA 94108  
415.830.8464 | [walkerconsultants.com](http://walkerconsultants.com) | [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/in/chrissy-mancini-nichols)

---

**From:** Melody Garland <Melody.Garland@PremiseHealth.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 15, 2025 10:45 AM  
**To:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy <CMancini@walkerconsultants.com>  
**Cc:** Debbie Long <debbie.long@premisehealth.com>  
**Subject:** City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule

**CAUTION:** External Email: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender.

---

Hi Chrissy,

As a response to the below invitation to provide feedback, I'm responding on behalf of Premise Health, situated at 350 Potrero Ave, Sunnyvale, CA 94085. Every day, we encounter unauthorized RVs parked in front of and around the property perimeter. We've observed local agencies marking the tires of these RVs to enforce existing regulations; however, the RV owners are aware that they can simply move their campers to hide the tire markings, thus evading the system once again.

This situation is not only unsightly but also creates a disturbance and nuisance for our operations. We are constantly dealing with these campers around our property, as well as the excessive trash in our secured waste containers caused by the owners of these vehicles. Any help in reducing the presence of these RVs and the subsequent issues they bring would be greatly appreciated.

**Melody Garland**

Director Property, Facilities, Physical Security

Premise Health

P: 615.577.5854  
C: 615.438.1114

[premisehealth.com](http://premisehealth.com)

---

**From:** Christine Velasquez <[CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 10, 2025 5:25 PM  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL EMAIL] City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule

**CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL**

---

*Do NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.  
Report suspected phishing emails by using the Phish Alert Report button.  
For other concerns, please forward this email to [security@premisehealth.com](mailto:security@premisehealth.com) with an explanation of your concern.*

---

Good afternoon, Sunnyvale business stakeholders.

City staff regularly receives complaints from businesses and residents regarding vehicles parked on the street in violation of the 72-hour rule ([SMC Section 10.16.120 – Use of streets or public parking facilities for storage of vehicles prohibited](#)).

At the request of City Council, a study is underway to evaluate the following aspects of on-street parking:

- **Updating the 72-hour parking policy** in the municipal code
- **Exploring a potential Oversized Vehicle Parking Permit** program
- **Considering restrictions on oversized vehicle parking** near parks and schools

We welcome your thoughts on how to improve the 72-hour parking policy and related issues.

Please share your feedback directly with Chrissy Mancini Nichols with Walker Consultants at [CMancini@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:CMancini@walkerconsultants.com).

Your input is important to help shape future parking policies in our community. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,



**CHRISTINE L. VELASQUEZ** (pronouns: she/her/hers)  
**Economic Development Manager**  
Office of the City Manager

Office Phone: 408-730-7908  
Mobile Phone: 408-992-5116

**Schleck, Tania**

---

**From:** kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com  
**Sent:** Monday, October 27, 2025 4:33 PM  
**To:** Schleck, Tania; Ryan Yin  
**Cc:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy; Peter Hoang  
**Subject:** RE: MPBG Oversized Vehicle Study Follow Up

**CAUTION:** External Email: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Tania,

One suggestion that has come from various discussions is to:

- add a list of prohibited business areas (El Camino Real, Downtown, Peery Park, Moffett Park, etc)
- create a designated parking area adjacent to City facilities for those permitted vehicles for a longer permitted time to supplement workforce housing (Monday to Friday for those tenants who are transient construction workers at local job sites)

Best,

Kerry

**Kerry Haywood**  
Executive Director  
**Moffett Park Business Group**  
408.742.6008  
[Mpbg.org](http://Mpbg.org)

---

**From:** Schleck, Tania <TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 9, 2025 9:14 PM  
**To:** Haywood, Kerry E (US N-MOFFETT PARK BUSINESS GROUP) <kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com>; Ryan Yin <RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
**Cc:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy <CMancini@walkerconsultants.com>; Peter Hoang <pHoang@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** EXTERNAL: RE: MPBG Oversized Vehicle Study Follow Up

Hi Kerry,  
We discussed the project timeline with the City. If possible, please provide any feedback by October 31.  
Thank you!



**Tania Schleck**  
Consultant  
*Employee/Owner*

**New Address:** 3415 S. Sepulveda Blvd, Suite 650 | Los Angeles, CA 90034  
213.335.5849 | [walkerconsultants.com](http://walkerconsultants.com) | [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com)

---

**From:** [kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com](mailto:kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com) <[kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com](mailto:kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 6, 2025 3:41 PM  
**To:** Schleck, Tania <[TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com)>; Ryan Yin <[RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy <[CMancini@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:CMancini@walkerconsultants.com)>; Peter Hoang <[phoang@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:phoang@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: MPBG Oversized Vehicle Study Follow Up

**CAUTION:** External Email: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Tania,  
Thank you and Chrissy joining us and working with us through the technical issues. I'll share the slides and have comments sent over to you.  
Kerry

---

**From:** Schleck, Tania <[TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 3, 2025 2:56 PM  
**To:** Ryan Yin <[RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Haywood, Kerry E (US N-MOFFETT PARK BUSINESS GROUP) <[kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com](mailto:kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com)>; Mancini Nichols, Chrissy <[CMancini@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:CMancini@walkerconsultants.com)>; Peter Hoang <[phoang@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:phoang@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** EXTERNAL: MPBG Oversized Vehicle Study Follow Up

Hi Kerry,  
Thank you for inviting us to present at your meeting yesterday. Following up, I have attached the slides that we presented (dated September 23, as we presented these slides at the community meetings held on that date). If your members have any feedback, please email me and my colleague, Chrissy (copied).  
Thank you!



**Tania Schleck**  
Consultant  
*Employee/Owner*

**New Address:** 3415 S. Sepulveda Blvd, Suite 650 | Los Angeles, CA 90034  
213.335.5849 | [walkerconsultants.com](http://walkerconsultants.com) | [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com)

---

**From:** Ryan Yin <[RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:RYin@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 3, 2025 2:01 PM  
**To:** Schleck, Tania <[TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:TSchleck@walkerconsultants.com)>  
**Cc:** [kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com](mailto:kerry.e.haywood@lmco.com)  
**Subject:** RE: [Caution]: MPBG Follow Up

## Schleck, Tania

---

**From:** Christine Velasquez <CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 4:38 PM  
**To:** Paulette Sidi  
**Cc:** Schleck, Tania; Mancini Nichols, Chrissy; Ryan Yin; Peter Hoang  
**Subject:** RE: City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule

**CAUTION:** External Email: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Paulette,

Thank you for sharing your experience in dealing with parked vehicles including a motor home that are impacting your auto dealership and employees. We greatly appreciate your feedback and suggestions to help mitigate these issues. I'm copying Public Safety and their consultants Walker Consultants so they have a copy of your comments and can connect with you directly if needed.

We value Sunnyvale Ford's business in our city. If you have any further feedback, questions, or concerns, please feel free to reach out.

Best regards,



Sunnyvale

Follow us on:



**CHRISTINE L. VELASQUEZ** (pronouns: she/her/hers)  
**Economic Development Manager**  
Office of the City Manager

Office Phone: 408-730-7908

Mobile Phone: 408-992-5116

Email: [CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

[Sunnyvale.ca.gov](http://Sunnyvale.ca.gov)

---

**From:** Paulette Sidi <paulette@sunnyvaleford.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 28, 2025 11:25 AM  
**To:** Christine Velasquez <CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
**Cc:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy <cmancini@walkerconsultants.com>  
**Subject:** RE: City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule

**WARNING** - This email came from an EXTERNAL source. Confirm the sender and its contents are safe before responding, opening attachment or links.

Christine,

The parking on Michelangelo is not monitored and I have to consistently deal with the same vehicles who park for months at a time. They litter, defecate in our grounds on the wall that surrounds Sunnyvale Ford. My landscape

team has to continually trim back bushes that should be allowed to flourish due to drinking alcohol (leaving their bottles in our shrubs) I have called and reported the motor home, the truck and trailer repeatedly only to have them return and continue the bad behavior.

It would be best to post a No Parking Signs along Michelangelo to prevent the ongoing incident. Our employees park their vehicles and would be impacted dramatically. Providing the employees with hang tags to park at the community center would be a solution to ensure the vehicles do not then relocate to that parking area.

We rely on the City of Sunnyvale Police to enforce the area, but the same vehicles return only to continue on with their trash, defecating and vehicles sitting for months.

I have worked at Sunnyvale Ford for over 15 years and am responsible for the grounds on our property and the landscaping on the opposing wall located on Michelangelo.

**Paulette Sidi**

*Guest Relations Manager*



650 E El Camino Real | Sunnyvale Ca 94087  
T 408-522-0252 | [paulette@sunnyvaleford.com](mailto:paulette@sunnyvaleford.com)



---

**From:** Christine Velasquez <[CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 10, 2025 3:25 PM  
**Subject:** City of Sunnyvale Study on Parking Policies - Request for Input on 72-hour Parking Rule

Good afternoon, Sunnyvale business stakeholders.

City staff regularly receives complaints from businesses and residents regarding vehicles parked on the street in violation of the 72-hour rule ([SMC Section 10.16.120 – Use of streets or public parking facilities for storage of vehicles prohibited](#)).

At the request of City Council, a study is underway to evaluate the following aspects of on-street parking:

- **Updating the 72-hour parking policy** in the municipal code
- **Exploring a potential Oversized Vehicle Parking Permit** program
- **Considering restrictions on oversized vehicle parking** near parks and schools

We welcome your thoughts on how to improve the 72-hour parking policy and related issues.

Please share your feedback directly with Chrissy Mancini Nichols with Walker Consultants at [CMancini@walkerconsultants.com](mailto:CMancini@walkerconsultants.com).

Your input is important to help shape future parking policies in our community. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,



Sunnyvale

Follow us on:



**CHRISTINE L. VELASQUEZ** (pronouns: she/her/hers)  
**Economic Development Manager**  
Office of the City Manager

Office Phone: 408-730-7908

Mobile Phone: 408-992-5116

Email: [CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:CVelasquez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

[Sunnyvale.ca.gov](http://Sunnyvale.ca.gov)

**Schleck, Tania**

---

**From:** Cathy Switzer <cbsbikes@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 9:52 PM  
**To:** Mancini Nichols, Chrissy; Schleck, Tania  
**Subject:** Sunnyvale 72-Hour Parking Policy

**CAUTION:** External Email: Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hello,

Found out about this comment deadline from today's Update Sunnyvale. Not your issue per se, these instructions "watch the Sept. 23 community meeting recordings at [YouTube.com/SunnyvaleMeetings](https://www.youtube.com/SunnyvaleMeetings)" were useless. Past Live Streams went as far back as 3 weeks ago (October), no site search capabilities made finding the appropriate video impossible. A google search of "Sunnyvale Sept. 23 community meeting" found the appropriate video.

Having found the video:

COMMENT: Sunnyvale streets are for **movement** of vehicles, NOT for **storage** of vehicles.

COMMENT: Whether you have a visitor with a car or RV, or you are using your RV as an extra room, or parking your own RV in the road between uses, storing any RV on the street should not be permitted. There are many storage facilities for your personal RV, not parking on the street in front of your home. The street in front of your house is not for personal use, it is city property.

SUGGESTED ACTION: Specifically for those living within vehicles (cars, RVs): Perhaps work with local large parking lot owners to have a safe lot, such as exists on Evelyn and ¿Bernardo? ¿Pioneer Way?, (sorry I'm not sure the cross street.).

SUGGESTED ACTION: As a homeowner of Sunnyvale, I would like to eliminate the storage/parking of any vehicle over 6' on city streets. This would include RVs as well as Commercial Trucks.

Thank you,  
Cathy