

16 August 2016

TO: City of Sunnyvale – Planning Dept.

FROM: Paul Christenson – resident at [REDACTED] Colton Ave.

Cell: 408-[REDACTED]

RE: "Peery Park" public notice comments

Development which has already been approved and constructed in this area has caused sometimes severe traffic congestion. Many neighbors and I are extremely alarmed by the additional development which has been proposed.

The last time the intersection of Mathilda and Ross was modified, I asked the City to consider a couple of minor changes which would have provided major benefits to our traffic problems. I asked for a "right turn only" lane on northbound Mathilda, for turns onto Ross. I also asked that the "arrows" for westbound Ross onto Mathilda to be changed; left lane left turn only, middle lane to be left turn OR straight thru OR right turn; and right lane to be right turn only. This is what many drivers do anyway, but making it legal would facilitate traffic to quickly move out of this subdivision during the VERY short light cycles in the morning.

Right turns on northbound Mathilda onto Ross are a much bigger problem. Particularly during the afternoon commute, northbound traffic on Mathilda crossing 101 joins traffic exiting northbound 101 onto northbound Mathilda. Many drivers in BOTH streams line up in the right lane. Some will turn onto the ramp to northbound 237, and some turn right on Ross. Over the past decade there has been a dramatic rise in the number of drivers going to their homes and apartments between Mathilda and Fair Oaks via this route. Now when 237 becomes backed up, there is ALSO a steady stream of drivers trying to avoid that congestion, by turning onto Ross and immediately onto Persian. They drive on Persian all the way across Lawrence, then turn left onto the Lawrence frontage road and take it all the way to Great America. If drivers waiting at the light at Ross to enter 237 stay to the left, drivers turning right onto Ross can "lane split". This has a big effect keeping traffic moving. However most of the time, drivers waiting at the light to enter 237 DON'T stop to the left. Many times those drivers "protect" their positions intentionally by stopping further to the right, blocking drivers waiting to turn onto Ross. For

long stretches of the afternoon commute this causes right-lane traffic to stop all the way onto the bridge over 101, also blocking traffic exiting 101.

It would be a BIG HELP if that intersection would be changed. The curb needs to be moved to the right, and the pavement striped for a RIGHT TURN ONLY lane from northbound Mathilda onto Ross. I have lived on Colton since 1978. I have personally witnessed hundreds of occasions when unobstructed right-turns-on red from northbound Mathilda onto Ross have prevented traffic being blocked for cars exiting 101 onto northbound Mathilda.

8/22/2016

City of Sunnyvale Mail - Peery Park Specific Plan



Amber Blizinski <ablizinski@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Peery Park Specific Plan

Stan Hendryx <[REDACTED]>
To: Amber Blizinski <ablizinski@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Cc: Sue Serrone <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Aug 19, 2016 at 5:22 PM

Hello Amber,

I would like to register my support for Alternative 2, more housing in Peery Park. We have added, and continue to add, so much office space for many years with no thought about where the workers in those offices will live. We are witnessing the consequences of those land use decisions in the skyrocketing prices of housing here and increasing commuting distances and congestion. This trend cannot continue. We cannot continue to force our workers into crushing commutes. They will rebel. It is already happening. People, young professionals we need for our future, are moving away because they cannot find housing for their families. This is not sustainable. Housing has reached a critical state that threatens Sunnyvale's long term economic and social future. This is a long term plan. It needs to be visionary, to show what Peery Park will be like over the next 30 years. That vision certainly must include more housing within walking or bicycling distance of the offices, a livable, sustainable Sunnyvale.

Thank you for your hard work on this project. It is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stan Hendryx
[REDACTED]

8/29/2016

City of Sunnyvale Mail - Item 16-0621 - Peery Park Specific Plan



Amber Blizinski <ablizinski@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Item 16-0621 - Peery Park Specific Plan

[REDACTED] mikeserrone [REDACTED]

Mon, Aug 22, 2016 at 3:25 PM

To: PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov>, council@sunnyvale.ca.gov, Amber Blizinski <ablizinski@sunnyvale.ca.gov>

Planning Commission,

Regarding 16-0621: Peery Park EIR and Specific Plan:

The proposed Peery Park Project adds 251 housing units and adds 2.2 million sf of commercial/office space or more than 7,000 jobs to the 7.5 million sf existing and approved office space. This will only make the current jobs/housing imbalance worse.

If we could only provide water for less than 10% of the proposed projects, would we consider this a workable proposal?

Alternative #2 replaces 500,000 sf of office space with 640 housing units. This reduces the new jobs to around 5,000 with 901 new housing units. This is better, but is still way out of balance.

Alternative #3, incomprehensibly increases the the new commercial/office space to 3.2 million without adding any housing beyond the 251 units originally proposed. Is this a serious proposal?

We can consider the jobs and housing for the city as a whole, but we would need to include the millions of sf of office space being added in Moffett Park and other areas.

The lack of housing for this large part of the city is often justified by the comment that "This has always been an office park." Actually, before it was an office park, it was orchards and before that it was oak trees. This area was developed in an era when it was considered good public policy to have office space and housing in different locations. Virtually, all development projects tear down the existing buildings and start from scratch, so there is no requirement to stick with the existing land use model, especially if it no longer makes sense.

Another issue that has been intermittently raised is the flight path noise. Note that we are already building many apartment buildings along the train tracks which has a more severe noise issue. The noise needs to be taken into consideration in the building design.

I urge the Commission to adopt Alternative #2 and look for additional opportunities to add housing to this area. Most of the areas identified for retail development could support housing as well.

On a separate subject, both Peery Park and the Moffett Park area are close to the water treatment plant and should be designed to include purple pipes, or a least the provision for hooking this water source up later.

Regards,
Mike Serrone
[REDACTED] Winggate Drive

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 4
P.O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-5528
FAX (510) 286-5559
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



Serious Drought.
Help save water!

August 22, 2016

04-SCL-2016-00024
SCLVAR062
SCL/VAR/PM VAR
SCH# 2015062013

Ms. Amber Blizinski
Planning Division
City of Sunnyvale
456 West Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94088

Dear Ms. Blizinski:

Peery Park Specific Plan – Final Environmental Impact Report

Thank you for continuing to include the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above-referenced project. Please also refer to the previous comment letters on this project and incorporated herein. Further comments may be forthcoming.

Response #18: Comment noted. As individual development projects are proposed in the Project area, under the proposed Peery Park Specific Plan, each project applicant may be required to prepare an individual traffic study or studies depending on the details of the proposed project. If the proposed project is shown to have a significant impact on pedestrian or bicycle facilities, additional mitigation would likely be required. This could include additional new bicycle facilities, including secure bike parking spaces. Additionally, as the Draft EIR included project-level information and analysis for the 7 Near-Term Projects and the Irvine Project, including the two near-term Traffic Impact Analyses, these projects may not need to prepare subsequent analysis, though supplemental and/or focused analysis may be required if deemed necessary under further review.

Reply to Response #18: The Plan should require new developments to provide bicycle parking in scale with the development. The response to comments proposed to require bicycle parking of individual projects when mitigation is needed for impacts to pedestrian and bicycle facilities. However, bicycle parking availability can be a tool to encourage bicycle travel in place of vehicle travel. We recommend it not only as a mitigation measure for impacts to bicyclists, but that it be included in other trip reduction strategies in the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.

Ms. Amber Blizinski/City of Sunnyvale
August 22, 2016
Page 2

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Brian Ashurst at (510) 286-5505 or brian.ashurst@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Pat C.', is positioned above the printed name.

PATRICIA MAURICE
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse
Robert Swierk, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) – electronic copy
Robert Cunningham, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) – electronic copy

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 4

P.O. BOX 23660

OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660

PHONE (510) 286-5528

FAX (510) 286-5559

TTY 711

www.dot.ca.gov



Serious Drought.
Help save water!

August 31, 2016

04-SCL-2016-00024

SCLVAR062

SCL/VAR/PM VAR

SCH# 2015062013

Ms. Amber Blizinski
Planning Division
City of Sunnyvale
456 West Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94088

Dear Ms. Blizinski:

Peery Park Specific Plan – Final Environmental Impact Report

Thank you for continuing to include the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above-referenced project. Please also refer to the previous comment letters on this project and incorporated herein. Our comments are based on the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and are in addition to the FEIR comments submitted in the letter dated August 22, 2016.

Response #18 (in part): For information purposes, the City's traffic consultant for the Project (Hexagon) has prepared queuing calculations for the requested ramps and intersections. However, the City of Sunnyvale does not consider potential deficiencies related to queuing to be an environmental impact under CEQA because queue lengths are determined by signal operational parameters and can generally be modified with changes to signal timing. The identification of transportation intersection impacts within the Draft EIR is based on the physical capacity of the transportation system. Excessive queue lengths, by themselves, are not evidence of capacity deficiencies but of the signal timing parameters that have been established. Intersections that are identified as having Level of Service (LOS) impacts, which are based on lack of capacity, typically also manifest excessive queues for some movements. Accordingly, no changes have been made to the EIR in response to this comment.

Intersection queuing analysis is not related to the CEQA impacts. Queuing analysis is prepared to examine whether any operational improvements are needed in relation to specific project proposals, though is typically not prepared or applicable for long-range plans. Intersection queuing is generally utilized as a project-specific, detailed form of analysis that is not necessarily appropriate unless development data are known or certain. Therefore, the traffic

Ms. Amber Blizinski/City of Sunnyvale
August 31, 2016
Page 2

study includes queuing analysis for the projects included in the two near-term Traffic Impact Analyses, but does not include analysis for the overall plan.

However, for informational purposes, Hexagon has provided the added Project left turn traffic to each of the requested ramps and intersections (Table 1) [excluded herein]. Four of the intersections would experience substantive left turn increases.

Table 2a and 2b below [excluded herein] show the queuing calculations for the four intersections that would experience a substantial increase in left turns.

Reply to Response #1

- A. Tables 2a and 2b: Queuing Analysis-Irvine Company: In both tables, the SR 237 westbound and Maude Avenue intersection is labeled as “SR 237 *EB* Ramps & Maude Ave” (emphasis added). Since the westbound analysis is not provided, we want to ensure that the correct intersection is being analyzed. Please provide the actual Calculation Sheets for all the intersections in the two table for our verification.
- B. Traffic LOS Computation Sheets: The information in Table ES-1 Intersection Levels of Service Summary (TIA, pp. xiii-xv) cannot be verified through the submitted Traffic LOS computation sheets. The values on the sheets do not correspond to those in Table ES-1. For example, Intersection #2 (Mathilda Avenue and SR 237) in Table ES-1-for PM peak hours shows the average delay to be 115.1 seconds and at LOS F. However, the corresponding information could not be located in the Traffic LOS computation sheets. Please provide the TIA Appendix B Intersection Levels of Service Calculation Sheets, so we can verify the information.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Brian Ashurst at (510) 286-5505 or brian.ashurst@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



PATRICIA MAURICE
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

- c: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse
Robert Swierk, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) – electronic copy
Robert Cunningham, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) – electronic copy