

Trudi Ryan

From: Arlene Goetze
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 10:22 AM
To: Horizon2035 AP
Subject: LUTE EIR

1. Time allowed public comment Feb. 4 was 90 seconds....for 11 people.
Not an adequate time for worthwhile comments
2. EIR. Gives one small paragraph to drought
3. Eir does not deal with specifics at Mary and Fremont. LUTE took 40 minutes to talk about city-wide development,
4. EIR does not deal with impact surrounding the Fremont/Mary site....it does not even tell us what will go there besides 4 high building for. 40 dentists??? Will it displaces Country Gourmet, the drug store, gas station???
5. It will add greatly to congestion at these ramps to #85....#85 is already jammed at these points.
6. It will be construction for 20 years?????
7. Stats given are debatable....didn't see any allowance for downturn in businesses who sell out to the big techies or loss of people for high rents and likely fewer immigrants who will fill or not fill the condos.
8. I spoke with 5000 people in Sunnyvale last year collecting petitions against the city selling more land. It was on the ballot and
only a few hundred votes were the cause of its loss.....most of the 4990 people I spoke with were vehement against the overbuilding in Sunnyvale. Only a dozen said the council should proceed with such building.
9. Our city council owes much to realtors out of town for their elections. They do not listen to the people.
10. A meeting at 6 pm means few attend...they are stuck in traffic. Most public has never heard of LUTE or had the EIR. It lists
Insignificant aspects at the beginning and the SIGNIFICANT ones at the end.
How FAIR. Is that. Few people will read this document....the construction languages used is beyond the experience of most readers for intelligent comments.

When the dog park gets new grass and is watered properly...but residents can't water their lawns....it tells you something about where the priorities of the city council lie. Plus a refusal to test sand in park for dog parasites....plus failure to ticket loose dogs in Las Palmas who refuse to use the park.....the list is endless how residents/ views are ignored.
11. EIRs are not read....the SCVWD with its 800 staff and 7 board member has not read the 400 page EIR on the 17 acre flood basin for a 'potential 1% flood in 100 years). They said the Impact report does NOT have to evaluate damage on what surrounds a project.

Is that why you left all discussion of what goes on at Mary and Fremont out of the LUTE EIR?

Trudi Ryan

From: PlanningCommission AP
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2017 9:12 AM
To: Trudi Ryan
Subject: FW: Hearing Draft LUTE – January 2017

From: On Behalf Of Jim Pravetz
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 10:47 PM
To: PlanningCommission AP <PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: Hearing Draft LUTE – January 2017

Planning Commission,

This message is to provide comment on the document "Hearing Draft LUTE – January 2017" and the proposed development for the Fremont/Mary intersection. I have not studied the document in depth, and so my comments do not address particular issues in the document. Rather, they express my opinion which I hope will be considered during your planning process.

I have lived approx 600 m from the Fremont/Mary intersection for almost 14 years, and have lived another 9 years near Bishop School. I walk to and frequent approximately 10 businesses at this intersection. Over the years I have been a regular bike commuter and recreational cyclist, including commuting by bike from my home to downtown Sunnyvale and/or the Caltrain station. Our family drives and bikes through Fremont/Mary almost daily, and to the 85/Fremont interchange. I have international non-professional experience with transportation and urban planning (my brother is an urban planner, and I once held a seat on the South Australian State Bicycle Committee).

Below are my comments.

1. I would love to see a vibrant village-like commercial center within walking distance of my house. For this reason I am in favour of a quality "village center" development at Fremont/Mary. This would or could include higher quality commercial/retail that we could frequent, possible business office space (tech, medical) and higher density housing than what we currently have in the neighbourhood, and would focus on pedestrian and bicycle access.

2. I am NOT in favour of establishing a new village center at Fremont/Mary if it is not accompanied by adequate transit and support for other non-automobile modes of transport. Specifically:

2a. I strongly believe, given the continued growth of the entire Bay Area, there should be a rail-based rapid/mass transit system being planned and under construction at all times as we look to expand rapid/mass transit and integrate it with higher density zoning. There are currently no such mass/rapid transits proposed for Sunnyvale or its neighbouring cities and, as such, I believe that the Planning Commission should be first focusing on this issue rather than on building higher densities in locations that may not correspond with new mass/rapid transit corridors. My blunt summary here is that Sunnyvale is not ready for higher density development except near existing Caltrain stations. Sunnyvale's Planning Commission should focus on working at a city and county level to establish plans for rapid/mass transit corridors that will inform your decisions

regarding higher density zoning and development. We must not become another unplanned Los Angeles. [Mass/rapid = permanent, priority rail and does not include buses even in dedicated busways]

2b. Sunnyvale has not provided adequate bike facilities between Fremont/Mary and Caltrain/downtown and I am unaware of any plans to improve this situation. I have ridden this corridor for 23 years. I know the ins and outs of riding North/South on Hollenbeck/Pastoria, N. Sunnyvale Ave, Mary and every back street. My current safest and least stressful route is to ride via Las Palmas Park and through the Trader Joe's parking lot and illegally cross El Camino. That should speak volumes. What we have is simply not good enough.

2c. I have been told that providing more services at Fremont/Mary will decrease car trips because people will be able to walk and bike to this location. Facts here are that (a) the new development will increase car trips because new residents will need to drive to their jobs and because others will drive to the new village center to make use of services (b) there will be more services at this location that neighbourhood residents can walk or bike to which will result in reducing the number of car trips. I do not believe for one moment that (b) will come close to offsetting (a). I would require hard evidence to believe otherwise. The Planning Commission should ensure that any suggestions that there will be less car trips because of this development is accompanied by data that supports this conclusion.

2d. The Fremont/85 intersection has been a masterpiece of signal light coordination and throughput for the 23 years that I have used this intersection. Both in a car and by bike, I am amazed at how well this intersection works: short delays for drivers and cyclists; safe integration of bikes and cars. The delay situation deteriorates quickly when traffic is increased, as we know from the 8:15 AM school rush. The intersection cannot handle more traffic. A redesign of the intersection would be expensive and could adversely affect cyclist safety.

In conclusion, increasing density at Fremont/Mary should not occur until after mass/rapid transit planning, and low-stress bicycle route planning to Caltrain has taken place.

Regards,

Jim Pravetz

Sunnyvale CA 94087

March 21, 2017

Planning Commission
456 W. Olive Ave.
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707

We are writing with feedback on the March 2017 Draft LUTE. Much of the Draft LUTE is excellent and we certainly support its overall goals; however, we have strong reservations about the plan to create a Village Center at Fremont and Mary. Based on a meeting our neighborhood had August 2016 and comments on NextDoor since that time, our neighbors have many of the same concerns.

We live in an Eichler, which we have owned for 23 years, whose back fence is adjacent to Foothill Medical Dental Center. The Medical Center has been a wonderful neighbor over the years, so naturally we are especially concerned about the proposal to build a mixed-used Village Center at the intersection of Fremont and Mary. In general, we support the goals of the LUTE and feel that, if properly implemented, a Village Center could be an asset to our neighborhood, but only if key issues are addressed.

We urge that no mixed-use Village Center specific plans or developments be approved that do not address the following concerns:

1. We strongly believe that the LUTE should preserve the zoning and character of the existing communities surrounding the Village Centers. We applaud and support Policy 53, Policy 55, Action 1, and all of Policy 56 in this regard. This is especially important to us since our Eichler neighborhood recently fought so hard for a single-story overlay to our zoning. However, we strongly disagree with Policy 55, Action 2 of the Draft LUTE. "Consider land use transitions, such as blended or mixed-use zoning and graduate densities, in areas to be defined **around** Village Centers." As currently worded, we interpret this to mean that neighborhoods surrounding the proposed Village Center at Fremont and Mary could have their zoning changed to allow higher density use. **We strongly support staff's comment in the current draft LUTE recommending that Action 2 be removed.**
2. Avoid - really avoid - negative impacts on existing residents' privacy, solar access, quiet, and streetscapes. We strongly support the statement on p36 of the LUTE, "Development intensity at the edges of Village Centers will decrease to provide a buffer to adjacent neighborhoods," but only if this means the buffer will occur **within** the Village Center area, not within the surrounding existing residential neighborhood. We think this statement is open to interpretation and needs to be clarified. Building a 3-4 story mixed-use complex at the intersection of Fremont and Mary could dramatically and negatively impact close neighbors' privacy (especially those of us living in Eichlers), increase noise, and cause parking and traffic issues in neighborhood streets. It could also block the sun, negatively impacting access to solar power. Surely the City wants to encourage residents to install solar and drive electric vehicles since reducing GHG is one of the goals of the LUTE. **We support staff's rewritten and expanded content for Policy 53, Action 2 in the current LUTE draft.**
3. Section 3.4 of the EIR (regarding transportation) states that the Fremont/Mary intersection and the Fremont/Southbound 85 intersection would both have "Cumulatively Significant" and "Significant and Unavoidable" impacts with "Mitigation Unfeasible" (p237 of the August 2017

EIR). Tied to that will be decreases in air quality (Section 3.5) and increases in noise (Section 3.6). This conflicts with one of the primary stated purposes of the LUTE, which is to reduce traffic and greenhouse gases. The EIR also states that development could “create potential safety issues for pedestrians and bicyclists” at the Fremont/Mary intersection” (p237 of the EIR). **We feel strongly that these traffic and air quality issues need to be addressed in the final LUTE.**

4. **Retain the mix of local services we currently enjoy at Fremont-Mary:** branch post office, cleaners, pet supplies, vet, drug stores, large general groceries, Indian grocery, restaurants, coffee houses, barbers and salons, doctors, dentists, acupuncturists, locksmith, packaging shops, florist, etc. The neighborhood uses these, and we often walk to them already. We have already seen huge failures in implementing similar concepts (Santana Row in San Jose and San Antonio Center in Mountain View) and are anxious to prevent the same thing happening in Sunnyvale.
5. Provide a mechanism for long-time local businesses with a big following -- such as Foothill Medical Center tenants, Country Gourmet, For Other Living Things, Hallmark (and its post office station) and others -- to survive the transition. These are real neighborhood resources that have been appreciated for decades. We don't want to lose them and we certainly don't want them to lose their businesses and the income they provide. **As it stands now, the LUTE does not appear to include any strategies for protecting existing businesses, and we believe this to be a significant weakness.**
6. We believe that **reduced parking in a Fremont/Mary Village Center would be a huge mistake.** Many of the businesses (especially the medical offices) rely on income from clients who are not within walking distance. And how can a nearby customer walk home with a 50-pound bag of pet food? At best, reduced parking would simply move the cars to surrounding residential streets or force residents to drive further to more convenient locations. We don't believe it would “encourage” residents to walk more. We already frequently walk to the existing businesses.
7. The large numbers of residents added in the Village Centers will require that schools be added or existing schools be re-assumed by the School District from the lessees. Schools are already overcrowded and one of our cul-de-sac families has been forced to send their children to a school across town since Cherry Chase is full. **The proposed Village Center at Fremont and Mary would surely aggravate the school overcrowding problem, and this concerns us.**
8. **We support reaching out to neighbors when the time comes to create an Area Plan.** We hope that the Community Development Department will be more effective in communicating with residents during the planning stages of the Area Plan than it was when the LUTE was being developed. In fact, no LUTE announcements, including the upcoming March 27 and April 11 public hearings, have ever been posted on NextDoor by the City.

Thank you for this opportunity to give our input. We want to reiterate that we support much of the Draft LUTE and would also support building a Village Center at Fremont and Mary if our concerns are adequately addressed. The City will need the cooperation of adjacent neighborhoods for this project to be fully successful. Based on the postings on NextDoor the past six months, a significant number of neighbors oppose any development at all at this intersection. It can only be to the advantage of the City to heed the concerns of residents like us that are open to change.

Sally and Bruce Terris

Sunnyvale, CA 94087