

---

**From:** Terry Wilfley  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 19, 2017 1:13 PM  
**To:** Horizon2035 AP  
**Subject:** Limited Mobility

Hello,

I am a resident of Sunnyvale near the Fremont & Mary intersection. While I applaud the goals set out in this plan, I see little, if any discussion of accessibility. This concerns me as part of the reason we move to Sunnyvale was to purchase a single story home as I lose my ability to get around easily on my own due to medical conditions. You talk of reducing parking places and making single passenger driving less attractive, but I rely on this for my mobility. I also rely on Disabled parking spots which more & more often are not available or inconvenient to some stores. Please consider this in all multi floor designs that the Disabled parking places be of a generous number near elevators and that elevators that easily accommodate wheel chairs be required for all multi-floor commercial buildings.

I am unable to attend your meetings due to my decreasing ability to get around. But I hope this message will find some one who will champion it in a real and passionate way. This does matter and the laws support it. Thank you for your time.

Terry Wilfley

Terry

---

**From:** Jill Johnson  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2017 7:53 PM  
**To:** Horizon2035 AP  
**Subject:** No to high density anything

Hi,

I'm writing to say NO to any high density building at Mary and Fremont. No to anything that will cause more congestion and traffic. As a frequently pedestrian, cyclist, I have had many harrowing experiences with frenzied drivers running red lights due to our overcrowding and frustration. We don't need anything to make it worse. Assuming people will stay out of their cars is not realistic. I have lived here for 23 years and am so sad at all the ugly development – the new mall space, Chic-Fil-A, hotels galore. I waited 23 years for a decent grocery store and don't want to see Zanutto's displaced, nor Country Gourmet. Build affordable housing on the outskirts of town if you must, but not in the heart of an already overcrowded, choked city.

Jill Johnson  
Persimmon Avenue

---

**From:** Susan Kuhl  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2017 8:39 PM  
**To:** Horizon2035 AP  
**Subject:** New Building/High Density Housing

Please no more of this in Sunnyvale. What use to be a lovely place to call home, has been over run by building bigger and better. Because of poor judgement on my part, my house enjoys all of the bigger and better in Sunnyvale, Cupertino, and Santa Clara. Who would have ever thought when I moved her as a child in 1971, that this would turn into such a nightmare. When do the benefits of all this building start. Maybe all the developers that are employed to come up with these plans, are the folks receiving benefits.

It is very difficult to watch this town become something it was never meant to be.

Susan Kuhl  
Birdland

Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** Grace Sun  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2017 10:22 PM  
**To:** Horizon2035 AP  
**Subject:** Regarding LUTE and specifically the intersection of Mary and Fremont

- 1) I like the concept of village centers, but please don't make them look like the characterless boxes that were dumped in the Sunnyvale downtown area.
- 2) Residential housing is fine in the village centers, but please restrict the number of floors to 3 maximum--- we don't want more traffic on Mary, Hollenback and Fremont
- 3) in other words, make it nice and livable. Lots of plants, drought friendly, bike friendly, outside eating opportunities, etc.
- 4) Why is it necessary to add so much industrial/commercial zones?

Thanks,  
Tom and Grace

---

**From:** jtakasug  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2017 3:01 PM  
**To:** Horizon2035 AP  
**Subject:** Horizon 2035

While I applaud the stated "...overall purpose of moving Sunnyvale toward a Complete Community,... a sustainable end state that represents a place to live that is less dependent on automobiles..." I question their basic premise that we need to increase jobs and housing while increasing their ratios from 1.44 to 1.73 advocated by this document. BTW, this ratio increase is not "a slight increase" as they state, especially when up to 42,410 new jobs are proposed. Our immediate neighborhoods (e.g. Mary and Fremont) with their higher-density mixed-use "village" concept will absorb the impact of this plan if implemented.

Yes, we need a "Complete Community: a sustainable end state that represents a place to live that is less dependent on automobiles", but this plan takes us further away from this vision. Our neighborhood classrooms are already at their capacity. Higher density development in an already over-taxed community such as the Fremont-Mary area is going to help our current situation? We have lived in our residence for 35 years. It is now nearly impossible to get through from my house to 85 within a reasonable amount of time via Fremont/Mary or Fremont/Bernardo or El Camino during commute periods. This situation has rapidly deteriorated to intolerable in the past five years.

I think we need to do better than this plan proposed by Horizon 2035.

J Takasugi  
Heatherstone Ave

---

**From:** Ken Gudan  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 23, 2017 6:50 PM  
**To:** Horizon2035 AP  
**Subject:** Fremont/Mary - current tenants

Regarding neighborhood gathering places and services, what is the plan for current tenants at Fremont/Mary? There are some excellent neighborhood gathering places and services already existing which I fear will disappear with the new plan, including Country Gourmet and Michael's Hallmark.

-- Vivian Gudan  
Lewiston Dr.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

---

**From:** Council AnswerPoint  
**Sent:** Monday, March 27, 2017 10:00 AM  
**To:** Jennifer Nunez  
**Cc:** Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; CityClerk AP  
**Subject:** POLICY--FW: Final LUTE EIR  
**Attachments:** LUTEFinalPlatform.pdf

Councilmembers:

Forwarding to you from Council AnswerPoint.

Jennifer Nuñez  
Executive Assistant  
Office of the Mayor and City Council  
City of Sunnyvale  
456 West Olive Ave  
Sunnyvale, CA 94088  
[jnunez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:jnunez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)  
Ph: 408.730.7913

**From:** Sue Serrone  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 26, 2017 11:15 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission AP <PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov>; Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** Final LUTE EIR

Dear Mayor, Council, and Commissioners,

Attached are some recommended guidelines from SSALC (Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition) as regards the final LUTE EIR.

We believe there is an unprecedented urgency to provide more affordable housing everywhere we can in the city. We appreciate the steps you have taken in this direction and we hope we can help bring more solutions and education to our neighborhoods regarding affordable, sustainable, and livable developments.

Thank you so much for allowing us to have some input into your important decisions regarding the future of Sunnyvale

Sincerely,  
Sue Serrone  
Chair SSALC and Affordable Housing Committee of the Sunnyvale Democratic Club

Winggate Dr.  
Sunnyvale 94087

Sent from my iPad

# **Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition (SSALC)**

---

## **Recommendations for Sunnyvale's Land Use and Transportation Element**

The city of Sunnyvale is updating the Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) of its General Plan and has recently released a draft LUTE for public consideration.

The LUTE establishes the overall vision for how the city should grow as well as its major transportation priorities. It should provide meaningful solutions for our pressing housing affordability crisis and foster thriving, walkable neighborhoods that allow more residents to live closer to where they work, rather than face grueling commutes on our congested roads. It should catalyze more transportation choices for residents and workers, making it easier to walk, bike, or take transit. These strategies would create a more climate-friendly, sustainable future; strengthen our local economy, and improve the quality of life for everyone in our community.

To ensure the final LUTE achieves these goals, we offer the following recommendations:

### **1. Provide sufficient homes**

Job growth in Sunnyvale and the region has far outstripped housing supply. This is leading to an escalating crisis in housing affordability as people with the most money, including foreign investors, can bid up housing prices and outbid current residents.

We are pleased that the draft LUTE would allow more homes than are currently permitted under the existing General Plan. However, the draft LUTE would significantly worsen the jobs-housing balance in Sunnyvale, permitting far more new jobs than new homes. This approach would exacerbate the many challenges Sunnyvale and the rest of the Bay Area are experiencing with a rapidly growing workforce and insufficient housing—decreasing housing affordability, worsening traffic congestion, increasing air pollution, and adding pressure for sprawl development on our natural and agricultural lands.

The city has also included “Alternative 2,” in the Draft LUTE, which would wisely provide a better ratio of new homes and jobs in an attempt to avoid worsening the city’s jobs-housing balance. This is a step in the right direction, yet the alternative fails to accomplish its stated goal. This is primarily due to the city’s use of outdated job-density information, which results in the city underestimating the number of new jobs that are likely to result from each alternative’s



development pattern.<sup>1</sup> In addition, Alternative 2 proposes 11 million square feet of new office space, which is very similar to the draft LUTE.

We propose a “Livable Alternative” that would keep the jobs-housing balance from getting worse, adding a robust 7 million square feet of office space than current conditions and providing 19,500 more homes than currently, representing 5,400 more new homes than the draft LUTE throughout the city in various change areas.

## **2. Promote thriving village centers**

We commend the Sunnyvale City Council and staff for their inclusion of several “village centers” in the draft LUTE. These areas can become important hubs for the entire community—thriving neighborhoods where homes, shops, jobs, transit, and other amenities are all close at hand. This will allow residents and visitors alike to meet their needs in walkable, bikeable, and transit-accessible settings, increase the customer base for local shops, provide much-needed housing opportunities, and reduce the need to drive.

The city should consider opportunities to provide more homes in these village centers than included in the draft LUTE. In addition, the final LUTE should be amended to include additional strategies to actively promote the development of village centers and improve transit connectivity.

## **3. Create homes we can all afford**

As Sunnyvale’s economy grows, the city must provide sufficient housing for people across the income spectrum, including seniors, teachers, young adults, and low-wage workers. Unfortunately, Sunnyvale has a particularly severe lack of homes that are affordable to low- to moderate-income residents. The city has undertaken several bold initiatives to address this issue, yet it still lacks the programs and policies necessary to provide an inclusive and affordable community for all.

The final LUTE should include a statement that calls out the city’s commitment to increasing housing affordability, particularly for those most in need. The city should also include strategies in the LUTE to help provide homes for residents across the income spectrum. For example, the LUTE should explicitly prioritize affordable homes in areas within ½ mile of major transit stops. It should also commit to utilizing innovative tools to incentivize the creation of affordable homes in areas identified for new growth. In particular, it should create new programs modeled upon the community benefit policy in the city’s new Lawrence Station Area Plan to encourage more affordable homes.

---

<sup>1</sup> To calculate the number of new jobs that would occur under each alternative, the city assumes 450 square feet of office space per employee. This was a typical job-density ratio in previous decades, but current information from local employers and developers indicates that the typical ratio today is 250 square feet per employee. This means that the amount of commercial development proposed in each alternative would result in far more jobs than the city has estimated. This would, in turn, worsen the jobs-housing ratio for each alternative.

In addition, the city should commit to re-examining its requirements for affordable housing (Housing Impact Fee, BMR program, etc.) to encourage additional funding for affordable housing and to protect currently existing affordable housing. The City should commit to examining housing type spread exploring a variety of approaches to improve “affordability by design” including support for smaller units, ADUs, and “missing middle” housing types.

Strategies to improve housing affordability should focus on increasing the amount, not just the percentage of affordable housing; this requires increasing the housing supply, improving the jobs/housing balance, and working with regional partners to do so.

#### **4. Set bold goals for sustainable transportation**

Everyone who lives and works in Sunnyvale deserves to have an array of sustainable transportation choices—where walking, biking, and transit are safe and accessible and driving is not the only option. All people should have the opportunity to live close to where they work to avoid lengthy commutes on our congested roads to find an affordable place to live. These approaches will reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, improve community health, and reduce traffic and congestion.

Unfortunately, the draft LUTE moves in the wrong direction—increasing the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per person above current levels, making the problem worse, rather than better.

The final LUTE should include bold targets for the reduction of VMT per person as well as vehicle mode-share goals for increasing the share of trips made by walking, cycling, and transit. A good model can be found in Mountain View’s plans for North Bayshore, which include an overall trip cap, requirements to reduce solo driving to no more than 45% of all trips, and specific mode-share goals for transit, carpool, walking, and bicycling. The city is now using these goals to prioritize local transportation investments. Following the Mountain View model, we urge Sunnyvale to set specific trip and mode-share goals for each precise plan area to guide decisionmaking and investment priorities.

In addition, the city should calculate the expected VMT per person for each of its LUTE alternatives. This would allow the public and decisionmakers to compare each alternative’s environmental performance and help ensure that the final LUTE is best positioned to make the city a more sustainable and affordable place to live. In its calculations, the city should always consider commute trips by Sunnyvale workers, in addition to trips by residents, to effectively assess the transportation outcomes of its decisions.

We also urge the city to move forward in an expeditious manner to adopt the new state requirement to use VMT per person as the primary transportation metric under CEQA. This metric is much better at assessing the environmental impacts of land use and transportation decisions than the city’s current approach. Cities including San Francisco, Oakland, and Pasadena have already made the change, and others are poised to join them shortly. The faster the city adopts this new metric, the sooner it will reap the many sustainability and quality-of-life benefits of this approach.

---

**From:** Council AnswerPoint  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 28, 2017 8:48 AM  
**To:** Jennifer Nunez  
**Cc:** Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Deborah Gorman; Andrew Miner; CityClerk AP  
**Subject:** POLICY--FW: LUTE

Councilmembers:

Forwarding to you from Council AnswerPoint.

Jennifer Nuñez  
Executive Assistant  
Office of the Mayor and City Council  
City of Sunnyvale  
456 West Olive Ave  
Sunnyvale, CA 94088  
[jnunez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:jnunez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)  
Ph: 408.730.7913

**From:** Leah I  
**Sent:** Monday, March 27, 2017 4:14 PM  
**To:** Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: LUTE

Hello,

I am a 11 year resident of Sunnyvale and I am growing very concerned about the accelerating pace of development in the city. I feel the current roads and schools and transportation options cannot keep pace with all the development the city is allowing here. I feel that this is creating too much pressure on our existing systems, and the growing traffic problem is severe. I live on the corner of a busy street and all the traffic noise and pollution is getting really bad. There is a reason that many families are starting to relocate out of the Bay Area and that is that city officials are not listening to local residents' complaints about overcrowding and overdevelopment. Please listen before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Leah

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 29, 2017 8:25 AM  
**To:** CDD-Admin AP;  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:**

Please respond to web request **47373** by clicking one of the three buttons below:

[Reply](#)   [Reassign](#)   [Close with no reply](#)

<b>From</b>	drsteveswim@gmail.com <drsteveswim@gmail.com> - 408-335-9540														
<b>Reply Needed</b>	Yes														
<b>Priority</b>	Regular														
<b>Subject</b>	LUTE														
<b>Message</b>	I asked Mayor Hendrick why the city needed to approve the LUTE. He said that there are legal requirements but he didn't know the specifics. He told me that I should refer the question to staff. So that is what I am doing. Also what happens to the City if the LUTE is not approved. Also do the legal requirements require the LUTE to be so long. It is my understanding that the LUTE is just a set a guidelines for the next twenty to thirty years , why do you need so much detail? Thank you in advance for your quick reply.														
<b>Actions</b>	<table><tr><td><b>Action</b></td><td>Reassign</td></tr><tr><td><b>Date</b></td><td>03-27-17 7:47 am</td></tr><tr><td><b>From</b></td><td>Debbie Gorman - Community Development</td></tr><tr><td><b>To</b></td><td>Trudi Ryan - Building</td></tr><tr><td><b>Subject</b></td><td>Web Request - Reassign 47373 from: Debbie Gorman to: TRyan, subject: LUTE</td></tr><tr><td><b>Message</b></td><td>LUTE question. Thank you.</td></tr></table>			<b>Action</b>	Reassign	<b>Date</b>	03-27-17 7:47 am	<b>From</b>	Debbie Gorman - Community Development	<b>To</b>	Trudi Ryan - Building	<b>Subject</b>	Web Request - Reassign 47373 from: Debbie Gorman to: TRyan, subject: LUTE	<b>Message</b>	LUTE question. Thank you.
<b>Action</b>	Reassign														
<b>Date</b>	03-27-17 7:47 am														
<b>From</b>	Debbie Gorman - Community Development														
<b>To</b>	Trudi Ryan - Building														
<b>Subject</b>	Web Request - Reassign 47373 from: Debbie Gorman to: TRyan, subject: LUTE														
<b>Message</b>	LUTE question. Thank you.														

---

**From:** Ken Gudan  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 02, 2017 5:20 PM  
**To:** Horizon2035 AP  
**Subject:** Re: Fremont/Mary - current tenants

Hi Trudi,

I understand there is no current proposal, but it sounds like at some point there will be a proposal, and while there may be some token effort to show that current tenants had an opportunity to remain, I am not convinced that those backing the development (who I'm guessing are more motivated by profit than community concerns) would appreciate the true value of some of the current tenants. Country Gourmet and Michael's Hallmark/post office in particular serve the community well, and would be sorely missed if driven out by redevelopment.

Thanks for your reply and your consideration.

-- Vivian Gudan  
1 Lewiston Dr.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

· From: Horizon2035 AP <Horizon2035@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
· Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2017 02:09:21 +0000  
· To: Ken Gudan <agudan@comcast.net>  
· Subject: RE: Fremont/Mary - current tenants

· Vivian/Ken Gudan:  
· Thank you for participating in the process to update the Land Use and  
· Transportation Element (LUTE). Your message will be shared with the  
· Planning Commission. As the report has been completed the message will  
· be sent as supplemental information prior to the hearing.

To answer your question: There are no current proposals to redevelop any of the shopping centers or office complexes at Fremont and Mary. The LUTE is an enabling document that, if approved, would require first the preparation of a detailed Village Center Plan (or possibly multiple plans), subject to community outreach and approval by the City Council. The preparation of a plan would be initiated by a property owner interested in redevelopment of the site (timing of which could be affected by many things, including existing leases, market conditions, and general interest in redeveloping or selling site).

- Redevelopment of a site into a Village Center, if it occurs, may
- include a phasing program that allows tenants to relocate to new
- store-fronts on the site.

I hope this information is helpful to you.

· Trudi Ryan, AICP  
· Director, Community Development Department City of Sunnyvale  
· 408-730-7435

- tryan@sunnyvale.ca.gov
- ▪ Save the environment. Please don't print this email unless you really need to.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Gudan  
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2017 6:50 PM  
To: Horizon2035 AP <Horizon2035@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
Subject: Fremont/Mary - current tenants

Regarding neighborhood gathering places and services, what is the plan for current tenants at Fremont/Mary? There are some excellent neighborhood gathering places and services already existing which I fear will disappear with the new plan, including Country Gourmet and Michael's Hallmark.

-- Vivian Gudan  
Lewiston Dr.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

---

**From:** Council AnswerPoint  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:00 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Nunez  
**Cc:** Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Deborah Gorman; Andrew Miner; CityClerk AP  
**Subject:** POLICY--FW: Please attend to our housing and transportation needs  
**Attachments:** Housing\_Generation\_Gap-San\_Jose\_Mercury\_News-20174020.pdf

Councilmembers:

Forwarding to you from Council AnswerPoint.

Jennifer Nuñez  
Executive Assistant  
Office of the Mayor and City Council  
City of Sunnyvale  
456 West Olive Ave  
Sunnyvale, CA 94088  
[jnunez@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:jnunez@sunnyvale.ca.gov)  
Ph: 408.730.7913

**From:** Stan Hendryx |  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:12 AM  
**To:** Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>; PlanningCommission AP <PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov>  
**Cc:** Livable Sunnyvale <coalition@livablesunnyvale.org>  
**Subject:** Please attend to our housing and transportation needs

Hello City Council,

As you consider the LUTE, please consider sending it back to the drawing board to authorize sufficient housing for the rising generation of Sunnyvale residents. The current draft of the LUTE perpetuates zoning restrictions that have, over many years, led to the current crisis in housing and transportation, building so many jobs but not providing housing for the workers. The draft LUTE's token changes do not allow the increase in density needed to provide for our younger citizens' and workers housing needs. It is deficient and unimaginative in providing for local mass transit. It does not lead us out of this crisis. It must. Now is the time to do this. We won't have another opportunity to revise the LUTE for years.

I draw your attention to a report from the Bay Area Council published Sunday in the Mercury News, attached. Here is a quote: "Among millennials — ages 18-39 — 70 percent say "yes" to new housing in their neighborhoods. But only 57 percent of residents age 40 and older support such housing... too many older homeowners continue to "kick as hard as they can at anybody else trying to get on their ladder"...Many older homeowners, Regan said, have "for all intents and purposes built regulatory walls around their communities that prevent even their own children from moving back to the area after college, given the housing costs..." By supporting local zoning barriers to development, he contended, entrenched homeowners have helped create "a ticking time bomb. If we don't have a course correction, we're going to end up with a very old region

without enough new taxpayers to pay for our transportation infrastructure, our schools, our hospitals, all the services we need.'”

The LUTE should be a beacon of hope and direction. It should lead, should give us the needed course correction and set the trend for our neighboring cities. Without the rising generation, Silicon Valley’s vaunted industry will surely dwindle, and our standard of living with it. The city must grow or die. Please, give us a LUTE that will pave the way to a prosperous future, carried forward by and for our children and grandchildren.

Sincerely,

Stan Hendryx  
Sunnyvale



Bay Area survey

# Housing generation gap

*Poll shows sharp divide between Gen Xers and baby boomers in attitudes about crisis*

**By Richard Scheinin**

*rscheinin@bayareanewsgroup.com*

Generation X and baby boomer homeowners in the Bay Area are considerably more opposed to construction of new housing in their neighborhoods than millennials and those who have moved to the region in the last few years.

Moreover, a greater number of newer residents are worried about whether they can find affordable homes in the region than those who have lived here for many years.

That's the bottom line, according to a new poll by the Bay Area Council showing gen-

See **Housing** on Page 7



Among millennials  
— ages 18-39  
— 70 percent say "yes" to new housing in their neighborhoods. But only 57 percent of residents age 40 and older support such housing.

GARY REYES/STAFF ARCHIVES

## Housing

Continued from Page 1

erational divides in residents' attitudes toward the region's housing crisis. Among millennials — ages 18-39 — 70 percent say "yes" to new housing in their neighborhoods. But only 57 percent of residents age 40 and older support such housing.

A majority of residents — 62 percent overall — supports putting new housing in their neighborhoods, up from 56 percent in 2014.

Attitudes are "trending in the right direction, and I think it's a reflection of the severity of the housing crisis," said Matt Regan, the council's senior vice president of public policy and government relations. Still, he said, too many older homeowners continue to "kick as hard as they can at anybody else trying to get on their ladder."

A separate poll released Thursday by the council showed that 40 percent of Bay Area residents — and

46 percent of the region's millennials — are considering leaving the region because of congested roadways and exorbitant housing costs. Those costs have marched higher in recent years as the local economy has generated more jobs while the supply of available housing has shrunk.

The new poll reveals that 80 percent of millennials say they are concerned about finding an affordable place to live, as opposed to 52 percent of those in the 40-64 age bracket and only 36 percent of those 65 and older.

Many older homeowners, Regan said, have "for all intents and purposes built regulatory walls around their communities that prevent even their own children from moving back to the area after college, given the housing costs."

By supporting local zoning barriers to development, he contended, entrenched homeowners have helped create "a ticking time bomb. If we don't have a course correction, we're going to end up with

a very old region without enough new taxpayers to pay for our transportation infrastructure, our schools, our hospitals, all the services we need."

The council drew its conclusions from the polling of 1,000 registered voters in the region's nine counties: Santa Clara, San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, Marin, Sonoma, Napa and Solano.

The poll shows more new Bay Area residents worry about finding an affordable home than those who have lived here the longest: 81 percent of those living here for five years or less share that concern, compared with 69 percent of residents here 6-10 years, 64 percent of those in the region 11-20 years and 48 percent of those with 20 or more years in the region.

There are county-by-county differences as well. When it comes to supporting new housing in one's own neighborhood, 64 percent of those in San Mateo County say "yes," while 60 percent agree in Santa Clara County. In the East

Bay, 61 percent support new neighborhood housing in Alameda County, but only 49 percent support it in Contra Costa County, which is more uniformly suburban.

Developer Kevin Casey, whose Emeryville-based company, New Avenue, specializes in building accessory dwelling units — so-called granny units — said attitudes have "turned a corner" as awareness of the crisis has grown.

"We haven't had a neighbor fight an accessory dwelling project in two or three years now," Casey said. "In fact, we see politicians who get up and say, 'We're going to build thousands of backyard cottages,' and they get cheered."

Lenny Siegel, a Mountain View City Council member and housing advocate, said, "People who have children who can't buy homes are beginning to realize that though they've made it, they want their children to be able to live nearby. And the corollary is, how far do you have to

travel to see your grandkids?"

That said, he expressed some empathy for homeowners concerned about neighborhood development: "Some of the reasons people are concerned

about it are valid: traffic, parking ... and will you put up El Capitan or the Tower of Pisa in somebody's backyard?"

Contact Richard Scheinin at 408-920-5069.

## LET'S GARDEN TOGETHER!

### THE 23RD ANNUAL SPRING GARDEN MARKET

Don't miss the most anticipated one-day plant sale of the year, featuring:

- 70+ varieties of hard-to-find **HEIRLOOM TOMATOES**
- 90+ varieties of **PEPPERS**, from sweet to hot
- A cornucopia of **SUCCULENTS**, **HERBS** & **ORNAMENTAL PLANTS**

