

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
RECEIVED AFTER THE POSTING
OF THE APRIL 11, 2017 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
FOR AGENDA ITEM 4.
FILE NO. 17-0379,
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT.

From: aldeivnian@gmail.com on behalf of Adina Levin <adina.levin@friendsofcaltrain.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 2:38 PM
To: Trudi Ryan
Cc: Kiyomi Yamamoto; Matt Vander Sluis; Meredith Rupp; Sue Serrone
Subject: Specific language supporting LUTE recommendations
Attachments: SunnyvaleLUTEletterSenttoCC.docx; DRAFTLUTElanguagerecsletter4_5_17_V2.docx.pdf

Hi, Trudi,

Attached please find some specific language suggestions following up to the earlier comments made by the Livable Sunnyvale Coalition regarding the Sunnyvale General Plan LUTE.

I will follow up by phone in case you have any questions.

Thanks you very much,

- Adina
Adina Levin
Friends of Caltrain
<http://greencaltrain.com>
650-646-4344

Trudi Ryan
Community Development/Planning Division
456 W. Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Dear Director Ryan,

Thank you for this opportunity to provide further comments on Sunnyvale's Hearing Draft Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE)¹.

This letter provides additional details that build upon our previous comments on the draft LUTE from February 17, 2017 (see attached).

1) Jobs Housing Balance

The draft LUTE includes "Jobs/Housing Balance" as one of the three "major strategies for achieving a Complete Sunnyvale." The draft LUTE further states, "The intent is to continue to allow for economic growth, while allowing residential growth to 'catch up' to jobs growth" (page 6, Hearing Draft LUTE).

We continue to believe that the draft LUTE should be revised to ensure that future growth does not worsen the city's overall balance of new homes and jobs.

We also believe that it would be beneficial to include specific language in the LUTE to implement the stated desire to allow residential growth to "'catch up' to job growth." To that end, we recommend that the LUTE be amended to include the following language (recommended additions are italicized and in red):

REGIONAL PARTICIPATION

POLICY 3: Contribute to a healthy jobs-to-housing ratio in the region by considering jobs, housing, transportation, and quality of life as inseparable when making planning decisions that affect any of these components.

Action 1: Measure the amount of residential and employment growth over time within the city. Review this information regularly to ensure development patterns do not undermine the city's jobs-housing ratio.

(page 17, Hearing Draft LUTE)

2) Sustainable Transportation Planning

The city should commit to set trip and mode share goals for each change area of the draft LUTE. In doing so, it should utilize the model from its adopted Peery Park Specific Plan (page 139, Peery Park Specific Plan). We recommend the following language be included in the draft LUTE:

EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION OF TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE PLANNING

¹ http://www.pmcworld.com/client/sunnyvale/documents/mar2017/Hearing_Draft_LUTE_Clean_3-15-17.pdf

POLICY 19: Use land use planning, including mixed and higher-intensity uses, to support alternatives to the single-occupant automobile such as walking and bicycling and to attract and support high investment transit such as light rail, buses, and commuter rail.

Action 1: As part of the development project review process in mixed-use and other high-intensity use areas, require that adequate transit stops or a dedicated transit lane is provided, even if bus stops are not yet located there. Ensure that off-street loading areas do not conflict with adjacent uses or impede pedestrian, bicycle, or transit access.

Action 2: Establish reduced parking requirements for transit, corridor, and village mixed-use developments and for developments with comprehensive TDM programs that are consistent with the City's established goals.

Action 3: Establish numeric trip reduction and transportation demand management goals for the city and for specific area plans.

(page 27, Hearing Draft LUTE)

The city should also commit to transition as soon as possible to the new VMT-based CEQA transportation impact analysis, since that approach is more compatible with the city's sustainability and multi-modal transportation goals. We recommend the following language be included in the draft LUTE:

~~Action 3: As soon as possible, As part of a future update to the City's Transportation Impact Assessment Guidelines, consider to establishing additional development-based transportation goals and indicators for the following:~~

- ~~• Vehicle trips miles traveled per capita~~
- Service population within walking distance to bicycle facilities and transit stations
- Service population within walking distance to daily destinations for services, amenities, and entertainment

(Page 28, Hearing Draft LUTE)

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Sue Serrone

Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition

Kiyomi Honda Yamamoto

Greenbelt Alliance

kyamamoto@greenbelt.org

Adina Levin
Friends of Caltrain
adina.levin@friendsofcaltain.org

February 17, 2017

Sunnyvale City Council
Attn: Mayor Glenn Hendricks
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707

RE: Sunnyvale Land Use and Transportation Element Update

Dear Mayor Hendricks and City Council Members:

On behalf of the Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition, Greenbelt Alliance, and Friends of Caltrain, we thank you for this opportunity to comment on the update to the Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) of the city of Sunnyvale's General Plan.

The Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition is a new and rapidly growing coalition of individuals and organizations that are working together toward a more vibrant, inclusive, and people-friendly Sunnyvale. Greenbelt Alliance is dedicated to shaping how the Bay Area grows to protect our natural and agricultural lands from sprawl development and help our cities and towns become even better places to live. Friends of Caltrain works towards a modern, integrated, and comprehensive transit network, with equitable access and transit-supportive policies.

The City of Sunnyvale has recently released a draft of the LUTE for public consideration. Unfortunately, this draft has several significant shortcomings which must be remedied before the city moves forward. In particular, the draft LUTE would significantly worsen the jobs-housing balance in Sunnyvale and fails to include sufficient measures to address housing affordability and advance sustainable transportation choices for all.

Sunnyvale's LUTE will shape the future of our community for years to come. It 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 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.¹ 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 beyond current conditions and providing 19,500 more homes throughout the city in various change areas, representing 5,400 more new homes than the draft LUTE.

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

¹ 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.

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.

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.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to working with you to help create a plan that we can all be proud of, and that makes Sunnyvale an even better place to live.

Sincerely,

Sue Serrone
Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition

Kiyomi Honda Yamamoto
Greenbelt Alliance
kyamamoto@greenbelt.org

Adina Levin
Friends of Caltrain
adina.levin@friendsofcaltain.org

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2017 11:23 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Deborah Gorman; Andrew Miner; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: April 11th LUTE review meeting

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: dave scholz
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 5:36 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: April 11th LUTE review meeting

Regarding your upcoming LUTE review, the following comments about (1), the City's Urban Forest, and (2), the "Village Mixed - Use" concept at Fremont and Mary (Village #7), are respectfully submitted.

1. Forestry

[Reference August 2016 Public Review (LUTE) Draft, Page 22, Policy 14, Action 1 and 2]

Studies have shown that "street right-of-way" and "city owned property" land use elements usually provide 15% (+/-) of a city's total tree canopy. However, because Sunnyvale has a low overall urban forest canopy coverage, these two land elements currently represent a larger percentage of *our* canopy. Back in 2007, an aerial survey estimated the tree canopy over the City's **total land area** to be 18%. It is less than that today due to tree-related budget cuts, changes to - and waivers of - landscape-related Municipal Codes, and the recent five year drought.

Since "private property" represents the major land element in every local city, ignoring this crucial piece of the urban forest public policy pie renders any such policy meaningless. And, as the Council knows all too well, when it comes to public policy, vision, goals, etc., words without metrics usually end up as, well, just words.

Therefore, the following augmentations are suggested:

Policy 14: Accelerate the planting of large canopy trees to increase tree coverage in Sunnyvale to 19 % of the City's total land area by 2022 and to 20% by 2025 in order to add to the scenic beauty and walkability of the community; provide environmental benefits such as air quality improvements, wildlife habitat, and reduction of heat islands; and enhance the health, safety, and welfare of residents, visitors, shoppers and those that work in Sunnyvale.

As noted, trees can be a significant mitigating factor in both the changing climate battle and our City's continuing high density love affair.

2. "Village Mixed - Use" designation at Fremont and Mary.

This is an unwarranted change to a long established, low density, commercial zoned intersection, one that would set the stage for new development completely out of character with the surrounding single family residential neighborhood. Such a change engenders the age-old question: Why do periodic General Plan updates ALWAYS result in increased density, height, etc.? Must they ALWAYS be a Construction Company Full Employment Act? It must be that love affair thing. Regardless, Village #7 designation should be deleted from the proposed LUTE.

Thank you for this opportunity to 'unload' a few comments. They are meant to be constructive.

And thank you for your service to our community; it is much appreciated.

Dave Scholz
1 Klamath Drive
Sunnyvale

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2017 11:30 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: LUTE Fremont/Mary

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Julie Treichler
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 10:43 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: LUTE Fremont/Mary

Dear City of Sunnyvale Council Members and City Staff,

As a resident who lives close to and has patronized the businesses on all four corners of Mary & Fremont, I'd like to share a vision of what I view as a rare opportunity to make it a thriving multi-generational hub for millennials, senior citizens, and the gen Xers that support these seniors as well as their own children.

This vision requires a coordinated development effort on each of the separately owned parcels and the public land beneath the intersection of Mary & Fremont. While the LUTE cannot dictate private land use, it certainly can create conditions more favorable for specific types of development.

If you like any of the ideas in my Nextdoor post below. I would urge you to share them in your meetings with landowners, developers, targeted businesses, community residents, and of course the LUTE authors -- and make them your own.

Thanks for considering,
Julie Treichler.

p.s. In a recent SJ Merc article, I believe all but 2 pedestrian fatalities in San Jose this year involved seniors. I suspect that similar victim demographics are in play in Sunnyvale.

===== 4/3/2017

Julie Treichler from Nimitz · 3d ago

It might be a good wake up call to survey all the mixed use developments over the last 1, 5, and 10 years in Cupertino, Mountain View, SF King St etc to see what retail occupancy rates are like even in ideal conditions (i.e. lots of parking, light rail, Caltrain, growing economy). I don't think it has been a slam dunk for small businesses anywhere over the last few decades and I don't see how this will change in the foreseeable future.

Instead of having multiple corners of generic mixed use buildings, it might be really nice to have one corner of "packaged" commercial property that can provide an excellent combination of the dental/medical clinic with imaging and labs, assisted living for the elderly, low cost grocery, pharmacy, post office outlet, bank, small branch library, large piazza with exercise structures, and family restaurants. This way seniors would not need to cross any major intersection to receive services and our aging neighbors will not need to move away from their established support networks of friends and family. Visitors can park underground (connecting all corners) and upon return to their cars, the cars will be fully charged/refueled, detailed, serviced.

One corner can be dedicated higher density residential with top of the line gym, street cafes with character, specialty grocer, take out restaurants, beauty/grooming services, and large dog park.

Another corner bursting with family-oriented services (daycares, preschool, parent education, after school services, special needs clinics, bike shop, drop off care with rental office cubicles, children's indoor/outdoor gyms, other mommy & me specialty facilities, children's clothing stores, child-friendly food services, open amphitheater).

A fourth corner could provide other professional services: legal, immigration, real estate, vacation planning, insurance etc. with a small conference center and hotel.

I don't know who owns the various pieces, but an experienced retail/commercial developer can probably make it happen.

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2017 1:52 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Deborah Gorman; Andrew Miner; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: Specific language supporting LUTE recommendations
Attachments: Draft LUTE Language recs letter 4_5_17.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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Matt Vander Sluis [mailto:mvandersluis@greenbelt.org]
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2017 1:32 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>; Kiyomi Honda Yamamoto <kyamamoto@greenbelt.org>; Adina Levin <adina.levin@friendsofcaltrain.com>; Serrone Sue
Subject: Specific language supporting LUTE recommendations

Dear Sunnyvale City Councilmembers,

Thank you for this opportunity to provide more specific comments on the hearing draft of the city's LUTE.

The attached comment letter provides three concise line edits to the draft LUTE. These recommended edits offer a straightforward, practical method to help address several concerns that have emerged consistently in response to the draft LUTE -- the potential for the plan to significantly worsen housing affordability and the lack of clear goals and metrics regarding VMT per capita, mode share, etc. to guide the city's transportation decisionmaking.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any comments, concerns, or suggested modifications to the attached recommendations.

Thank you and we look forward to your leadership on these issues,

Matt Vander Sluis
Program Director

Greenbelt Alliance

312 Sutter Street, Suite 510 | San Francisco, CA 94108

1 (415) 543-6771 x322 | cell: (707) 628-3324 | mvandersluis@greenbelt.org

greenbelt.org | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)

Bay Area greenbelt lands are at risk of being lost to sprawl development. [Get the facts here.](#)

Trudi Ryan
Community Development/Planning Division
456 W. Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Dear Director Ryan,

Thank you for this opportunity to provide further comments on Sunnyvale's Hearing Draft Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE)¹.

This letter provides additional details that build upon our previous comments on the draft LUTE from February 17, 2017 (see attached).

1) Jobs Housing Balance

The draft LUTE includes "Jobs/Housing Balance" as one of the three "major strategies for achieving a Complete Sunnyvale." The draft LUTE further states, "The intent is to continue to allow for economic growth, while allowing residential growth to 'catch up' to jobs growth" (page 6, Hearing Draft LUTE).

We continue to believe that the draft LUTE should be revised to ensure that future growth does not worsen the city's overall balance of new homes and jobs.

We also believe that it would be beneficial to include specific language in the LUTE to implement the stated desire to allow residential growth to "'catch up' to job growth." To that end, we recommend that the LUTE be amended to include the following language (recommended additions are italicized and in red):

REGIONAL PARTICIPATION

POLICY 3: Contribute to a healthy jobs-to-housing ratio in the region by considering jobs, housing, transportation, and quality of life as inseparable when making planning decisions that affect any of these components.

Action 1: Measure the amount of residential and employment growth over time within the city. Review this information regularly to ensure development patterns do not undermine the city's jobs-housing ratio.

(page 17, Hearing Draft LUTE)

2) Sustainable Transportation Planning

The city should commit to set trip and mode share goals for each change area of the draft LUTE. In doing so, it should utilize the model from its adopted Peery Park Specific Plan (page 139, Peery Park Specific Plan). We recommend the following language be included in the draft LUTE:

EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION OF TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE PLANNING

¹ http://www.pmcworld.com/client/sunnyvale/documents/mar2017/Hearing_Draft_LUTE_Clean_3-15-17.pdf

POLICY 19: Use land use planning, including mixed and higher-intensity uses, to support alternatives to the single-occupant automobile such as walking and bicycling and to attract and support high investment transit such as light rail, buses, and commuter rail.

Action 1: As part of the development project review process in mixed-use and other high-intensity use areas, require that adequate transit stops or a dedicated transit lane is provided, even if bus stops are not yet located there. Ensure that off-street loading areas do not conflict with adjacent uses or impede pedestrian, bicycle, or transit access.

Action 2: Establish reduced parking requirements for transit, corridor, and village mixed-use developments and for developments with comprehensive TDM programs that are consistent with the City's established goals.

Action 3: Establish numeric trip reduction and transportation demand management goals for the city and for specific area plans.

(page 27, Hearing Draft LUTE)

The city should also commit to transition as soon as possible to the new VMT-based CEQA transportation impact analysis, since that approach is more compatible with the city's sustainability and multi-modal transportation goals. We recommend the following language be included in the draft LUTE:

Action 3: *As soon as possible, As part of a future update to the City's Transportation Impact Assessment Guidelines, consider to establishing additional development-based transportation goals and indicators for the following:*

- *Vehicle trips miles traveled per capita*
- Service population within walking distance to bicycle facilities and transit stations
- Service population within walking distance to daily destinations for services, amenities, and entertainment

(Page 28, Hearing Draft LUTE)

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Sue Serrone
Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition

Kiyomi Honda Yamamoto
Greenbelt Alliance
kyamamoto@greenbelt.org

Adina Levin
Friends of Caltrain
adina.levin@friendsofcaltain.org

February 17, 2017

Sunnyvale City Council
Attn: Mayor Glenn Hendricks
P.O. Box 3707
Sunnyvale, CA 94088-3707

RE: Sunnyvale Land Use and Transportation Element Update

Dear Mayor Hendricks and City Council Members:

On behalf of the Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition, Greenbelt Alliance, and Friends of Caltrain, we thank you for this opportunity to comment on the update to the Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) of the city of Sunnyvale's General Plan.

The Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition is a new and rapidly growing coalition of individuals and organizations that are working together toward a more vibrant, inclusive, and people-friendly Sunnyvale. Greenbelt Alliance is dedicated to shaping how the Bay Area grows to protect our natural and agricultural lands from sprawl development and help our cities and towns become even better places to live. Friends of Caltrain works towards a modern, integrated, and comprehensive transit network, with equitable access and transit-supportive policies.

The City of Sunnyvale has recently released a draft of the LUTE for public consideration. Unfortunately, this draft has several significant shortcomings which must be remedied before the city moves forward. In particular, the draft LUTE would significantly worsen the jobs-housing balance in Sunnyvale and fails to include sufficient measures to address housing affordability and advance sustainable transportation choices for all.

Sunnyvale's LUTE will shape the future of our community for years to come. It 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 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.¹ 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 beyond current conditions and providing 19,500 more homes throughout the city in various change areas, representing 5,400 more new homes than the draft LUTE.

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

¹ 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.

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.

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.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to working with you to help create a plan that we can all be proud of, and that makes Sunnyvale an even better place to live.

Sincerely,

Sue Serrone
Sunnyvale Sustainable and Affordable Living Coalition

Kiyomi Honda Yamamoto
Greenbelt Alliance
kyamamoto@greenbelt.org

Adina Levin
Friends of Caltrain
adina.levin@friendsofcaltain.org

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 10:24 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; Manuel Pineda; CityClerk AP; Christina Uribe
Subject: POLICY--FW: In support of the LUTE plan

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: John Novicki | . . .
Sent: Sunday, April 09, 2017 7:11 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: In support of the LUTE plan

I have been a resident of Sunnyvale for 36 years and I strongly support the proposed LUTE plan.

I am tired of the NIMBYism of so many Sunnyvale residents. Their attitude is "I've got my single story home; forget about everyone else".

I am tired of Sunnyvale residents using "historical preservation" to circumvent reasonable growth.

Sunnyvale needs to grow up, both physically and in attitude. I support the development of all the proposed higher-density urban villages. They will create more jobs not less.

--
John Novicki
Cashmere Ct
Sunnyvale CA 94087

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: LUTE should do more to make Sunnyvale sustainable and livable

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Tim Oey
Sent: Sunday, April 09, 2017 10:24 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: LUTE should do more to make Sunnyvale sustainable and livable

Honorable Sunnyvale Council Members,

Unfortunately I cannot attend the 4/11 council meeting.

I strongly support the position articulated in the letter posted at:
<http://www.greenbelt.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/LUTE-Letter-to-Council.pdf>

We need to do much, much, much more to encourage affordable housing and non-car transportation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Tim Oey
Sunnyvale, CA

--

Sincerely,
Tim Oey
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
<http://www.timoeey.com/>
"Knowledge is Power"

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 11:56 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: Vote against LUTE proposal please!

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Elizabeth Lennie
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 11:03 AM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: Vote against LUTE proposal please!

Dear city council members,

Please vote against the LUTE (Land Use and Transportation Element). I am very alarmed at the extent of the development you are planning for Sunnyvale. I am especially worried about the increase in traffic this will cause!

The proposal seeks to reduce traffic by increasing pedestrian, bicycle and public transportation ridership. This increase in pedestrian and cycling is supposed to happen while all this development is going on. How will you increase non-auto transportation with this proposal if it can't even be done right now!?!

I am an avid cyclist. I ride through the current heavy traffic and cycle from southern Sunnyvale to northern Sunnyvale about twice a week to get to my job. Traffic is frightening!! More traffic will make this much, much worse, and **people will be even less likely to cycle or walk to work if we add more and more commuters to our area, which this LUTE proposal WILL bring.**

The government of Sunnyvale needs to focus FIRST on increasing cycling, pedestrian traffic and VTA ridership now, BEFORE even considering a proposal to highly increase office and residential building. I sincerely hope you all vote against this LUTE proposal and focus on reducing our current traffic problems. I would love to see more bicycle friendly corridors, trails and programs to get people cycling. Do that without this irresponsible development. LUTE will make our traffic and pollution much worse, and people will cycle and walk less than they do right now because of an increase of automobile traffic.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Lennie
Kinross Court
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 12:04 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; CityClerk AP; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe
Subject: POLICY--FW: April 11 agenda 4 LUTE input
Attachments: LUTE_Stefan_170410.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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Peter Stefan
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 11:48 AM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: April 11 agenda 4 LUTE input

Honorable City Council:

I urge you not to ratify the 2017 LUTE as it is, but pay attention to residents' concerns. There should be much more discussion and examination about the policies proposed. My comments are attached.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mei-Ling Stefan

2017/04/10

Honorable City Council:

Very serious issues with the 2017 LUTE remain, in spite of comments expressing concerns. I submitted comments on the DEIR, but I have noticed that my letter is missing. I urge you not to ratify the LUTE as it is. Sunnyvale residents need *your* leadership, not that of any others who are out of touch with residents.

I have listed some of my main concerns below. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mei-Ling Stefan

Sunnyvale resident, 17 years

COMMENTS ON 2017 LUTE

(1) Jobs/housing ratio (p.6)

Why should we destroy the present ratio of 1.44 , close to ideal ? **The ratio should not exceed 1.5.** The proposed ratio of 1.73 is a large increase that is thoughtless, and would have very serious implications not only for Sunnyvale, but also for regional cooperation which is much needed. It is highly unclear what “allowing residential growth to ‘catch up’ with jobs growth” means. For the areas designated by Horizon 2035 for focused job growth, why not incorporate their fair share of housing ? For example, Santa Clara Square offers office space, retail space and housing units. To this mix, I think it is important to include high-quality childcare facilities.

(2) Policy 31 (p.29)

Should it be a policy of the LUTE to tackle the direct and hidden subsidies in our society?

Instead, we should tighten up Transportation Demand Management plans and impose hefty fines for non-compliance. Paid parking at large job centers can be a very good way to reduce single-occupancy vehicle traffic. Please see my additional comment at the end of this letter.

However, on-street paid parking, or mandating shopping malls to charge for parking, or limit their parking space, would be a misguided policy. People will go out of town to shop, increasing GHG emissions, and this would also risk driving local stores to go out of business. In addition, parking lots can be used as shuttle pickup locations, as well as places for special events, roller-skating, or morning exercises.

(3) Caltrain is our most important mass transit option here but gets inadequate attention.

One Caltrain removes several hundred cars from our freeways, and is the most effective transportation mode for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. **As VTA provides only spotty connections to both Sunnyvale and Lawrence stations, the city should have a shuttle system to enable more people to use the Caltrain.** (Only a small fraction of Sunnyvale residents work in Sunnyvale.) The importance of bus rapid transit is exaggerated by its advocates, while Caltrain gets only the following passing notices:

Policy 8 (p.19) out of 8 action items:

Action 7: Monitor and participate in decision-making processes regarding regional rail planning, such as those for High-Speed Rail and Caltrain.

Policy 46 (p.33) out of 5 action items:

Action 5: Advocate for the preservation of railroad lines for intercity passenger, commuter, and freight transport.

Additional comments

(1) Schools: Too often, it seems that the City wants to plan for people who will have no children and who will only work, shop and dine, who can walk and bike very well (like me). Land use planning should include discussions with the school districts about the needs for new schools or school expansions.

(2) Need for city shuttle : We need a city shuttle system to connect important points in Sunnyvale and to mass transit, and I suggested it at meetings on the Civic Center. As parking seems to be a big driver in the costs of Civic Center modernization, it only makes sense to help people reduce the need to drive. But architects only want to build as much as possible. Important points for a Sunnyvale shuttle system should include the intersections where villages are proposed.

The Marguerite shuttle system in Palo Alto is exemplary. It began in the late 70's. We have a lot to catch up with, having not a single city community shuttle at present. The Marguerite shuttle system is paid for by Stanford University, City of Palo Alto, Palo Alto Medical Foundation, Bay Area Air Quality Management Board, Rosewood Hotel, Hewlett-Packard Foundation,...The system connects different important points on Stanford campus and in Palo Alto. It extends even to the Menlo Park Caltrain Station and the San Antonio Shopping Center. It serves Caltrain stations with shuttle schedules matched with Caltrain schedules. I hope the city shuttle system can take children to school too, though ideally the school districts should have more school buses (electric or fuel cell). When people have to drive their children to school, would they afterwards take public transit to work?

Stanford University charges parking fees, except for van pools and car pools. (It has a commute club.) The fees help fund the Marguerite, as well as rewards for employees not to drive. Stanford does all these because it would have to pay a hefty fine if it generates more than a certain number of trips. Paid parking in industrial parks was mentioned as a strategy in GHG reduction in a meeting on SB 375 at the MTC several years ago. I think corporations and industrial parks should be required to pay towards a city shuttle system. I do not know if they can be required to charge their employees for parking, if this is not a county-wide policy. But make them pay, and leave it to them to decide how to recuperate the money.

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 2:01 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: Development at Fremont and Mary

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Greg Payne
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 12:14 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: Development at Fremont and Mary

Hi

Recently there's been a lot of emails on the nextdoor.com website discussing the development of a multi-story building complex at the 877 Fremont and Mary intersection. One of the contributors cites an email (see below) from the Sunnyvale mayor saying that "there were many residents that wanted better use of this space. Taller buildings with high density housing." They mention that this issue will be discussed further in the Tue 4/11 city council meeting. I want to go on record that I'm am totally opposed to any type of tall/high density buildings at this intersection.

In addition, I am disappointed to learn of such a major development via a "neighborhood chat room" rather than in some official correspondence from the city. I did a simple "Fremont and Mary development" search on the city's website and saw nothing discussing this development in the first two pages of search results. The city sends out "Quarterly Reports" to all residents and again, there's no mention of this development. Why is that? Something this major should be announced to all the resident so they can voice their opinions on it. As it stands, it appears to me that the council is operating in a vacuum totally disconnected from its residents.

Gregory V Payne
1111 Russet Dr
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Neighbors of Sunnyvale,
Yesterday, I received a response back from the mayor regarding the newest plans for the intersection of Mary and

Fremont. He said that the upcoming gatherings with the city, we're not a dog and pony show to just go through the motions of hearing what Sunnyvale wanted. That there were many residents in Sunnyvale that wanted better use of this space. Taller buildings with high density housing. I am not clear where these Sunnyvale residents come from, but I will take his word they are around. Please, please, please come to these meetings. I don't know of anyone who would be happy with more building on those corners. We have finally gotten a grocery store that is part of the community. It is the go to store, when you have no desire to be treated like a herd of cattle or stand in line for 20 minutes. Where can you buy better deli and meat products? Who else invites the community for dinner and wine tasting? COUNTRY GOURMET has been there 35 years with great success. You know there will always be a choice of American food to choose from. How many of you have doctors and dentists Neighbors of Sunnyvale,

Yesterday, I received a response back from the mayor regarding the newest plans for the intersection of Mary and Fremont. He said that the upcoming gatherings with the city, we're not a dog and pony show to just go through the motions of hearing what Sunnyvale wanted. That there were many residents in Sunnyvale that wanted better use of this space. Taller buildings with high density housing. I am not clear where these Sunnyvale residents come from, but I will take his word they are around. Please, please, please come to these meetings. I don't know of anyone who would be happy with more building on those corners. We have finally gotten a grocery store that is part of the community. It is the go to store, when you have no desire to be treated like a herd of cattle or stand in line for 20 minutes. Where can you buy better deli and meat products? Who else invites the community for dinner and wine tasting? COUNTRY GOURMET has been there 35 years with great success. You know there will always be a choice of American food to choose from. How many of you have doctors and dentists at 877 Fremont? The very most important of all, is Cameron Vet Clinic. There is not another office on the face of this earth where your furry friends will get better care. Kate Cameron a real gift to any of us who know her skills. Her skills with the owners are equally superb. She can relate on either side of the examining table. For us and all her other owners it would be a devastating loss.

Please come to let the mayor know you do not want builders with big plans destroy some of the only real Sunnyvale left. Susan Kuhlar 877 Fremont? The very most important of all, is Cameron Vet Clinic. There is not another office on the face of this earth where your furry friends will get better care. Kate Cameron a real gift to any of us who know her skills. Her skills with the owners are equally superb. She can relate on either side of the examining table. For us and all her other owners it would be a devastating loss.

Please come to let the mayor know you do not want builders with big plans destroy some of the only real Sunnyvale left. Susan Kuhl

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 2:04 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Deborah Gorman; Andrew Miner; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: LUTE Proposal for rezoning Fremont & Mary for construction

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Ajeer Salil Pudiyapura
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 1:05 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: LUTE Proposal for rezoning Fremont & Mary for construction

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am a resident, homeowner and voter of Sunnyvale, living within one mile of the Fremont & Mary intersection. I have grave concerns about the LUTE plan for 2035 regarding the re-zoning of the land on the four corners of the above intersection for mixed use. In particular, I need to see the following addressed before this is approved in tomorrow's council meeting.

- 1) Impact on local schools from multiple families moving into these apartments and proposed steps to mitigate this.
- 2) Impact of traffic during peak times, and steps to mitigate this.
- 3) Impact on water and sewer capacity, and steps to mitigate this.
- 5) Impact on local parks capacity, and steps to mitigate this.

I would like to point out that I do not see any reason for this re-zoning. The properties in question are providing excellent and necessary services and they are correctly zoned as commercial. I am not against modernizing these buildings and adding more essential retail, consistent with the architecture and lifestyle of the surroundings.

Please consider this as a strong NO vote from a resident against this re-zoning as someone who would be directly impacted by this development.

Thanks

-Ajeer Pudiypura
Franchere Pl.
Sunnyvale, CA - 94087.

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 2:25 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; CityClerk AP; Deborah Gorman
Subject: POLICY--FW: In support of more housing in the 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
Ph: 408.730.7913

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

From: Jason Uhlenkott
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 2:14 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: In support of more housing in the LUTE

Dear City Council,

Sunnyvale faces a critical choice as we consider adoption of the new Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE). We must decide if we will be a welcoming community or one that tries to keep people out.

Sunnyvale and the entire Bay Area are already in a severe housing shortage. The proposed LUTE would make it worse. Our policies keep making it harder for new people to come contribute to our community, and even for children who grew up here to live here as adults.

This is a solvable problem. There are many steps we can take: We need much more housing in the transit-oriented developments (TODs).

We should upzone other parts of the city as well. We should explore form-based zoning and allowing missing middle housing in more places.

The LUTE is a moral document that will have enormous consequences for many peoples' lives. Let's take this opportunity to make a dent in our city's biggest crisis. Let's legalize housing.

Sincerely,
Jason Uhlenkott
Escalon Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 3:40 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: LUTE Proposal for rezoning Fremont & Mary for construction

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Bushra PudiyaPura
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 2:38 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: LUTE Proposal for rezoning Fremont & Mary for construction

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am a resident, homeowner and voter of Sunnyvale, living within one mile of the Fremont & Mary intersection. I have grave concerns about the LUTE plan for 2035 regarding the re-zoning of the land on the four corners of the above intersection for mixed use.

I would like to point out that I do not see any reason for this re-zoning. The properties in question are providing excellent and necessary services and they are correctly zoned as commercial. I am not against modernizing these buildings and adding more essential retail, consistent with the architecture and lifestyle of the surroundings.

Please consider this as a strong NO vote from a resident against this re-zoning as someone who would be directly impacted by this development.

Thanks
-Bushra PudiyaPura
Franchere Pl.
Sunnyvale, CA - 94087

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 8:57 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe; 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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: oneill.stephen@
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 4:17 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: LUTE

Dear Council

I am a long time resident of Sunnyvale and currently reside at 867 Nantucket Court. I have reviewed the LUTE and the EIR and I believe that the both documents have major flaws in their assumptions. Table 1 indicates that it is expected that in 2035 Sunnyvale will have 59.8 million square feet of industrial/office/commercial space which will result in 124,410 jobs. This equates to approximately 480 sq. ft. per job. The current square feet to job ratio in Silicon Valley is not 480 square feet per job but is now approximately 250 square feet per job. Workers in Silicon Valley are not getting private offices, they are either sharing offices, getting a small cubicle or just a docking station on a bench. I received this information from several commercial real estate brokers, from clients, from my own experience in looking for new space in Silicon Valley for my firm and also just by googling the question. I believe you can confirm this information by asking around. If my number is accurate, the total jobs in Sunnyvale will be twice as many as indicated in the LUTE and the EIR. I am not an urban planner but even I can tell you that will make a significant change.

I hope you take this into consideration when you are reviewing the LUTE and the EIR.

Stephen T. O'Neill
Partner
Palo Alto Office Head



DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
305 Lytton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301
P: 650.843.2719

WWW.DORSEY.COM :: PALO ALTO :: BIO :: V-CARD

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

E-mails from this firm normally contain confidential and privileged material, and are for the sole use of the intended recipient. Use or distribution by an unintended recipient is prohibited, and may be a violation of law. If you believe that you received this e-mail in error, please do not read this e-mail or any attached items. Please delete the e-mail and all attachments, including any copies thereof, and inform the sender that you have deleted the e-mail, all attachments and any copies thereof. Thank you.

Please help reduce paper and ink usage. Print only if necessary.

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 10:10 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Deborah Gorman; Andrew Miner; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: 2017 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
Ph: 408.730.7913

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

From: Paul Healy
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 8:32 AM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: 2017 LUTE

Honorable Council members,

The LUTE proposal before you worsens the jobs to housing imbalance, and changes the very character of our city in ways that I believe are not supported by the majority of our residents. If approved, I believe this plan will be the source of a degraded quality of life for all residents, and will be the source of true suffering for those most effected by the housing imbalance. I respectfully urge you to send this proposal back for a rewrite that would reduce the jobs to housing imbalance, and respect the low density residential character of the majority of our city.

Respectfully

Paul Healy

Sent from my iPhone

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 10:06 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: L.U.T.E. General Plan

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Leeann Bent [
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 9:57 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: L.U.T.E. General Plan

Hello -

I am a resident of Sunnyvale (Pastoria Terrace, 94086) and am writing you tonight about the L.U.T.E. plan. I have some specific concerns, which I suspect may not dovetail exactly with the concerns of other residents, especially since my job is moving to Sunnyvale this month (the new Google Moffett Place campus).

Because I both live and work in Sunnyvale, you can understand my desire for a balanced city. I do not mind adding more jobs to the city of Sunnyvale by any means, as long as there is housing to balance it out. I do not mind adding high density housing to Sunnyvale as long as our schools and parks are funded. I do not mind mixed use village-style development (actually I love it) as long as it's walkable and there is viable public transportation.

This means that the devil (as always) is in the details and I am concerned that the details of the L.U.T.E. plan do not go far enough to ensure that our community is balanced. Specifically, it sounds like the plan is to add many more jobs than housing and I'd rather see both. I am also concerned that schools may not be adequately funded by high density projects. Perhaps it's not appropriate for a land use study, but we need to consider how adding any high density housing affects our schools (even if it means creative fees may be necessary or condos are favored over apartments). Finally, it seems like there has been a significant effort in making the city more walkable and bicycle friendly. Thank you for that.

We need to have a balanced, forward-looking plan for our city. I look forward to hearing more about Sunnyvale's plans.

Thank you for your time,

Leeann Bent

P.S. - I am excited to finally see plans for the city center taking shape and development happening. I can't wait for a movie theater and grocery store.

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 10:32 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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Lois S .
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 10:29 AM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: LUTE

Dear City Council members,

I am very concerned about the LUTE which is to be considered at tonight's City Council Meeting for several reasons.

It increases the jobs to housing ratio which is already a serious problem.

Although we have been told that Sunnyvale wants to protect single family neighborhoods, the proposal to demolish at least 7 neighborhood commercial areas at various intersections and replace them with 3 - 4 story mixed use "Village Centers" will impact the single family neighborhoods behind most or all of these intersections. Not only will 4 story buildings block sun and tower over the homes behind them, the plan is to provide less parking at these "Village Centers" than needed, which will force additional traffic and parking into the nearby streets. This produces more traffic, conflict with existing homeowners, and more pollution.

Please vote against the LUTE as written and take a close look at each part of it.

Thank you,

Lois Smallwood
Sunnyvale resident

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 11:05 AM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: Housing in the 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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: Karen Schlessner
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 10:54 AM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: Housing in the LUTE

Dear City Council,

I'm writing to express my deep concern that the Land Use and Transportation Element does not go far enough to reduce the housing shortage that is harming the quality of life throughout our region.

I believe this to be a social justice issue. By creating more housing, Sunnyvale would be sending the message that we are a welcoming and inclusive community, proud of our diversity.

There are many opportunities for growth that will enhance our neighborhoods. In addition to building dense housing along transit corridors, we should encourage homeowners to add Accessory Dwelling Units. This will increase the number of housing units and give homeowners the opportunity for extra income, without causing undue distress.

Our region needs to add tens of thousands of new homes ASAP. Sunnyvale has the opportunity to be leader on this issue. By showing our neighboring cities that housing brings tremendous value to our community, we can start to turn this crisis around.

Please consider including more housing friendly policies in the LUTE, such as upzoning, ADUs, and the transportation options that go hand in hand.

Thank you,
Karen Schlessner
1111 Escalon Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 1:47 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: LUTE thoughts

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
Ph: 408.730.7913

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

From: Barbara Fukumoto
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 1:26 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: LUTE thoughts

Honorable Councilmembers:

1. While it is easy to get lost in the weeds, I think a key thing about the draft LUTE update is that it conforms to State and regional policy in an effort to reduce *regional* VMT and GHG emissions. While the draft update does result in higher Sunnyvale VMT and GHG emissions, I believe we can assume that it reduces both at a regional level. Given the projected population increases in Santa Clara County, development within the already developed cities would result in less regional VMT and GHG than more sprawl onto greenfield. This draft helps address our share of these regional measures. And importantly, the draft reduces Sunnyvale's per capita VMT, compared to the current LUTE.
2. Delaying implementation of the parking recommendations in the LUTE would encourage driving. Likely, if you are concerned about traffic, it would be preferable to bite the bullet and begin educating the public about the unintended consequences of free parking now and implement the LUTE parking policies soon.
3. I see the neighborhood villages as a plus for the neighborhoods, with several advantages---more housing choices (smaller multi-family buildings), community gathering centers and more support for the village businesses from additional housing within the villages.
4. The LUTE indicates that housing:employed resident is a more helpful indicator than jobs: housing. Is it time to stop talking about the latter measure?

Barbara Fukumoto

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 1:50 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; CityClerk AP
Subject: POLICY--FW: Comments regarding agenda item 17-0379 (draft 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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: rsteward
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 1:39 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Cc: Bob Steward
Subject: Comments regarding agenda item 17-0379 (draft LUTE)

To Your Honor the Sunnyvale Mayor and Sunnyvale City Council Members:

After reading the entire draft LUTE proposal in preparation for tonight's council agenda item 17-0379, I have the following comments:

SUMMARY

- * Overall, a well reasoned proposal, given that we are constrained in area and need to accommodate some level of growth.
- * My issue is with the scale and timing of the added jobs and how it drives the entire LUTE. I believe the jobs growth target needs to be substantially reduced, which will lower the pressure on the trailing housing and infrastructure items, including the impacted jobs to housing ratio.
- * What controls will be in place to regulate the rate at which the plan is implemented over 20 years? How will we insure that the 3 growth areas will be mutually supportive vs. time? How will this be transparent to the residents?
- * We need to justify a jobs growth target that can be supported by subsequent housing and infrastructure growth, especially since the former tends to lead the latter two, per comments from my communications with a city council member last year.

DETAILS

* Key facts from page 12 of Attachment 4:

- Jobs increase 15,000 more than the population. Unless every new housing unit is required to house 2 people employed within the city boundary, we are insuring that we are adding 15,000 commuters despite the plans for village centers. This argues for cutting the added job target in half.
- Compounded growth rate for housing units is ~ 1% per year while jobs is ~ 2% per year, over 20 years.

* From communications with council members last year, it is my understanding that:

- The additional jobs target is driven not by what we can absorb vs. time but by what we can fit in if commercial sites are maxed out.
- It is difficult to balance the growth of jobs vs. housing vs. infrastructure as they come in waves, one creating the demand for another. As such, the planning commission and city council actions tend to be a result of response to proposals, as long as a proposal fits the General and Specific Plans. That is, all growth within the Plan is good whenever we can add it, and regardless of whether the other legs of the milking stool would be too short.

* I have heard that our recent aggressive housing plan is to catch up from a time when jobs were added 5:1 over housing units. So adding 2x more jobs than housing units is an improvement? I had heard that the jobs target in the last General Plan was completed early in the planned period, leaving housing and infrastructure far behind. If not planned and measured, don't expect it to be under control. I believe there needs to be a target that gives relatively constant compounded growth with a periodic public review mechanism and pre-planned trigger points if the targets vs. time are exceeded excessively. This would also be true if the expected balance between the 3 factors exceeds a plan. Note here that I am not aware of any growth vs. time plan or allowed variation between the 3 growth areas. From my past communication with the Council, I understand we are Market Driven - jobs drives housing which drives infrastructure.

Thanks for your consideration,
Bob Steward
3 Thornapple Drive
Sunnyvale resident since 1975

From: Council AnswerPoint
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 4:25 PM
To: Jennifer Nunez
Cc: Yvette Blackford; Deanna Santana; Walter Rossmann; Kent Steffens; Trudi Ryan; Andrew Miner; Deborah Gorman; CityClerk AP; Manuel Pineda; Christina Uribe
Subject: POLICY--FW: Comments on the 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
Ph: 408.730.7913

From: John Cordes
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 4:21 PM
To: Council AnswerPoint <council@sunnyvale.ca.gov>
Subject: Comments on the LUTE

Hello Mayor Hendricks and esteemed council members,

Here is my feedback on the LUTE which you will be voting on this evening. Please let me know if you have any questions.

I am disappointed with this plan. The significant environmental impacts you are being asked to waive tonight can be mitigated by restricting commercial development. I agree this LUTE is an improvement over the current General Plan in some policy areas. But in others like reducing congestion and helping reduce green house gases, it does a poor job.

Main points

1. It allows too many jobs given that Sunnyvale already has a serious job housing imbalance. Too many people already have long commutes to the existing jobs in Sunnyvale. Yes congestion is a regional problem, but adding more jobs than homes in Sunnyvale will make this situation worse.
2. It does not require balanced growth over the 20 years. All the jobs, a.k.a. commercial development, can be added before the housing is built. The LUTE should have intermediary development caps. Look at what is happening in Perry Park. The PP EIR assumes a 20 year cycle, but much of the redevelopment there is already planned.
3. It does not add enough housing. Please increase housing to 19,000 or even 20,000 homes.
4. It makes meeting Sunnyvale's GHG reduction goals harder to meet.

Back to point 1. This plan does not do enough to reduce the existing job to housing imbalance in Sunnyvale. Current commercial development in SV is 47.3 M sq. ft with only 58,000 housing units. The existing general plan already allows an add'l 8.2 MSF or ~ 20%. This new LUTE adds another 4.3 M sq. ft for another 10% of the current cap for a total of 12.3 M sq. ft. This would allow up to 40,000 more jobs @ 300 sq ft per employee. 40,000 more jobs, but it only plans for up to 15,000 more houses. This plan will allow increased congestion, increased VMT, increased green house gases, and reduces the affordability of housing. Please add more housing and restrict the rate of commercial development so Sunnyvale has time to implement solutions to these self-inflicted problems.

Balance the growth by having intermediate development caps like is done in the LSAP. Please cap commercial development to allow only 5M sq ft until at least 10,000 homes are added. This will start to correct the J-H balance.

This plan will degrade quality of life for all Sunnyvale residence by making traffic much worse. it will lead to increasing ghgs. It will reduce housing affordability and drive up rents. Makes for longer and more unpleasant commutes. It increases VMT. How will Sunnyvale meet its climate goals when this plan predicts dramatic increases in traffic and vehicles miles travelled?

In summary

1. Please increase the housing maximum to 20,000 units and direct staff to bring back proposals to support this.. Sunnyvale will probably need to rezone more commercial to residential. Suggest adding more housing in southern areas of Perry Park near Caltrain and downtown. please keep the 1.7M sq Northrop Grumman property as ITR for potential housing.
 2. Limit the commercial development to 1/4 of the total allowed every 5 years instead of having it be unconstrained so housing can be build and transportation upgraded to better adapt current and future needs.
 3. When making budget decisions later this year, please consider increasing both traffic impact fees and housing impact fees to better mitigate the congestion and housing pressure this plan will allow.
 4. Please adopt all the proposed policies which will work to make Sunnyvale more sustainable.
- Sunnyvale is progressive forward thinking city. I urge you to make this plan even better.

Regards,
John Cordes