

**From:** [Scott Hughes](#)  
**To:** [Gian Martire](#)  
**Cc:** [Kitty Moore](#); [R Wang](#); [Vikram Saxena](#); [Alan Takahashi](#); [David Fung](#)  
**Subject:** FW: City of Cupertino, CA: Westport Cupertino Planning Commission Hearing  
**Date:** Sunday, May 3, 2020 5:10:59 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello All,

As a 25 year Cupertino home owner who lives within a mile of this site proposal, I have driven, biked and walked the Oaks neighborhood regularly.

As was seen at the previous 2 public meetings, many of us nearby residents have unique and valuable input which you will not find in the project proposal.

I would like to take the opportunity to share a little insight today.

First, after two previous failed attempts, it is very sad that this developer is even considering trying to push a 3<sup>rd</sup> flawed project proposal through during our unprecedented pandemic.

In my opinion, Cupertino should have a much higher bar of expectation which provides our residents the opportunity to share our passion, concerns and suggestions with you in person.

However, Gian has told me that email is the only option.

I am happy to see that the developer has finally listened to a small amount of the public input provided in the past.

However, this proposal still has significant concerns and I hope that you will recommend against this request for exception.

My overview of concerns:

- Existing site access challenges have been ignored/will get worse and will impact public safety
- Project could be completed with similar functionality with zero/minimal exceptions
- Site Plan does not align with the majority of consistent public feedback

I suspect some of you already have similar concerns, so rather than detail within the body of this email, I will add the detail as an appendix below.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Good luck with this one and please stay healthy.

Regards,  
Scott

Appendix:

- Existing site has ingress/egress challenges. I have witnessed many near misses of

pedestrians and cyclists due to this specific issue and unfortunately have been involved in a few myself. Regardless of the traffic reports, this proposal will make things worse for public safety. However, we have provided input which could result in improved public safety.

Suggestions:

- More balanced, re-distributed site plan will minimize usage of Stevens Creek Blvd access point (see below)
- Access point to Stevens Creek Blvd needs re-design. It should be an entrance only and site exits should only be onto Mary Ave. If this connection must have an exit, then that exit should only connect to the 85 entrance ramp. This because the present situation of exiting traffic having the option to cross the bike lane and proceed west on Stevens Creek is a disaster. If anyone does not know this or understand this, I would be willing to provide more details but per this proposal moving the exit further west is a problem. Further, the developer should work with the City to address the conflict between exiting traffic and the bike lane. If exiting traffic is restricted to 85 only, then a physical barrier between this traffic and the bike lane are preferred. I do not need to solve this problem here but it is a significant public safety risk today which gets worse in all project proposals to date.
- General site access to/from adjacent usage. Many of us have suggested pedestrian underpass and/or overpasses. Especially for seniors accessing to/from the senior center. There are many improvements possible from these options but improved public safety is the primary motivation.
- This project could meet most objectives within a 45' height envelope and within all existing setback/slope requirements. i.e., the developer could have provide a design which does NOT need any height or slope/setback exceptions but has refused to offer any such alternatives for review. I recommend that you request this from this developer.
- The usage of this proposal seems reasonable but the height distribution is backwards from most, previous resident input. If the developer really must exceed 45' to make this project feasible, then only the portion of the site directly adjacent to Highway 85 be given a height exception. This is the most common sense approach because height above 45' is the least intrusive along 85 and nobody cares about the slope/setback relative to a wide highway ramp. The proper re-distribution of height will enable the project to maintain the suburban "look and feel" that is most appropriate for this suburban site and provide an easier implementation of the needed public safety improvements.

**From:** webmaster@cupertino.org [mailto:webmaster@cupertino.org]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 28, 2020 12:38 PM

**To:** scottahughes@comcast.net

**Subject:** City of Cupertino, CA: Westport Cupertino Planning Commission Hearing

Cupertino, CA



**Westport Cupertino Planning Commission Hearing**

**Date:** 04/28/2020 12:37 pm

Good afternoon,

This is a reminder that the Westport Cupertino project will be heard at the Planning Commission Hearing on May 12, 2020. See the [Westport City-wide Postcard](#) for the development.

The applicant has revised the scope for the application to be a Senior Enhanced alternative. The amended description is below:

*Development proposal to demolish a 71,250 square foot retail center (The Oaks), remove and replace 74 protected trees, and construct a mixed-used development consisting of 294 housing units (88 Rowhouse/Townhomes, 206 senior apartments, of which include 48 senior affordable apartments and 27 memory care units) and 20,000 square feet of commercial space. The applicant is requesting a Heart of the City Exception for retail frontage along Stevens Creek Boulevard.*

The changes are limited to the unit count and type in Building 1. No physical changes are proposed to the square footage of the project, tree removals, and/or building envelope of the development. The waivers requested are consistent with that of the original application. This scope was already analyzed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a viable alternative in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). For further clarification and project submittals, please review the Westport Project webpage: [Westport Cupertino](#).

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

**Gian Martire**  
Senior Planner  
Planning Division  
[GianM@cupertino.org](mailto:GianM@cupertino.org)  
(408) 777-3319

[Change your eNotification preference.](#)

[Unsubscribe from all City of Cupertino, CA eNotifications.](#)



**From:** [Jerry Kozina](#)  
**To:** [Gian Martire](#)  
**Subject:** Westport  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 28, 2020 4:25:58 PM

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Why need the on street parking space? Given increased traffic from more residents the roadway should be wider not reduced to hazardous levels.

I am appalled that this is seen as reasonable.

No to any exemptions.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Roxanne Beverstein](#)  
**To:** [Gian Martire](#)  
**Subject:** Westport Cupertino  
**Date:** Tuesday, April 28, 2020 4:45:01 PM

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We have lived in Cupertino for 40 years. Volunteered to plant trees, managed a research project for 25 years at the McClellan Ranch Preserve and have been active in political movements in the city. We do not need anymore traffic congestion in Cupertino and do not want this development where the Oaks is located. The best thing is to add another grocery store in the Oaks. Stop over crowding in Cupertino

Sent from my iPhone