



## MEETING NOTES

### Lawrence Station Area Plan | Phase 2

City of Sunnyvale

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	November 7, 2012
<b>Location:</b>	City Hall, West Conference Room
<b>Subject:</b>	Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting 3
<b>Attendees:</b>	Sunnyvale staff Citizens Advisory Group BMS Design Group (BMS) Fehr + Peers (FP)

---

### Agenda

The agenda included the following main topics:

1. Meetings Update
2. Station Area Plan Principles
3. Alternatives Review
4. Infrastructure and schools
5. City-wide numbers – Jobs/Housing
6. Traffic analysis
7. Evaluation of plans – *Select preferred plan*
8. Next Steps
9. Public Comment

### Key discussion points include:

#### Slide presentation

A slide presentation was given that addressed the items on the agenda.

---

#### Discussion:

The meeting was opened to elicit feedback from the CAG on the material presented. The following comments were collected from the CAG:

- The plan should be reviewed by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC).
- Land use adjacencies are important.
- Higher density should not be limited to the ¼ mile radius. The plan should include flexibility for higher density throughout the study area.
- There was a discussion about height limits and it was indicated the team is currently looking at 4-6 stories depending on location and that it is the role of the committee to decide the character of the place. Height will be an important discussion topic at future meetings.
- Open space numbers shown in the presentation were 100% build-out and gross development.
- The city will discuss the preferred plan with the school district when the plan is selected.

---

### Evaluation of plans

CAG members were given established principles and goals to evaluate the three land use alternatives and the one circulation framework. There were eight participants and ten questions for land use and seven questions for circulation. CAG members were asked to rate the three land use alternatives from a 1-3 for each question and a yes or no for the circulation. The results were as follows:

---

Alternative A: 128  
**Alternative B: 189**  
Alternative C: 163

The circulation framework was given all yes votes with the exception one member who said no for question IV which reads:  
Encourages bicycling and walking throughout the study area

It was noted that a bike connection on Aster Avenue was missing and if that was added to the framework the network would be more complete and the answer could change to a yes.  
It was agreed that Aster Avenue should have bicycle facilities.

---

**Discussion:**

CAG members discussed the results of the evaluation and had the following comments/recommendations:

- It was suggested that a node of employment within a 1/8 mile radius be included on Alternative B.
- Higher intensity throughout the plan was recommended to create more flexibility.
- It was discussed that the plan could include development potential and a general pool of increased density allowance, or bonuses could be established for certain areas in the plan. The city indicated this was a method used in Moffett Park. It was suggested that the pool could be used between the ¼ and ½ mile radius.

---

**Public Comment:**

A BPAC member provided input that there needs to be more bike routes than what currently exists and access should be provided to all destinations. The team should be proactive about new VTA bike guidelines that have just been released.

---

**Motion:**

A motion was made to select **Land Use Alternative B** with the inclusion of the changes outlined during the discussion period.

Seconded.

Unanimous agreement.

---