

CITY OF SUNNYVALE
City Council Study Session Summary
Study Session Summary of “Discussion of Proposals for Retooling
the Zoning Code”
November 20, 2012

The City Council met in study session at City Hall in the West Conference Room, Sunnyvale, California on November 20, 2012, with Vice Mayor Whittum presiding.

City Councilmembers Present:

Mayor Anthony (Tony) Spitaleri
Vice Mayor David Whittum
Councilmember Christopher Moylan
Councilmember Jim Griffith
Councilmember Pat Meyering
Councilmember Tara Martin-Milius
Councilmember Jim Davis

City Councilmembers Absent:

None

City Staff Present:

City Manager Gary Luebbers
Assistant City Manager Robert Walker
Interim City Attorney Michael Martello
Director of Community Development Hanson Hom
Planning Officer Trudi Ryan

Visitors/Guests Present: none

Call to Order: 5:35 p.m.

Study Session Summary:

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, used a slide show to provide overview of the effort to “retool” the zoning code. The City Councilmembers offered comments and posed questions and indicated which features they liked. The Planning Officer responded to questions.

Councilmember concerns, comments, questions:

- Need to maintain “one-stop” friendliness
- Do not generalize too much as it may make code too general and therefor too prone to interpretation

- Increases in staff discretion could be a concern
- The methodology should include: other cities, stakeholders, typical residential applicant and developers.
- Noticing, do not want to lose the reason for multiple noticing distances.
- Not worried about the amount of hours for various permits as fees should cover the costs of permit applications.
- Prefer that all applications are appealable to the City Council.
- What is the difference between design and use?
- What is the difference between SDP and PD permit?
- Should more permits come to the City Council or should City Council be aware of more projects?
- City Council should have decision authority on bigger projects
- Noticing could suggest possibility of a hearing

Councilmembers indicated items they liked:

- The goals are admirable
- There is a lot to like in the proposed reorganization
- Simplifications are positive
- Realigning project approval with scope of project is good
- Hearings and appeal process at night vs. daytime are better
- Clearer to have all the residential items together
- Code showing clear separation of “who does what”
- Distinguishing between use and design review permits is good

Adjournment: 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer