The City Council met in study session at City Hall in the West Conference Room, 456 W. Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, California on July 23, 2013, with Vice Mayor Griffith presiding.

City Councilmembers Present:
Vice Mayor James Griffith
Councilmember Christopher Moylan
Councilmember David Whittum (via telephone)
Councilmember Jim Davis
Councilmember Tara Martin-Milius
Councilmember Patrick Meyering

City Councilmembers Absent:
Mayor Anthony (Tony) Spitaleri

Planning Commissioners Present:
Maria Dohadwala, Chair
Russell Melton, Vice Chair
Bo Chang
Glenn Hendricks
Gustav Larsson
Ken Olevson

Planning Commissioners Absent:
Arcadi Kolchak

City Staff Present:
City Manager, Gary Luebbers
City Attorney, Joan Borger
Director of Public Works, Kent Steffens
Transportation and Traffic Manager, Jack Witthaus
Planning Officer, Trudi Ryan
Principal Planner, Gerri Caruso

Visitors/Guests Present:
Members of the public

Call to Order:
Vice Mayor Griffith called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Study Session Summary:
Principal Planner, Gerri Caruso, and Transportation and Traffic Manager, Jack Witthaus provided an overview of the study of the Downtown Specific Plan carriage road (also called a frontage road), highlighting the community character/urban design policy issues
and the traffic capacity/safety issues. A table was included that presented the key differences in the current plan requirement and the studied alternative.

Councilmembers and Planning Commissioners asked questions, made comments and requested additional information; summarized below.

- How will review of the companion project for residential rental apartments be made?
- Public hearing on the carriage road should be on a different night than the public hearing for the project.
- Review the assumptions used for the traffic analysis
- Clarification of bicycle lane configuration, bicycle use on Mathilda and what has been studied
- Timing on carriage road decisions vis a vis options for Block 15 City owned parcels
- Do all three downtown blocks with the carriage road requirement have pending applications (no, only Block 14 has a pending application for redevelopment)
- What was the original intent on requiring the carriage road?
- Carriage road could provide a “grander” interface with Mathilda
- If there is no carriage road could there be another way to configure the additional 18 feet of right-of-way?
- Was potential future light rail alignment on Mathilda considered?
- Bicycle access is important; there should be no barriers.
- Policy question is essentially: where does the City want the primary access to be?
- Would having a bike lane affect access to and from driveways on Mathilda?
- Is requirement for a carriage road detrimental or beneficial to achieving the Downtown Specific Plan?
- What are the traffic and access issues for vehicles needing to make U-turns?
- Is parking required on Mathilda?
- From an urban design standpoint it seems that Mathilda without the carriage road provides a better visual connection between the two sides of street.
- At this point it appears there are more benefits without the carriage road
- Clarify the allowable density in the blocks (note this was later clarified in the July 25, 2013 City Manager Bi-Weekly Report)

**Public Comment:**
Four members of the public spoke and expressed opinions that: the frontage road does not “feel right” or look good and that it is more for the city to maintain; the frontage road adds too many lanes for traffic and could be a safety issue for pedestrians; ingress/egress for SummerHill project should be from Mathilda, not Charles; the carriage road requires too much land to be taken and noting that there is no parking on Mathilda in his block next to Wells Fargo.

**Adjournment:**
Vice Mayor Griffith adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer