

CITY OF SUNNYVALE
City Council Study Session Summary

Study Session on September 24, 2013

**Overview of Proposed Amendments to
Moffett Park Specific Plan and Development Agreement for the Proposed
Moffett Place Office Campus**

The City Council met in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 456 W. Olive Avenue in Sunnyvale, California, on September 24, 2013 at 5:45 p.m., with Mayor Anthony Spitaleri presiding.

City Councilmembers Present:

Mayor Anthony Spitaleri
Vice Mayor Jim Griffith
David Whittum
Chris Moylan
Patrick Meyering
Tara Martin-Milius
Jim Davis (via phone)

City Councilmembers Absent:

None

City Staff Present:

Gary Luebbers, City Manager
Robert Walker, Assistant City Manager
Hanson Hom, Director of Community Development
Kent Steffens, Director of Public Works
Frank Grgurina, Director of Public Safety
Grace Leung, Director of Finance
Manuel Pineda, Assistant Director of Public Works
James Bouziane, Deputy Chief, Public Safety
Joan Borger, City Attorney
Jennifer Garnett, Communications Officer
Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer
Kathleen Franco Simmons, City Clerk
Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner
Jack Witthaus, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Connie Verceles, Economic Development Manager

Call to Order: 5:45 p.m.

Study Session Summary:

Directors Hanson Hom and Kent Steffens provided a PowerPoint presentation on the subject, including an overview of the project, environmental impact report, development agreement, project taxes and fees, and next steps.

Questions and comments were provided by Councilmembers.

- Inquired if the TIA will look at the traffic impacts of existing and proposed in regards to the Monster Intersection? Staff stated that the TIA does provide that analysis.
- Inquired if the project was considering a shuttle? Staff clarified that the applicant is considering a shuttle when the project reaches a critical mass and has contacted other companies in Moffett Park to explore opportunities for economies of scale.
- Inquired if the project will provide additional visual information as it relates to the existing neighborhood across 237? Staff indicated that the applicant will provide those illustrations.
- Inquired about the TIF fees and if there are projects that will improve the traffic in the area? Staff stated that the funds will cover some of the larger scale projects such as grade separations on Lawrence Expressway and the Mary Avenue Extension.
- Expressed concern that the TIF doesn't really mitigate the traffic in the area in the short term.
- Stated that they are glad to see a Development Agreement for the project.
- Clarified that the intent of the MP-TOD is to cluster development around the light rail stations.
- Stated that the applicant could consider merging all the parcels together to get the project into MP-TOD without the amendment. Also, rather than adjusting the radius standard, consider maintaining the existing ¼-mile standard and allowing parcels with any portion within the radius to be designated MP-TOD.
- States that requiring additional pedestrian and bicycle improvements is good.
- Stated that they didn't like the way the Moffett Towers MPSP Amendments were handled as they were pieced together.
- Inquired if the land swap would be problematic with the FEMA parcel? Staff clarified that there has been initial discussions with FEMA and they have indicated that the land swap proposal is possible and did not have any objections.
- Inquired what the current Zoning is for the existing fire station site? Staff clarified that it is MP-I and that it does not have access to the development reserve.
- Inquired about what would be required to increase the development reserve if that came up in the future? Staff clarified at the MPSP was developed with a maximum development capacity of 24.3 Million. An increase in the Development Reserve would be above the limit established by the MPSP and

any increase would take additional environmental review (most likely an EIR).

- Inquired if this project would result in an increase in housing? Staff clarified that the project will pay housing mitigation fees, and that the build-out square footage for Moffett Park is already factored into the City's regional housing needs allocation (RHNA). Further, the housing demand generated by the new jobs will affect the regional need rather than Sunnyvale only.
- Inquired about the how the development affects the Balanced Growth Profile and that it will most likely put us way beyond the 20 year projection. Staff indicated that we will include that information with the future staff report.
- Inquired how will the HOV lanes help traffic? Staff indicated that they will provide additional movement on the freeway.
- Inquired who will own the Innovation Way Extension? Staff clarified that the applicant will own and maintain the property.
- Inquired about the Air Quality Impacts on the adjacent neighborhood? Staff clarified that they would be temporary impacts primarily related to emissions from construction vehicles.
- Stated that the SNAIL neighborhood was impacted by construction from the LinkedIn project. The addition of HVAC systems for the impacted residents in Orchard Gardens could be a possible mitigation.
- Stated that the City Council should see the DEIR after the Planning Commission public comment hearing.
- Inquired if the West Channel trail will be extended? Staff clarified that it will be extended to the bay in the future.
- Inquired about what type of pedestrian/bicycle trail crossing is anticipated at Java and will it be a grade separated crossing? Staff indicated that they will look into it.
- Stated that they were glad to see a discussion about the bird safe building requirements.
- Inquired what are the benefits of aligning the TOD radius standard with VTA guidelines? Staff stated that it allows for reduced traffic generation assumptions and will explore if there are other benefits.
- Stated that the property tax information was indicating a tripling in revenues and that it really is not the case since the information should include the revenue from what is allowed under the current code.
- Stated that this should be brought forward for a second study session.
- Stated that Mathilda Avenue is in gridlock and there is great concern.
- Stated that the costs to the City have not been included in the information.
- Stated that we should look at a subway under Mathilda, which currently costs \$1 billion per mile.
- Stated that this is a deeply flawed plan.
- Stated that the project seems like it will provide many benefits to the community, including tax revenues and a new fire station.

Adjournment: 6:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner