APPROVED MINUTES
SUNNYVALE PLANNING COMMISSION
November 11, 2013
456 W. Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA 94086

7:00 PM - Study Session – West Conference Room

1.	**Training:**	• Engineering Division • Economic Development Division
2.	**Public Comment** on Study Session Agenda Items	*(5 minutes)*
3.	**Comments** from the Chair	*(5 minutes)*
4.	**Adjourn Study Session**	

8:00 p.m. – Public Hearing - Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Melton called the meeting to order at 8:00 PM.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Vice Chair Russell W. Melton; Commissioner Gustav Larsson; Commissioner Glenn Hendricks; Commissioner Ken Olevson; Commissioner Bo Chang; and Commissioner Ralph Durham.

Members Absent: Chair Maria Dohadwala (excused).

Staff Present: Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer; Joan Borger, City Attorney; Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner; Hanson Hom, Director of Community Development; and Cristina Pfeffer, Recording Clerk.

SCHEDULED PRESENTATION

None.

Any agenda related writings or documents distributed to members of the Planning Commission regarding any open session item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Division office located at 456 W. Olive Ave., Sunnyvale CA 94086 during normal business hours, and in the Council Chambers on the evening of the Planning Commission meeting pursuant to Government Code §54957.5.

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENTS

Speakers are limited to three (3) minutes. If you wish to address the Planning Commission, please complete a speaker's card and give it to the Recording Secretary or you may orally make a request to speak. If your subject is not on the agenda, you will be recognized at this time; but the Brown Act (Open Meeting Law) does not allow action by Planning Commission Members. If you wish to speak to a subject listed on the agenda, you will be recognized at the time the item is being considered by the Planning Commission.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1.A Approval of Minutes: October 28, 2013

1.B FILE #: 2013-7734

Location: 1229 Pennyroyal Ter. (APN: 202-17-053)

Proposed Project: **SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT** to allow a first-story addition of 606 square feet to an existing two-story single-family home within a Planned Development, resulting in 2,874 square feet and 55.2% floor area ratio.

Applicant / Owner: Integrand, Inc. / Yanjuan Yuan and Weiwen Weng

Environmental Review: Categorically Exempt Class 1

Staff Contact: Tim Maier, (408) 730-7257, Tmaier@sunnyvale.ca.gov

ACTION: Comm. Larsson moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar. Comm. Hendricks seconded. Motion carried, 5-0-1 with Comm. Chang abstaining and Chair Dohadwala absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than November 26, 2013.

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

2.	**FILE #:**	**2012-7854**
	Location:	**1152 Bordeaux Dr.** (APNs: 110-25-037, 038; 110-27-017, 023, 031, 032; 100-35-007, 008, 009)
	Proposed Project:	**CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS** to consider a new Class A office campus of 1.78 million square feet; **MOFFETT PARK SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT** changing land use designation for 8 parcels from Moffett Park Industrial to Moffett Park Transit Oriented Development and associated text amendments; **REZONE** of 8 parcels from MP-I to MP-TOD; **MAJOR MOFFETT PARK DESIGN REVIEW** to allow the construction of 6 eight-story buildings, 1 two-story amenities building, two parking structures, surface parking and associated site improvements for a total floor area of 1.78 million square feet and extension of Innovation Way to Bordeaux Drive; and **DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT** for a land swap between the City of Sunnyvale and Jay Paul Company and the construction of a new fire station valued at $11.5 million.
	Applicant / Owner:	Jay Paul Company (Mathilda Avenue Campus LLC, Mathilda Avenue Campus LLC and Borregas Avenue LLC)
	Environmental Review:	Subsequent Environmental Impact Report
	Staff Contact:	Shaunn Mendrin, (408) 730-7429, smendrin@sunnyvale.ca.gov
	Note:	This item is scheduled to be considered by City Council on December 3, 2013.

Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner, presented illustrations while summarizing the staff report.

Comm. Larsson noted that if the criteria were changed for the Moffett Park Transit Oriented Development (MP-TOD) designation, it would include parcels not part of this project, and that the land use designation and zoning would not change when City Council makes their decision regarding the project. He confirmed with Mr. Mendrin that those parcels would go through a change process and would have an opportunity to obtain community benefits in the future. Comm. Larsson also confirmed with Mr. Mendrin that the applicant is requesting no deviations for this project. Comm. Larsson said that at the Borregas Bike Bridge landing there is a guardrail creating a conflict for vehicle and bike traffic and asked if there would be any changes to it. **Jack Witthaus**, Transportation and Traffic Manager, explained that the placement of the guardrail was

necessary to do the constrained right-of-way between the freeway and the City right-of-way and that there is no remedy for it now so the lane would be shared between vehicles and bikes.

Comm. Hendricks and **Trudi Ryan,** Planning Officer, discussed the purpose of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Comm. Hendricks discussed with **Mr. Witthaus** how a project of this size would generate additional traffic that is considered to have a less than significant impact. Mr. Witthaus explained that the project is required to comply with the City's 30% peak hour reduction, and that the reduction in traffic for this project is less than the City's requirement. Mr. Witthaus also discussed the financial contributions required of the applicant that would go toward both City and County transportation improvement projects. Comm. Hendricks and Mr. Witthaus discussed a condition of approval (COA) that would restrict the hours of construction truck access to the site.

Comm. Olevson and Ms. Ryan discussed the evolution of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and how that influences changing the specific plan. Comm. Olevson commended staff for including in the report the City's ongoing financial benefit from the proposed project.

Comm. Durham inquired about potential plans for the Mathilda-101 intersection, to which Mr. Witthaus explained that alternatives are being evaluated now and he anticipates bringing an alternative to the City Council during a study session in January.

Vice Chair Melton confirmed with Mr. Mendrin that the applicant would pay to maintain the Innovation Way extension in perpetuity, and confirmed that the developer could decide to develop the acquired City property into commercial space. Vice Chair Melton discussed with Ms. Ryan reasons for which Council may be comfortable adopting the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and confirmed with Ms. Ryan that the environmentally superior alternative would have the same significant and unavoidable impact as the project. In response to Vice Chair Melton's inquiry, Ms. Ryan stated that the maximum height permitted would not change if City Council adopts the rezone. Vice Chair Melton asked if staff would not have been able to make some or all of the findings if the developer was not providing the City benefits such as building a new fire station. Ms. Ryan replied that the whole package of the development agreement facilitated making the finding that overall it is a benefit to the city.

Comm. Hendricks asked if the construction of a firing range in the project area would make land use for shooting ranges legal in the City, to which Ms. Ryan replied that because the shooting range would be a Public Safety facility, it falls under a different set of rules. Comm. Hendricks confirmed with **Hanson Hom**, Director of the Department of Community Development, that there would be sufficient parking in the rear of the shooting range for Public Safety vehicles. Comm. Hendricks and staff discussed the square footage coming out of the Moffett Park Development Reserve. In response to Vice Chair Melton's inquiry, Mr. Mendrin explained that the top of proposed parking structure B could be an open space green layer and another layer of parking could be added to parking structure C.

Comm. Olevson confirmed with Ms. Ryan that 67% of the original development reserve has been utilized if all projects that have been approved are counted. Comm. Olevson discussed with Mr. Witthaus that all transportation mitigation alternatives involve intersection and freeway ramp modifications between U.S. Highway 101 and Innovation Way, and confirmed that construction of these improvements would begin mid-2016.

Comm. Hendricks noted that other projects have contributed toward paying for transportation improvements in the area and confirmed with Mr. Witthaus that the fund for the improvements will likely increase in the future. Mr. Witthaus said the City will build a project that will improve the Mathilda Corridor through U.S. Highways 101 and 237.

Comm. Larsson confirmed with Mr. Witthaus that the discussed transportation improvements on Mathilda Avenue will not require further funding from other projects to begin construction in 2016.

Vice Chair Melton opened the public hearing.

Tom Gilman, project architect with DES, and **Janette D'Elia**, project applicant, presented an animated video of images of the proposed project, including a view from highway 237 as it passes the project site. Mr. Gilman said the project is adjacent to the light rail, has 35% open space and a variety of architectural features among the buildings. He said that if a company wanted more square footage they could occupy two buildings and that the two-story amenities building was designed with the idea to keep employees on campus to reduce traffic during the day. He said the extension of Innovation Way will also reduce traffic, and that they have been working with local public safety to construct a new fire station that will meet their requirements. Ms. D'Elia said she thinks the project is a benefit for the city and enhances the City's ability to provide emergency services.

Comm. Larsson asked about the kind of art being provided in the development. Ms. D'Elia said they would be distributing art throughout the public view corridors, similar to the art in the Moffett Towers project.

Comm. Hendricks inquired about the applicant's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. Ms. D'Elia said they would be exploring the use of buses, providing incentives for employees to ride public transit and shuttle service to the Mountain View Light Rail station. Comm. Hendricks confirmed with Ms. D'Elia that the applicant will be building the project in phases, that construction traffic will be moving along alternate routes and that they will be deconstructing as many of the existing buildings as soon as possible. Ms. D'Elia said construction of the perimeter sidewalk would be part of the phase of the associated building. Comm. Hendricks asked City staff if there were concerns regarding missed or delayed benefits due to construction phasing. Mr. Mendrin said everything can be addressed through coordination with the building permit review. Ms. Ryan said that typically if something cannot be completed in the proposed phase, the City would take a deposit to hold to make sure there are adequate funds to complete it. Mr. Hom stated that the development agreement has specific completion deadlines for the public safety facility.

Comm. Durham confirmed with Mr. Gilman that bike lane widths will not be increased on Moffett Park Drive, but that bike lanes will be included on Innovation Way, and that the trail on the north side of the project will be mixed-use and paved. Comm. Durham also confirmed with Mr. Gilman that there will be temporary signage on the road warning of any closed sidewalks or bike lanes.

Vice Chair Melton asked Ms. D'Elia to reiterate what she said during the last few seconds of her presentation. Ms. D'Elia said they are asking for only 18% over existing zoning, and she feels they have worked hard to provide an adequate public benefit for the City in the long run.

Comm. Hendricks asked Mr. Witthaus if the use of asphalt to create a curved curb and gutter has been considered, to which Mr. Witthaus responded that it has not because pavement degrades if asphalt is used as the surface carrying runoff.

Susan Muller, a Sunnyvale resident, said the project would bring 7,000 more people and increased traffic to the area. She said that while the design of the buildings is beautiful, she asked that the applicant compromise and move building one to site three so there is not an eight-story building looking down into the neighborhood she inhabits.

Kerry Haywood, Executive Director of the Moffett Park Business Group (MPBG), said she attended the public hearing to show support from the group of the Moffett Place development. She said Jay Paul is a member of the group and had requested membership support for the project and that the group carefully considered the impacts of the project on the community. She encouraged the Planning Commission to recommend approval of the project to City Council. **Comm. Hendricks** asked Ms. Haywood to discuss the TDM Plan the companies of the MPBG have been using. Ms. Haywood said the larger companies provide extensive TDM programs for their employees and the MPBG brings the companies together to share resources. She said many of the companies are working on programs that provide public transit ride passes, subsidies, pre-tax benefits, and vanpooling.

Holly Lofgren, a Sunnyvale resident, said she thinks the applicant is doing only a portion of mitigation efforts, but that the project will create much more traffic which will increase the demand for housing. She said the increase in demand will lead to the overcrowding of schools for which the community will end up paying. She said she would like to see the cumulative effects of all of the projects coming about in the area, and that the City should ask for more Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) money. She said she is not opposed to the development, but thinks that the community needs to understand better the effects of the projects.

Ms. D'Elia said she feels they have worked hard to address the needs of the community. She said they are not sure if they can commit to the recommendation of placing the green roof on the parking structure because it may present a substantial cost for them. She asked that the Commission consider making the green roof optional.

Comm. Hendricks said that if the green roof is made optional it may not be done. Ms. D'Elia said that may not be case and that they had initially suggested it to staff as an

alternative site plan. She said they wanted to be sure they could do it without having to go back to the Planning Commission and City Council. She said they hoped it would be optional, that she feels they have gone well over what they have been required to provide and that they will be striving to build the green roof. Mr. Hom said that during the Planning Commission study session comments were made about the applicant potentially reducing surface parking, which the applicant did, along with increasing the open space. He said the applicant suggested the possibility of converting the roof deck into a recreational amenity, but that the applicant needed to evaluate the financial feasibility of it. Mr. Hom said it is the discretion of the Planning Commission to determine if the green roof should be required or optional. Comm. Hendricks confirmed with Ms. D'Elia that the 35% green space does not include the green roof. Comm. Hendricks and Mr. Hom discussed alternatives to reduced surface parking and to the green roof. Ms. D'Elia noted the competitiveness the provision of on-site parking adds to a development when attempting to attract tenants. Comm. Hendricks discussed with Mr. Hom potentially adding a condition that would recommend approval of the project with current conditions and that the applicant could return to the Planning Commission or City Council to discuss the reasons for refraining from building the green roof.

Vice Chair Melton asked the applicant how they would respond if Council required them to move building one, as suggested earlier by Ms. Muller, so that it has less of a visual impact on the neighborhood across highway 237. Ms. D'Elia said it would make the site imbalanced in terms of parking distribution. Mr. Gilman said the building would be less desirable due to an increased distance from parking.

Mr. Mendrin displayed context illustrations showing views of the project from surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Hom responded to the earlier comment about the lack of benefits for schools saying there would be an increase in annual property taxes that would go to schools.

Vice Chair Melton closed the public hearing.

Comm. Hendricks moved to recommend adopting Option 1 to adopt a resolution certifying the EIR, adopt the Statements of Overriding Consideration, and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as contained in Attachment L; Option 3 to adopt a resolution to amend the Moffett Park Specific Plan to change the Land Use Designation from Moffett Park Industrial (MP-I) to Moffett Park Transit Oriented Development (MP-TOD) for eight parcels and associated text amendments including siting criteria for MP-TOD based on any portion of the parcel within ¼ mile of a Light Rail (LRT) station, as contained in the Findings in Attachment C and Resolution in Attachment M; Option 5 to introduce an ordinance to Rezone eight parcels within the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area from MP-I to MP-TOD as contained in the Findings in Attachment D and Draft Ordinance in Attachment N; Option 7 to approve the Major Moffett Park Design Review as indicated in the Site and Architectural Plans in Attachment H and T, Findings of Approval in Attachment E and Conditions of Approval in Attachment G; Option 9 to introduce an ordinance to enter into a Development Agreement between the City of Sunnyvale and Jay Paul Company as contained in findings

for approval in Attachment F and Draft Ordinance in Attachment O; and a Condition of Approval that "The applicant shall implement the additional open space located on Parking Structure B as indicated in Attachment T (Exhibit 3 of the Conditions of Approval) unless a finding is made that it is not financially feasible or another solution could achieve a similar purpose. Any modifications to this requirement, including deletion of the open space, shall be reviewed through a Miscellaneous Plan Permit (MPP) application. The applicant shall submit a detailed landscape plan and rationale for any proposed changes, or provide a rationale for deleting the open space. The MPP shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission." Comm. Olevson seconded.

Vice Chair Melton offered a friendly amendment to split up the motion into five smaller motions to individually consider each option. Comm. Hendricks declined the friendly amendment.

Comm. Hendricks said this is a big project, and that the Planning Commission looked at it several different times during study sessions. He said he is not sure how many times he has read the EIR, but it was certainly more than once. He said the thinks the overriding pieces on this are whether to expand out the TOD, and is the difference of several hundred feet to say people will or will not walk to the light rail station. He said he is comfortable with the extension and that it is compatible with VTA guidelines. He said the next thing to look at is traffic impact, and while it is not up to this body to agree or disagree, there is already an EIR done that says there can be much more development in this area of Sunnyvale than what the Commission is approving now. He said we are one step along the way from the big EIR that was approved before, and he thinks there should be separate discussion about the size of the remaining reserve. He said those are the first starting points of this project to determine whether or not it makes sense to expand out the TOD, and he does not think we are overly impacting the traffic side. He said we do not need findings for option 1, and for options 3, 5, 7 and 9 he can make the findings in the attachments. He said he thinks this is an overall good project, that we did not talk much about the architecture now, but have before, and that it is more about the walkability of the project and the flow of traffic. He said he wants to see the applicant keep the extra open space, and he is not going to hassle the applicant for the lack of solar on top of the buildings.

Comm. Olevson said this is a massive project, and that the Subsequent EIR adequately addressed the major issues, the biggest one being transportation. He said he is pleased to hear that we have a specific date for when money will be spent to start alleviating the major concerns of the residents, and is pleased to hear that we have money in the bank today and will not be relying on further development. He said he can make the findings in attachment C, for the rezoning and design review. He said this attains the objectives of the MPSP, and that the development agreement is consistent with policies in general land use and that the modification that adds parking and enhances the public safety facility is a definite benefit to the City. He said for those reasons he supports the project and can make the findings.

Comm. Larsson said he agrees with almost all of the comments made by Commissioners Olevson and Hendricks, especially the comments regarding banked

money for the transportation improvements and a set schedule. He said he is concerned with the requirement for the applicant to come back for further review if they are unable to do the green roof and the potential delay it could add. He said he would prefer to have something that is more efficient and needs more persuasion to support the motion.

Comm. Chang said he will be supporting the motion and can make the findings. He said this is a huge project and that the Commission has been going through many different steps to ensure we are doing the right thing and that today is the culmination of all of those steps to the final step of giving the project the green light. He said we have talked about the main part which is the traffic impact report and after all of the issues have been addressed he thinks it is important that it goes to the City Council for a decision to be made. He said he agrees with Comm. Larsson that issues regarding the green parking deck do not need to come back to the Planning Commission. He said that as the project goes forward maybe the Director of Community Development can review it and asked that Comm. Hendricks reconsider his motion.

Comm. Larsson offered a friendly amendment to have the decision made by the Director of Community Development rather than requiring it to come back to the Planning Commission. Commissioners Hendricks and Olevson accepted the friendly amendment.

Comm. Durham confirmed with Ms. Ryan that should City Council not like the adjustments they can make their own changes.

Vice Chair Melton reiterated that this is a big project and said it has been roughly a decade since Sunnyvale has seen a project of this size. He said he takes seriously the responsibility of the Planning Commission to measure this up against the General Plan and the Specific Plan of the City of Sunnyvale. He said he listed the pros and cons of the development, with the pros being: it is a nice development, the new fire station with three bays, the new engine, the firing range, the extension of the street and the sidewalk improvements. He said he agrees that the staff write-up regarding the financial impact was well done. He said monetarily there is one-time revenue to the City of $29 million, and annual revenue of $1 million. He said there will also be untold benefits to the employment situation in Sunnyvale and additional economic benefits. He listed his cons as: the unmitigated to a less than significant level release of nitrous oxide during construction; having to tweak the MPSP and the zoning change; and that the project will infringe on surrounding neighborhoods. He said the biggest thing he his thinking about is the General Plan and the Balanced Growth Profile (BGP), which contains a section that talks about office industrial floor area and is intended to be a 20 year plan. He said we are eight years into the 20 year plan and the total contemplated square footage of new office industrial floor area space was going to be 7.6 million square feet and we have completed 2.3 million through October of 2013. He said there have been projects approved but not built that will take up another 3.4 million square feet, that this project adds another 1.8 million square feet, so that eight years into the 20 year plan we are going to exhaust 98% of the planned office square footage. He reiterated that perhaps it is time to think about tapping the brake pedal on development going on in Sunnyvale. He said he will support the project because on the whole it

makes sense and benefits Sunnyvale residents, and that he would challenge the Planning Commission and City Council to think this through. He said he thinks Comm. Hendricks had an interesting idea to do a manual override to the Moffett Park Development Reserve as a brake tapping tool, and that the Land Use and Transportation Element will be reviewed next year and may be another means of tapping the brake pedal. He said these are his concerns but he will be pressing the yes button.

Comm. Durham said he will be pressing the yes button as well.

ACTION: Comm. Hendricks moved to recommend adopting:

a) Option 1 to adopt a resolution certifying the EIR, adopt the Statements of Overriding Consideration, and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as contained in Attachment L;

b) Option 3 to adopt a resolution to amend the Moffett Park Specific Plan to change the Land Use Designation from Moffett Park Industrial (MP-I) to Moffett Park Transit Oriented Development (MP-TOD) for eight parcels and associated text amendments including siting criteria for MP-TOD based on any portion of the parcel within ¼ mile of a Light Rail (LRT) station, as contained in the Findings in Attachment C and Resolution in Attachment M;

c) Option 5 to introduce an ordinance to Rezone eight parcels within the Moffett Park Specific Plan Area from MP-I to MP-TOD as contained in the Findings in Attachment D and Draft Ordinance in Attachment N;

d) Option 7 to approve the Major Moffett Park Design Review as indicated in the Site and Architectural Plans in Attachment H and T, Findings of Approval in Attachment E and Conditions of Approval in Attachment G;

e) Option 9 to introduce an ordinance to enter into a Development Agreement between the City of Sunnyvale and Jay Paul Company as contained in findings for approval in Attachment F and Draft Ordinance in Attachment O;

f) and a Condition of Approval that "The applicant shall implement the additional open space located on Parking Structure B as indicated in Attachment T (Exhibit 3 of the Conditions of Approval) unless a finding is made that it is not financially feasible or another solution could achieve a similar purpose. Any modifications to this requirement, including deletion of the open space, shall be reviewed through a Miscellaneous Plan Permit (MPP) application. The applicant shall submit a detailed landscape plan and rationale for any proposed changes, or provide a rationale for deleting the open space. The MPP shall be subject to review and approval by the Director of Community Development."

Comm. Olevson seconded. The motion carried, 6-0 with Chair Dohadwala absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This recommendation will be considered by the City Council on December 3, 2013.

3. Standing Item Potential Study Issues (2015)

No new study issues were added to the potential study issue list for 2015.

4. Select and Rank Potential 2014 Study Issues
(Public Hearing to allow public comment in the Council Chambers; Planning Commission action will take place in the West Conference Room following Information Only items.)

Vice Chair Melton opened the public hearing, and upon seeing no speakers for comment, Vice Chair Melton closed the public hearing.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

- COMMISSIONERS ORAL COMMENTS

  Vice Chair Melton noted that two of the Commissioner will be moving into City Council seats and asked staff if there is a predetermined legal timeframe for when the Commissioners must leave the Planning Commission.

  Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, said there is not and noted that there have been Planning Commissioners serve up until the week before moving over to the City Council.

  Comm. Hendricks suggested the process to look for new Commissioners start as soon as possible.

  Ms. Ryan said she will pass that suggestion on to the City Clerk's office.

- STAFF ORAL COMMENTS

  City Council Meeting Report

  Ms. Ryan congratulated Commissioners Hendricks and Larsson for their election to the City Council. She said there have been no recent City Council meetings on which to report.

  Other Staff Oral Report – none.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

None.

ADJOURN PUBLIC HEARING TO THE WEST CONFERENCE ROOM

- Completion of Public Hearing Item 4 to **Select and Rank Potential Study Issues for 2014.** *(Public Hearing is closed to public comment.)*

  The Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 10:29 p.m. and reconvened in the West Conference Room for Study Issue ranking at 10:35 p.m. Commissioners discussed the potential study issues, selected those to be considered and ranked them in preference. The outcome of their ranking is shown in Attachment A.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Trudi Ryan
Planning Officer

Attachment:

A. Planning Commission recommendations for ranking of CDD Potential Study Issues for 2014.

Notice to the Public:

Any agenda related writings or documents distributed to members of the Planning Commission regarding any open session item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Community Development Department located at 456 W. Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA during normal business hours and in the Council Chambers on the evening of the Planning Commission meeting, pursuant to Government Code §54957.5.

Agenda information is available by contacting The Planning Division at (408) 730-7440. Agendas and associated reports are also available on the City's web site at http://sunnyvale.ca.gov or at the Sunnyvale Public Library, 665 W. Olive Ave., Sunnyvale, 72 hours before the meeting.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that if you file a lawsuit challenging any final decision on any public hearing item listed in this agenda, the issues in the lawsuit may be limited to the issues which were raised at the public hearing or presented in writing to the City at or before the public hearing. PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.6 imposes a 90-day deadline for the filing of any lawsuit challenging final action on an agenda item which is subject to Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance in this meeting, please contact the Planning Division at (408) 730-7440. Notification of 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28 CFR 35.106 ADA Title II)

VISUAL PRESENTATION

To assist you in utilizing the technology available in the Council Chambers, the publication "How to Make Your Presentation More Effective" may be helpful.

Ask the Project Planner for a copy. Copies are also available on the table located at the back of the Council Chambers prior to scheduled Planning Commission and City Council meetings. You may also pick up a copy at the One Stop Permit Center or the City Clerk's Office during normal business hours, or visit the City's website at: http://sunnyvale.ca.gov.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARING DATES FOR 2013:

January 14	May 13	October 21 – *Special Meeting*
January 15 *	May 29, *Wednesday* ***	October 28
January 28	June 10	November 11
February 1, *Friday* **	June 24	November 25
February 11	July 8	December 2 -*Special Meeting*
February 25	July 22	December 9
March 11	August 12	December 23 – *No Meeting*
March 25	August 26	January 13, 2014
April 8	September 9	January 27, 2014
April 22	September 23	February 10, 2014
	October 14	February 24, 2014

* Joint Study Session with City Council
** City Council Study Issue Workshop
*** Special Meeting Date due to Holiday

Planning Commission typically meets the 2nd and 4th Monday of each month. Study Sessions are held at 7:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room. Public Hearings are held at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Public Hearings are available by web cast at the following link:

http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/CityGovernment/CityCouncil/CouncilMeetings/WatchCouncilMeetingsOnline.aspx

Public Hearings are broadcast on KSUN.

Channel 15 – KSUN

Monday, November 11, 2013	Planning Commission Meeting – (Live) 8:00 p.m.
Thursday, November 14, 2013	Planning Commission Meeting (Replay of November 11, 2013) 8:00 p.m.
Sunday, November 17, 2013	Planning Commission Meeting (Replay of November 11, 2013) 11:00 a.m.

GUIDELINES FOR ADDRESSING THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Public Announcements – Beginning of Meeting

- 3 minutes or less per speaker.
- Speakers are requested to give their name (address is optional).
- Recognition of a special achievement.
- Announcement of public event with definite time and date.
- Public events that are of Planning Commission interest that occur in the City annually. (Only announce one time for the year).

Public Hearings – Order of Hearing as Follows:

- Opening remarks by the applicant (if applicable).
- Speakers are requested to give their name (address is optional).
- Anyone interested in addressing the Planning Commission (may only speak one time).
- Closing remarks by the applicant (if applicable).
- Time limit of 3 minutes per person (to be extended at discretion of Chair). Please make comments brief and be prepared to provide new input.

Citizens to be Heard

- Any item relevant to the Planning Commission.
- Speakers are requested to give their name (address is optional).
- Speakers are to turn in a Speaker Card to the Recording Secretary.
- Items not on the agenda.
- Items that do not fall within the scope of the Public Announcement section.
- Time limit of 3 minutes, 15 minutes total for this category (to be extended or continued to end of Planning Commission business, at the discretion of the Chair). Limit to one appearance during this section.

If you wish to provide the Planning Commission with copies of any handout materials you are presenting, please provide sufficient copies for each Planning Commission member, the Recording Secretary and other staff present.