

Proposed 2010 Council Study Issue

DPW09-02 Update/Review Corner Vision Triangle Municipal Code Ordinance

Lead Department Public Works

Element or Sub-element Land Use and Transportation Element

New or Previous Previous

Status Pending **History** 1 year ago Deferred 2 years ago Below the line

1. What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?

At an intersection, the corner vision triangle is formed by measuring 40 feet from the property line of each of the intersecting streets. The driveway vision triangle is created by measuring 10 feet along the outer edge of a driveway and 10 feet along the back edge of a public sidewalk. Fences, hedges or any other obstructions more than 3 feet in height are prohibited in the vision triangles.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission would like to review the relevance and adequacy of the corner vision triangle in the Sunnyvale Municipal Code (SMC). The Commission believes that visibility at street intersections and driveways is extremely important for the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists, and that the current ordinance may not adequately ensure that adequate visibility is provided. For example, the current vision triangle ordinance does not take into consideration street curvature, intersection angle and type of control, and consistency with the Highway Design Manual. This issue was initiated because of a vision problem at the driveway that was constructed on Mathilda Avenue for the Cherry Orchard retail center.

Sunnyvale's policy does not presently allow for a sliding scale or reduction in the required vision triangles. Some cities, but not Sunnyvale, allow sight triangle encroachments based on the fence design. An open decorative type fence design would allow for the greatest visibility, and two prime examples of this style are wrought iron and open-type wood fences. In 2008, City Council decided to broaden the BPAC initiated study issue to examine the benefits of modifying the SMC by taking into account the openness or transparency of the fence in conjunction with the height of the fence.

2. How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?

C3 – Attain a transportation system that is effective, safe, pleasant, and convenient.

3. Origin of issue

Council Member(s)

General Plan

City Staff

Public

Board or Commission Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

4. Multiple Year Project? No Planned Completion Year 2010

5. Expected participation involved in the study issue process?

Does Council need to approve a work plan? No

Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission? Yes

If so, which?
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Planning

Commission

Is a Council Study Session anticipated? No

What is the public participation process?

Public hearings that take place during the BPAC and Planning Commission meetings.

6. Cost of Study

Operating Budget Program covering costs

115 Transportation Operations

Project Budget covering costs

Budget modification \$ amount needed for study

Explain below what the additional funding will be used for

7. Potential fiscal impact to implement recommendations in the Study approved by Council

Capital expenditure range None

Operating expenditure range None

New revenues/savings range None

Explain impact briefly

There would be no fiscal impact related to the recommendations of the Study.

8. Staff Recommendation

Staff Recommendation None

If 'For Study' or 'Against Study', explain

9. Estimated consultant hours for completion of the study issue

Managers

Role	Manager	Hours	
Lead	Witthaus, Jack	Mgr CY1: 50	Mgr CY2: 0
		Staff CY1: 100	Staff CY2: 0
Support	Kahn, David	Mgr CY1: 10	Mgr CY2: 0
		Staff CY1: 20	Staff CY2: 0
Support	Ryan, Trudi	Mgr CY1: 30	Mgr CY2: 0
		Staff CY1: 60	Staff CY2: 0

Total Hours CY1: 270

Total Hours CY2: 0

Note: If staff's recommendation is 'For Study' or 'Against Study', the Director should note the relative importance of this Study to other major projects that the Department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.

Reviewed by

Marvin A. Rose

Department Director

10/1/09

Date

Approved by

[Signature]

City Manager

10/04/09

Date

Addendum

A. Board / Commission Recommendation

Issue Created Too Late for B/C Ranking

Board or Commission	Rank	Rank 1 year ago	Rank 2 years ago
Arts Commission			
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee	5	Defer	5
Board of Building Code Appeals			
Board of Library Trustees			
Child Care Advisory Board			
Heritage Preservation Commission			
Housing and Human Services Commission			
Parks and Recreation Commission			
Personnel Board			
Planning Commission			

Board or Commission ranking comments

B. Council

Council Rank (no rank yet)
Start Date (blank)
Work Plan Review Date (blank)
Study Session Date (blank)
RTC Date (blank)
Actual Complete Date (blank)
Staff Contact