

## 2011 Council Study Issue

## DPW 09-02 Update/Review Corner Vision Triangle Municipal Code Ordinance

**Lead Department** Public Works

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

### 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, according to current City policy. 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

**Board or Commission** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

### 4. Staff effort required to conduct study Major

### 5. Multiple Year Project? No Planned Completion Year 2011

### 6. Expected participation involved in the study issue process?

<b>Does Council need to approve a work plan?</b>	No
<b>Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission?</b>	Yes
<b>If so, which?</b>	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Planning Commission
<b>Is a Council Study Session anticipated?</b>	No

### 7. Briefly explain cost of study, including consultant hours, impacted budget program, required budget modifications, etc. and amounts if known.

The study would be conducted by Public Works and Community Development staff. Costs would be minor and would be absorbed by operating budgets.

**8. Briefly explain potential fiscal impact of implementing study results (consider capital and operating costs, as well as potential revenue).**

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

**9. Staff Recommendation**

**Staff Recommendation** Against Study

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

Staff believes the current policy is adequate. The current process allows for property owners to request a variance from vision triangle requirements, which provides some flexibility. Also, staff can condition projects during the design review process to provide differing sight distance, based upon unique site characteristics.

Reviewed by

Mario A. Rose 11/1/2010  
Department Director Date

Approved by

[Signature] 11-2-10  
City Manager Date