7:00 PM - Study Session – West Conference Room

1. File #: 2010-7148  
Location: City-wide  
Subject: Retooling the Zoning Code: Proposed Permits and Procedures  
Staff Contacts: Diana O’Dell, (408) 730-7257, dodell@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us  
Rosemarie Zulueta, (408) 730-7437, rzulueta@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us  
Notes: (45 minutes)

2. Public Comment on Study Session Agenda Items  
(5 minutes)

3. Comments from the Chair  
(5 minutes)

8:00 PM - Public Hearing – Council Chambers

The Planning Commission met in regular session with Chair Hendricks presiding.

CALL TO ORDER/SALUTE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Glenn Hendricks; Vice Chair Gustav Larsson; Commissioner Bo Chang; Commissioner Maria Dohadwala; Commissioner Arcadi Kolchak; Commissioner Brandon Sulser; and Commissioner Nick Travis.

Staff Present: Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer; Kathryn Berry, Senior Assistant City Attorney; Ryan Kuchenig, Associate Planner; and Recording Secretary, Debbie Gorman.

SCHEDULED PRESENTATION - None

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


   ACTIONS: Vice Chair Larsson moved to approve the consent calendar. Comm. Chang seconded. Motion carried 7-0.
PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

2. File #: 2012-7124
Location: 811 Mulberry Lane (APN: 198-28-019)
Proposed Project: Design Review for a 1,200 square foot second-story addition to an existing 2,447 square foot single-family home resulting in (gross floor area) square feet and approximately 55% floor area ratio in an R-0 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District.

Environmental Review: Categorically Exempt Class 1
Staff Contact: Shaunn Mendrin, 408-730-7429, smendrin@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, presented the staff report.

Chair Hendricks opened the public hearing.

Eugene Sakai, architect representing the applicant, said that the proposed project meets the Shinmoto’s desire for a modern design home and accommodates their growing family. He said the Shinmoto’s received a letter of support from most of the neighbors. Mr. Sakai discussed a condition in Attachment B regarding the height of the courtyard wall and provided a handout to the commissioners showing what the wall would look like at different heights. He requested that the height be allowed as proposed, as it is an important component of the design. Mr. Sakai introduced the homeowner Roger Shinmoto who said his family has lived in this neighborhood for a long time and when their family needed more space they considered moving. He said they decided to remodel for a second time instead. He said he has always been a fan of contemporary architecture and encouraged the Commission to approve the design including the allowance of the courtyard wall to remain at 8 feet, as proposed.

Comm. Kolchak discussed the letter of support from the neighbors with Mr. Shinmoto, confirming that the residents of the three addresses across the street are not included on the letter. Mr. Shinmoto commented about each residence. He said one neighbor was concerned about the modern design, however he said he would not oppose the project nor sign the support letter.

Mr. Shinmoto said that his family wants to stay in this neighborhood. He said the modern design of the home has always been a dream.

Chair Hendricks closed the public hearing.

Comm. Chang discussed with staff height of the courtyard fence.

Vice Chair Larsson confirmed with staff that the courtyard fence is 8 feet above grade.

Comm. Travis moved for Alternative 2, to approve the Design Review with modified conditions: to allow the 8-foot high courtyard fence remain as proposed. Comm. Sulser seconded the motion.
Comm. Travis said he understands staff’s concern about the 8-foot fence and how it does not fit with the prevailing architecture of the neighborhood. He said after looking at different height options, he thought the best fit would be the 8-foot fence with the open gate. He said he likes the modern architecture and to lower the wall would take away from the architecture.

Comm. Sulser said he likes the modern architecture and the changes made since the study session. He said the large 8-foot gate and walled courtyard could be seem less inviting to some people however the gate design is now more open which helps mitigate this concern.

Ms. Ryan suggested a clarification of the motion saying the deletion of condition PS-1.a in place of the modification made by Comm. Travis results in the same outcome, allowing the courtyard fence as proposed. This clarification of the motion was acceptable to the maker and seconder of the motion.

Vice Chair Larsson said he would be supporting the motion. He said he was reluctant to support the higher fence, however the diagrams provided by the applicant helped show the higher fence was appropriate. He discussed improvements made to the plans since the study session including the lowered fence and gate, the addition of windows on the garage and the lowered plate height on the garage.

Comm. Kolchak said he would be supporting the motion and echoed most of Vice Chair Larsson’s comments. He said the walkway has been split up which matches the cultural design of the building.

Comm. Dohadwala said she would be supporting the motion and commended the applicant and architect for doing a good job. She said that she sees the fence as an extension of the home and is not concerned about the fence height.

Chair Hendricks said he would be supporting the motion as he can make the findings. He said he can support the fence height as proposed as the fence provides a level of privacy and is in the buildable space area.

**ACTION:** Comm. Travis made a motion on 2012-7124 to approve the Design Review with modified conditions: to remove condition PS-1.a regarding the height of the front courtyard fence approving the fence as proposed. Comm. Sulser seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

**APPEAL OPTIONS:** This action is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than May 29, 2012.
3. File #: 2012-7170
Location: 660-666 W El Camino Real (APN: 201-22-011 & 202-23-029)
Proposed Project: • Special Development Permit to allow a mixed use project consisting of a 145-room hotel and 103 residential townhouse units.
• Vesting Tentative Map to create 103 lots and 3 common lots.
Applicant/Owner: SummerHill Homes / Dorothy Miller Family LP
Environmental Review: Mitigated Negative Declaration
Staff Contact: Ryan Kuchenig, 408-730-7431, rkuchenig@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us

Ryan Kuchenig, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Comm. Travis referred to the data table on page 4 of the report and staff clarified the total parking spaces required vs. proposed.

Comm. Chang discussed with staff the phasing of the development. Comm. Chang asked staff about parking, expressing concern that hotel parking might overflow into the residential. Mr. Kuchenig addressed the question. Comm. Chang asked about the width of the walkway between the hotel and El Camino Real (ECR). Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, said staff tries to apply VTA (Valley Transportation Authority) sidewalk guidelines.

Vice Chair Larsson discussed with staff overflow parking from the hotel to the residential area. He asked about access to ECR and between neighboring sites. Ms. Ryan said the access between sites would probably occur as the neighboring sites redevelop. Vice Chair Larsson commented that the hotel use is ideal for highway commercial zoned areas even though it may be preferable to think of ECR as a boulevard instead of a highway.

Chair Hendricks asked about the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) being considered for ECR and whether this project needs to do anything to accommodate BRT. Ms. Ryan no decision has been made about the BRT as of this meeting. Chair Hendricks asked about the hotel parking survey being different from the city standard with Ms. Ryan saying staff is in agreement with the parking the applicant has proposed. Chair Hendricks said there is not a good parking overflow alternative with Ms. Ryan saying the hotel would not want to have inadequate parking and would have to find an alternative. Ms. Ryan said the city standard for hotel parking is probably 30 to 50 years old and based on motels vs. the more recent business hotels.

Chair Hendricks opened the public hearing.

Katia Kamangar, with SummerHill Homes representing the applicant, discussed the project. She introduced Kevin Ebrahimi, with SummerHill Homes. Mr. Ebrahimi discussed the project and that they have tried to design the third-story residential portion of the project away from the existing residential and have included a buffer of evergreen trees. He showed different views of the site plans discussing the connectivity of the project and said the proposal is consistent with Grand Boulevard Initiative and the Precise Plan for El Camino Real. He discussed the
pedestrian pathway, parking stalls, useable open space, the varying widths of the pathways, the color scheme, the early California style of the architecture, and that the trash enclosures would be managed through the Homeowners Association. **Greg LeBon**, with T2 Development, the hotel developer, discussed relocating the trash enclosures, and that the hotel, Courtyard By Marriott, would operate the café which would be open to public. **Jim Allred**, with TAAG Architects, discussed staff’s recommendation of glass on the east elevation, colors for the project, and the relocation of trash enclosures.

**Vice Chair Larsson** discussed with Mr. Ebrahimi the preferred locations for future pedestrian access, access points going through to Allegheny Drive, and cross-connection points and sidewalks related to future neighboring developments.

**Comm. Kolchak** discussed with Mr. Ebrahimi the pedestrian access being near a trash enclosure, sidewalks, and overflow parking and pedestrian access into the residential area.

**Comm. Sulser** disclosed that he met with the applicant. Comm. Sulser discussed the hotel and the café with the applicant saying he wants to make sure the café is included. Mr. LeBon explained that the café is not optional as Courtyard By Marriott requires that there be a café component.

**Vice Chair Larsson** discussed with Mr. LeBon the café entrance. Vice Chair Larsson asked about the parking study for hotel, with Mr. LeBon describing peak times and a typical week for parking. Mr. LeBon said this particular hotel does not have a lot of meeting space, so most of guests would be business travelers.

**Chair Hendricks** discussed with Mr. Ebrahimi soil testing and the work being done by the environmental consultants. Chair Hendricks asked staff about the Allegheny Dr. access and what kind of public outreach was done for this project. Mr. Kuchenig said there have been two outreach meetings. Chair Hendricks discussed with Mr. Ebrahimi the main access to ECR. Chair Hendricks discussed with Mr. Ebrahimi the café entrance, landscaping and a water feature further into the project. Chair Hendricks discussed with Mr. Ebrahimi pedestrian access on private property with public access and no gates. Ms. Ryan said that it was not intended for this area to be a connection for the general public and that the applicant could work with staff on the walkway and whether it should be gated. **Kathryn Berry**, Senior Assistant City Attorney, added that the City would be seeing more easements on ECR for access across private property. Ms. Berry said these are declarations of private access, and they are not public, as the City will not maintain these areas. She said these would be private easements, which is a newer concept, but the areas are always private.

**Comm. Dohadwala** asked staff further about public and private access portions of the project. Ms. Berry said pedestrians could go between the properties without having to go out to ECR. Comm. Dohadwala discussed with staff access points and pedestrian access portions of the project. Staff said there would be details to work out with adjacent property owners. Comm. Dohadwala asked about the residential areas behind the project with Ms. Ryan saying that staff did not think the public would be able to walk through to ECR.
Glenis Koehne, a Sunnyvale resident and neighbor, expressed her concern about the hours of construction, noise on Saturdays and air pollution. She said she would like the Commission to consider restrictions on construction hours, and said that ideally she would prefer no construction on Saturdays and construction hours on weekdays to be from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Martin Landzaat, a Sunnyvale resident, asked about park dedication, in lieu fees, the Parks of the Future study related to this project and asked why the City is not taking the land. Ms. Ryan discussed the Parks of the Future study and said generally this site is too small to require park land dedication. Chair Hendricks commented that that this is private property, and Ms. Ryan further discussed park related policy. Mr. Landzaat commented if City does not want a park at this site that it would seem advantageous for the City to take the land, as there is not much land to buy.

Vice Chair Larsson discussed with staff an acre of land that was recently designated for a park from a residential project that was joined with a smaller piece of land.

Mr. Ebrahimi addressed questions and said they are very excited and anticipate breaking ground this year and building next year. He said in respect to parks that this site is close to a large park. Mr. Ebrahimi addressed the hours of construction concern and said if they work six days a week it will reduce the length of construction.

Vice Chair Larsson discussed with Mr. Ebrahimi that the project would take about 1 1/2 years beginning in 2013 and be built in different phases.

Chair Hendricks discussed with Mr. Ebrahimi, which part of the project, would probably be built first. Mr. Ebrahimi said if there are problems regarding construction that the neighbors could contact either the director of site work or the superintendent for the site.

Chair Hendricks closed the public hearing.

Ms. Ryan discussed the amount of park area that would be needed for 103 residential units.

Vice Chair Larsson moved for Alternative 1, to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Special Development Permit and Tentative Map with attached conditions. Comm. Chang seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Larsson said he was able to make the findings. He said the shape of the property requires the residential portion be on the back of the site. He said he is glad that this now meets the 20% commercial requirement and that the hotel site is close to the two-acre goal. He said the pedestrian access is good for the residents, and discussed other improved features. He discussed the parking study and said the hotel provides an attractive frontage and that this is a creative solution to a challenging piece of property.

Comm. Chang said he was able make the findings, commended everyone for working together and creating a project that is what was envisioned in the Precise Plan. He said the location is a showcase and the challenges have been met. He said he is happy to see a project that meets
all the requirements and the Grand Boulevard Initiative for rapid transit. He said he likes the relocated trash enclosures, the driveway, the green elements, the traffic flow, and both pedestrian and auto traffic. He discussed a couple of concerns regarding parking and trash enclosures, however he said he is looking forward to seeing this project completed.

**Comm. Sulser** said he would be supporting the motion. He said he worked on the Planning Commission when the Precise Plan for El Camino Real was adopted however, this is a first real attempt for this node. He said he struggled whether this is the right project for the location. He said this is a great site and he can make the findings. He said he thinks this project is a lot better than the previous proposal for the site. He said he likes the commercial component a lot better and feels his concerns have been met.

**Comm. Dohadwala** said she would be supporting this motion and she is glad this meets the Precise Plan requirements. She said she finds the mixed use creative. She said she likes having the residential homes closer to public access, and does not like the noise pollution associated with traffic, which is why she likes the residential in the back of the site. She said likes the way the pedestrian and auto access worked out and commended everyone for finding solutions for this project.

**Comm. Kolchak** said he was able to make findings and likes that the developers worked with the layout of the land. He said this project is better than the previous proposal, and meets the requirements. He said the addition of the hotel and cafe would activate the community property, and he is looking forward to seeing the project develop a partnership with the community.

**Chair Hendricks** thanked the members of the public who spoke. He commented that there were two study sessions with the Planning Commission prior to this version of this complex project. He said this is not an ideal project, yet improvements were made. He said he would love to see a wider walkway, and commented that the residential driveway is long. He said he is not comfortable with the possible overflow parking, however the hotel operator feels the parking is workable. He said he is a little concerned about the Allegheny access. He said overall this is better than what is there.

**Vice Chair Larsson** commented as a side note, that he participated in Leadership Sunnyvale a couple of years ago, was given this property as a quick planning exercise and said his group did not do well, so it is interesting to see what the applicant proposed.

**ACTION:** Vice Chair Larsson made a motion on 2012-7170 to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Special Development Permit and Tentative Map with attached conditions. Comm. Chang seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

**APPEAL OPTIONS:** This action is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than May 29, 2012.
4. File #: 2012-7070
   Location: 505 N. Mathilda Ave. (APN: 165-42-005, 009)
   Subject:
   - Design Review to allow a 612,072 square foot R&D campus consisting of two new six-story office buildings, one four-story building and an existing three story office building with a new five-level parking structure resulting in a 99.4% FAR.
   - Rezone multiple properties from MS-55% and MS-70% to MS-100% FAR and to allow an increase in the maximum height to 100 feet in MS-100% FAR areas.

   Applicant/Owner: JP Napoli Companies / Sequoia M & M LLC
   Environmental Review: Mitigated Negative Declaration
   Staff Contact: Ryan Kuchenig, (408) 730-7431, rkuchenig@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us

Ryan Kuchenig, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. He said this item is scheduled for City Council consideration on June 19, 2012.

Comm. Sulser disclosed that he met with the applicant. Comm. Sulser discussed with staff the Peery Park Study Issue that was approved by Council and has not yet been scheduled. Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, discussed the reasons for the delay. Comm. Sulser asked if Council or staff could provide more direction on the desired densities for the Peery Park area. Ms. Ryan said any policy decision or direction would require environmental review, which the City does not have the funding for at this time. Comm. Sulser and staff further discussed environmental review for the Peery Park area and that each project that comes forward has its own environmental review.

Vice Chair Larsson asked staff further about the delayed Peery Park Study Issue confirming with staff that future projects in the Peery Park area could tier off the environmental review completed as part of the Study Issue. Vice Chair Larsson referred to the data table on page 3 of the report and discussed with the staff the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and the Building Height. Vice Chair Larsson confirmed with staff that it would be appropriate to recommend that the additional square footage allowed by the new zoning could be deducted from the citywide development pool. Staff further explained the development pool. Vice Chair Larsson discussed with staff the history of the practice and policies of the Housing Mitigation Fee and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.

Chair Hendricks requested staff explain 100% FAR for the public. Chair Hendricks said he likes that there is a bus stop requirement in the conditions, discussed the bus stop with staff and that it would have to meet VTA (Valley Transportation Authority) standards. Chair Hendricks discussed the width of the sidewalks in various locations with staff.

Comm. Dohadwala further discussed the FAR with staff.

Vice Chair Larsson asked staff about the sidewalk and planter strip on Mathilda Avenue. Vice Chair Larsson discussed with staff the traffic flow and circulation within and around the project.
Chair Hendricks opened the public hearing.

John DiNapoli, applicant with JP DiNapoli Companies, Inc., discussed the project and introduced other members of the team to answer questions. Pete Larko, also with JP DiNapoli Companies, Inc., said he is pleased to bring this project forward. He said this project would bring Class A, corporate headquarter quality type space to the Peery Park area. He said they have been a property owner and doing business in this area for a long time and that now is the time to move forward with a gateway project for this corner site.

Craig Almeleh, with ARC TEC, further discussed the project. He said they wanted to create something that coming off Highway 101 makes a statement. He explained changes made to the project since the study session and discussed the garage, buildings, ease of traffic circulation, pedestrian access, art concepts, landscaping, and amenities areas. He said they hope this project will bring an estimated 2,000 employees to the city and they are very excited about the project.

Vice Chair Larsson asked Mr. Almeleh further about art concepts, possible locations for art and sidewalks. Vice Chair Larsson asked about tree species and tree canopies along Maude. Tenaya Fihe, landscape architect with Guzzardo Partnership, said they would work with staff. She discussed the different trees recommended in the conditions including the use of the Chinese Pistache, Heritage Birch, Magnolia or Southern Live Oak describing the canopies and leaves of the various tree types. Vice Chair Larsson asked about traffic and consultant Gary Black, with Hexagon Transportation discussed the traffic study completed for the project. Vice Chair Larsson asked about any concerns of traffic getting to Highway 101 and expected traffic flow. Mr. Black explained traffic flow and said there is enough capacity to support the project as the project is not big enough to have a significant impact. Vice Chair Larsson further discussed with Mr. Black traffic at peak times and that this project does not reach a tipping point for Mathilda Avenue; this project’s traffic in relation to the larger region; and that more traffic is allowed at significant intersections. Vice Chair Larsson discussed with Mr. Black other traffic related questions regarding the TDM, bus schedules, and possible coordination with the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) if it occurs.

Chair Hendricks discussed with Mr. Almeleh the height of the buildings and how they decided to propose six stories. Mr. Almeleh said that the building codes change once six stories are exceeded and discussed other factors that lead to project decisions, including floor plates, square footage, the economy, and architectural decisions. Chair Hendricks discussed the Moffett Field area and that these height limits are okay. Chair Hendricks asked about the LED (light-emitting diode) lights on the building previously discussed. The applicant said at this point it might be easier to not have the LED lighting. Ms. Ryan said there were some concerns raised about the LED lighting. Chair Hendricks discussed with the Mr. Almeleh the trash enclosures. Chair Hendricks discussed traffic and TDM with Mr. Black explaining the TDM and different types of trip generation.
Mr. Larko discussed parking and driveways on Mathilda. He said they want to see bus headways more frequent and would like to work with the City to advocate for the bus system to be improved for the city, site and region and will continue to work with staff to improve transit.

Chair Hendricks closed the public hearing.

Comm. Dohadwala discussed with staff about the area between Building C and D, said she thinks it is a very attractive space, and envisioned it as pedestrian.

Comm. Travis moved for Alternative 1, to recommend to City Council to: adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration; introduce an Ordinance to amend the zoning code for 505-599 N. Mathilda Ave., 683 W. Maude Ave., and 510 N. Pastoria Ave. from M-S-55% and M-S-70% to M-S-100%; Modify S.M.C. 19.32.020 related to height for the M-S-100% FAR zoning district to a maximum 100 feet; approve the Design Review with the attached conditions; Direct staff to return with zoning code modifications for the Futures intensification sites developed at more than 70% FAR. The amendments should address requirements for: i. Housing Mitigation Fees. ii. Transportation Demand Management Requirements; and Direct staff to return with Green Building program modifications for the Futures intensification sites developed at more than 70% FAR. Vice Chair Larsson seconded the motion. Vice Chair Larsson offered a Friendly Amendment to recommend the deduction of the additional square footage allowed by the new zoning from the citywide development pool. The Friendly Amendment was acceptable to the maker of the motion. Vice Chair Larsson offered a Friendly Amendment that the lighting on the upper floors of the buildings be on timers or turned out at night when the buildings are not in use, so the lighting is not impacting the residents of the nearby residential properties. The Friendly Amendment was acceptable to the maker of the motion.

Comm. Travis said he is looking forward to this project going into Peery Park, and that this is one of the first projects for which the green building incentives will be used. He said this is an attractive project in the right location and he thinks it will attract a new campus tenant to Sunnyvale.

Vice Chair Larsson said he is excited about the project and that it is on a major corridor. He said he hopes Sunnyvale can get more public transit in this area. He said the dramatic building makes quite a statement and he would like to see this kind of development continue in this area. He said this is a great, complex project with the many policy updates involved.

Comm. Chang said he could make the findings and will support the motion. He said this is a showcase project and the upgrade to Class A office space is good. He said this would bring FAR changes and in the future this project would be the standard for this area. He said he is a little concerned about the left turns on to Pastoria and Maude, however the traffic analysis indicates there should be no problems.

Comm. Susler said he would be supporting the motion. He spoke about the zoning, and the current piecemeal requests in this area. He said he thinks this is an appropriate place for this project and that this part of Mathilda Avenue is appropriate for higher intensities. He said he
likes the project commending the applicant on the site plan; that he likes that the buildings are interfaced with the streets; and likes that the parking structure is hidden away in the center of the site.

Comm. Dohadwala said she would be supporting the motion as the plan is well done. She said she likes the frontage on Mathilda which contributes to the driving and pedestrian experience. She said she likes the sidewalks, the canopies of the trees, and that the parking structure is hidden away. She said dealing with the existing building was a challenge on this property and said she would have liked to seen a pedestrian plaza between Buildings B and C.

Comm. Kolchak said he would be supporting the motion. He said this brings an interesting dynamic to the area and is a beautiful design. He said the project is setting a great standard and will bring jobs to the City and the addition of the sidewalk is good. He said he is disappointed at the loss of trees, however the replacement trees will be nice for the area.

Vice Chair Larsson added that a walkable campus with attractive outdoor space is important for attracting and retaining good companies and employees and this should help Sunnyvale compete and provide a boost to the local economy.

Chair Hendricks addressed the policy concerns. He said what is on Mathilda will be dramatic and he thinks this is a good way to go. He said he agrees with Comm. Sulser in terms of the location and that this is a good location for what the City is trying to do. He said a good corporate citizen would provide a shuttle bus and that this is a nice project.

ACTION: Comm. Travis made a motion on 2012-7070 to recommend to City Council to: adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration; introduce an Ordinance to amend the zoning code for 505-599 N. Mathilda Ave., 683 W. Maude Ave., and 510 N. Pastoria Ave. from M-S-55% and M-S-70% to M-S-100%; Modify S.M.C. 19.32.020 related to height for the M-S-100% FAR zoning district to a maximum 100 feet; approve the Design Review with the attached conditions; Direct staff to return with zoning code modifications for the Futures intensification sites developed at more than 70% FAR. The amendments should address requirements for: i. Housing Mitigation Fees. ii. Transportation Demand Management Requirements; Direct staff to return with Green Building program modifications for the Futures intensification sites developed at more than 70% FAR; and two modifications that the additional square footage allowed by the new zoning be deducted from the citywide development pool, and that the lighting on the upper floors of the buildings be on timers or turned out at night when the buildings are not in use, so the lighting is not impacting the residents of the nearby residential properties. Vice Chair Larsson seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This recommendation will be forwarded to City Council and is scheduled for consideration at the June 19, 2012 Council meeting.
5. **Subject:** Planning Commission Member Representation on the Lawrence Station Area Plan Citizen Advisory Group

**Staff Contact:** Surachita Bose, (408) 730-7443, sbose@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, presented the staff report.

Chair Hendricks asked the Commissioners who would be interested in serving on the Citizen Advisory Group for the Lawrence Station Area Plan. Vice Chair Larsson and Comm. Sulser both said they would like to serve on the Group.

Comm. Travis nominated Vice Chair Larsson and Comm. Sulser to serve as the Planning Commission representatives on the Lawrence Station Citizen Advisory Group.

Comm. Chang commented that he thinks Comm. Sulser will do a great job, as he knows this project area.

Comm. Dohadwala commented that Comm. Sulser proposed this project as a Study Issue and should be a good representative.

**ACTION:** Comm. Travis made a motion nominating Vice Chair Larsson and Comm. Sulser to serve on the Citizen Advisory Group for Phase 2 of the Lawrence Station Area Planning. Comm. Chang seconded. Motion carried 7-0.
6. **Subject:** Review Planning Program Budget and Fees

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer presented the staff report. She said the draft Fees are not available yet and that she would provide the Fee information to the Commission for comment when it is available.

Comm. Hendricks asked what staff is looking for from the Commission. Ms. Ryan said that comments could be provided to the Council or a motion could be made.

Vice Chair Larsson asked what the Planning Division does if a lot more work than expected comes in, commenting that it is difficult to predict staff hours needed. Ms. Ryan said staff would look at other portions of the Planning Division budget and see if there were hours to borrow which would have to be done with City Manager concurrence. Ms. Ryan indicated if the workload becomes too great staff could ask for an adjustment to the budget. Vice Chair Larsson asked how to get the Peery Park study funded. Ms. Ryan said staff has applied for grant funding and will continue to look for grant funding.

Chair Hendricks discussed with staff the 1.2% increase to staff costs. Chair Hendricks said from his perspective that however the work was completed this year that the City Manager feels that the Planning staff can do that again with the small increase. Ms. Ryan said Planning staff expects a higher workload for the upcoming fiscal year. Chair Hendricks said the staff must be demonstrating some operational efficiency.

Comm. Chang said he would recommend forwarding the comments on to Council, which was acceptable to the Commission.

Staff said the comments would be provided to the City Council.
7. Standing Item: Potential Study Issues

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, said on April 23, 2012 the Planning Commission requested staff provide a brief potential study issue paper regarding single-family home parking requirements.

Comm. Kolchak said the reason he suggested this study issue was agenda items have come before the Planning Commission regarding homes with more narrow lot dimensions and could not incorporate the addition of a garage and meet the standard requirements. He said many of the older homes in Sunnyvale have narrow dimension lots.

Comm. Dohadwala said she thinks this study issue is important as the Planning Commission tries to make decisions regarding garage conversion and parking requirements. She said she does not like the discretionary part of the garage conversion decisions.

Vice Chair Larsson moved to sponsor a study issue regarding single-family home parking requirements. Comm. Kolchak seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Larsson said when we have had these parking variations come before the Planning Commission we have had split votes and he thinks there needs to be a consistent set of policies rather than the current case-by-case basis.

ACTION: Vice Chair Larsson made a motion to sponsor a study issue regarding single-family home parking requirements to be considered as a 2013 potential study issue. Comm. Kolchak seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

- COMMISSIONERS ORAL COMMENTS
- STAFF ORAL COMMENTS

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, announced that the Planning Commission is scheduled for a Joint Study Session with the City Council on May 15, 2012 at 5:45 p.m. in the West Conference room for a “Discussion of the Draft East Sunnyvale Precise Plan and Proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezoning.”

City Council Meeting Report

Ms. Ryan discussed Planning related items considered by City Council at their April 24, 2012 and May 8, 2012 Council Meetings. She discussed Planning related items to be considered at the May 15, 2012 meeting.

Other Staff Oral Report

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

ADJOURNMENT
With no further business, the Commission meeting adjourned 11:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

__________________________
Trudi Ryan
Planning Officer