



**APPROVED MINUTES
SUNNYVALE PLANNING COMMISSION
April 22, 2013
456 W. Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA 94086**

**Special Start Time
6:45 PM - Study Session - West Conference Room**

- 1. File #: 2013-7461**
Location: 538-560 S. Mathilda Ave.
(APNs: 209-29-058, 209-29-059)
Proposed Project: Special Development Permit to allow a new mixed use project consisting of 15 residential units and 5,531 square feet of ground floor office space, and
Vesting Tentative Map to create 15 residential condominiums and one common lot.
Applicant/Owner: SiliconSage Builders, LLC
Environmental Review: Mitigated Negative Declaration
Staff Contact: Noren Caliva-Lepe, (408) 730-7637
ncaliva-lepe@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Notes: (25 minutes)

- 2. File #: 2010-7148**
Location: City-wide
Proposed Project: Retooling the Zoning Code
Staff Contact: Diana O'Dell, (408) 730-7257
dodell@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Rosemarie Zulueta, (408) 730-7437
rzulueta@sunnyvale.ca.gov
(35 minutes)

- 3. Public Comment on Study Session Agenda Items** (5 minutes)

- 4. Comments from the Chair** (5 minutes)

- 5. Adjourn Study Session**

8:00 PM - Public Hearing – Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

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.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Gustav Larsson; Commissioner Bo Chang; Commissioner Glenn Hendricks; Commissioner Arcadi Kolchak; Commissioner Russell W. Melton; and Commissioner Ken Olevson.

Members Absent: Vice Chair Maria Dohadwala (excused).

Staff Present: Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer; Kathryn Berry, Senior Assistant City Attorney; Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner; and Deborah Gorman, Recording Secretary.

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

1.A. Approval of Minutes: April 8, 2013

ACTION: Comm. Hendricks moved to approve the Consent Calendar with modification: to add Comm. Melton's name to comments on page five. Comm. Kolchak seconded. Motion carried, 6-0, with Vice Chair Dohadwala absent.

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS –

2. **File #:** 2012-7986
Location: 726 San Miguel Ave. (APN: 205-14-030)
Proposed Project: Design Review to allow a new two-story single-family home resulting in 2,967 square feet and 56.6% Floor Area Ratio.
Environmental Review: Categorically Exempt Class 3
Staff Contact: Mariya Hodge, (408) 730-7659, mhodge@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, presented the staff report.

Comm. Melton referred to page 3 of the report and discussed with staff solar access and why the applicant had not requested a Variance for this issue. Staff provided possible reasons and said the applicant may want to address this question.

Comm. Hendricks confirmed with staff that the applicant needs to address the solar access and the Commission has no flexibility on this issue.

Chair Larsson opened the public hearing.

Jasbir Tatla and his wife, applicants, said they were not aware of a Variance option; however he said they are very close to meeting the solar access, square footage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requirements. He said they have taken privacy issues for the neighbors into consideration. He commented that no one in the neighborhood has installed solar at this time. He said there are houses in the neighborhood that have higher FAR and are two-story and there are three-story condominiums nearby. He said they originally wanted to have 10-foot ceilings; however they would go with 9 feet as suggested. Mrs. Tatla discussed that they would like more space and have tried to meet the requirements asking the Commissioners to support the proposed application.

Comm. Melton thanked the applicants for their hard work and confirmed with Mr. Tatla that he has lived in the neighborhood for a long time. Comm. Melton discussed with Mr. Tatla the possibility of reducing the square footage by 600 feet with Mr. Tatla saying that this would be a significant reduction from what is proposed and they might not move forward with the project if that were required.

Comm. Hendricks confirmed with staff that the garage square footage is included in the total square footage of the house. Ms. Ryan said staff would like to see modification to the proportion of the second floor to the first floor of the house closer to the second to first ratio of not more than 35%. Comm. Hendricks said he is having an issue making the finding 2.2.2 regarding the scale and bulk of the home in the adjacent neighborhood. He said he is also concerned about the shading. Mr. Tatla commented about possible modifications. Comm. Hendricks asked staff procedural questions about if the Commission were to approve, deny or defer the project. Ms. Ryan advised several options including continuing the item to allow the applicant time to make changes or denying the project and the applicant could appeal the decision to City Council. Designer **Jeannie Aiassa** discussed the design and said they tried to take the neighbors into consideration by addressing privacy concerns. Comm. Hendricks, staff, the designer and the applicant discussed the shadow concerns, and possibly lowering the first floor plate height to 8 feet. Mr. Tatla commented that his neighbors are fine with the proposal.

Comm. Melton asked the Tatlas if they had a preference of two options: the Planning Commission defer the proposed project and the applicants continue to work with staff to come up with solutions to address the issues; or the Commission denies the project and the applicant

could appeal the decision to City Council. Ms. Aiassa said they have been working with staff on the design, and the applicant said the neighbors have no opposition with neither stating a preference.

Chair Larsson discussed with staff that a separate application and fees would need to be submitted to consider a Variance for the shading. Ms. Ryan added that it is not easy to obtain a Variance and that there are State regulations that require opportunities be provided for solar access. Chair Larsson confirmed with staff that if the Commission denied the project and the applicant appealed the decision that shading changes would still need to be made.

Comm. Hendricks said he likes the idea of what is being proposed except he cannot find a way to say yes. He said the decision has to be made for the land and not based on the current neighbors. He said he understands compromises have been made and the proposal seems close to meeting requirements. Comm. Hendricks said the major problem is the solar component. Mr. Tatla said they could continue to work with staff. Ms. Ryan said the Commission could articulate the changes they would like to see, staff can work with applicant, and the Commission could require the item be considered again by Planning Commission or not.

Comm. Olevson said he thinks this would be a great addition to the neighborhood. He said he has concerns about the shading and there are too many deviations from the existing zoning regulations. He said he would prefer the applicant continue to work with staff, though he does not think the application needs to be considered by the Commission again if staff is satisfied with the modifications.

Ms. Aiassa said solar access does not have to go on the roof top. Mr. Tatla said he that they would work with staff on meeting the solar requirements.

Chair Larsson referred to page 2 of Attachment B, condition PS-1.a requiring that the FAR be no more than 52% and asked the applicant what they would do to the project. Mr. Tatla said that they would continue to work with staff to meet the requirements.

Comm. Kolchak asked the applicant about decreasing the plate height. Ms. Aiassa said the plate height for the bottom floor is 9 feet. Mr. Tatla said they would continue to work with staff to meet the solar requirements.

Chair Larsson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Hendricks moved for Alternative 4 to continue this item to allow time for the applicant to continue to work with staff to meet the conditions in Attachment B, particularly PS-1.a and PS-1.b and that the solar shading access requirements are not optional. Comm. Melton seconded the motion.

Comm. Hendricks said he would rather see this project come back to Planning Commission rather than get hung up on specifying exactly what the Commission wants. He said he likes the idea of the project for this neighborhood and that he does not have a problem with a second-story addition, just the massing and the solar issue. He said he would like the flexibility for the applicant to work with staff and then have the Commission consider this again.

Ms. Ryan said it would be helpful to continue the item to a date certain. After discussion it was determined that the **motion would include continuing this item to the May 13, 2013 Planning Commission meeting. This was acceptable to the seconder.** The applicant confirmed this date would work for them.

Comm. Melton said that he thinks this will be a fabulous addition to the neighborhood with some trimming back. He said as the project is currently proposed he is unable to make the findings regarding “Respecting the scale, bulk and character of the homes in the adjacent neighborhood” and “Design homes to respect their immediate neighbors.” Comm. Melton said if the applicant continues to work with staff on reducing the FAR to no more than 52% and reducing the second floor area to no more that 35% of the first floor area, that he thinks this would be a much more successful project than what is proposed tonight. He said he looks forward to seeing this again.

Comm. Kolchak said he agrees with his fellow commissioners’ comments. He said he likes that the applicants enjoy living in the City and want to stay. He said the only thing that bothered him about the project was the solar shading issue. He said with minor adjustments this issue should be able to be addressed and he looks forward to seeing the project again.

Comm. Olevson said he would be supporting the motion. He said this will be a great addition to the neighborhood and he is pleased the applicant is putting the efforts into the upgrade for the neighborhood. He said the proposal needs to be closer to the existing zoning requirements before it can be approved.

Chair Larsson said he would be supporting the motion. He said there are already some second story homes in the neighborhood so there is already a precedent. He said the ratio of the proposed second story to the first floor is too high. He said also the FAR is too high for this neighborhood even if the neighbors do not object. He said with the suggested changes he looks forward to this coming back to the Commission for review.

ACTION: Comm. Hendricks made a motion on 2012-7986 to continue this item to the May 13, 2013 Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant time to work on revisions with staff as listed in the conditions in Attachment B. Comm. Melton seconded. Motion carried 6-0, with Vice Chair Dohadwala absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action serves as the legal notification of the continuance of this item to the May 13, 2013 meeting.

- 3. File #:** 2013-7112
- Location:** 620 E. Maude Ave.
- Proposed Project:** **General Plan Amendment** to change the General Plan Land Use Designation from Industrial to Residential Medium Density to Residential High Density **Rezone** from M-S/ITR/R-3/PD (Industrial & Service/Industrial to Residential/Medium Density Residential) to R-4/PD (High Density Residential/Planned Development) **Special Development Permit** to allow the development of 117 affordable dwelling units.
- Applicant/Owner:** Mid-Pen Housing/Charities Housing
- Environmental Review:** Mitigated Negative Declaration
- Staff Contact:** Shaunn Mendrin, (408) 730-7429
smendrin@sunnyvale.ca.gov
- Notes:** *This item is scheduled to be considered by City Council on April 30, 2013.*

Comm. Melton, Comm. Olevson and Chair Larsson disclosed that the each had met with one or more of the applicants and had toured existing facilities similar to the proposal.

Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He provided two revisions: that in Attachment B, page 2, under the parking section of the data table, that the number of required standard spaces should be 156, the proposed standard spaces should be 147 and the required covered spaces should be 117; and in Attachment D, page 4, under PS-3 that the address referenced should be 675 East Taylor Avenue.

Chair Larsson provided a brief summary of the history of this project confirming with staff the information. Chair Larsson asked the Commissioners to ask their questions of staff during the early part of the meeting as he felt it would be good for the public to hear the questions prior to the public comment portion of the hearing.

Comm. Melton referred to page 6 of the report and discussed several questions with staff about the State Density Bonus (SDB) Law and the concessions and incentives requested by the applicant for this project. **Trudi Ryan**, Planning Officer, added that the SDB rules and regulations are complicated and that the requests by applicants need to be reasonable, and in context. Comm. Melton referred to page 9 of the report and confirmed with staff the City would be making the payment of \$7.4 million to the applicants out of housing mitigation fees, which would be given back to the City General Fund in the form of a lease payment.

Chair Larsson asked further about the source of the funds and Ms. Ryan explained how housing mitigation fees are collected.

Comm. Olevson thanked Comm. Melton for asking where the money would be coming from. Comm. Olevson discussed with staff the lockable storage and the applicants' request for a reduction in the required size. Staff said the applicants may provide more explanation regarding the reasoning behind reducing the lockable storage. Comm. Olevson said that for the project to proceed that there are a couple of agreements that need to be concluded with neighbors. Staff said the applicants may want to comment on the status of the agreement with the Church. He added that Public Works staff may still be working on the sidewalk issue. Comm. Olevson discussed with staff why this project does not need a traffic impact analysis as it does not exceed the threshold of peak hour trips.

Comm. Hendricks talked about several of the issues discussed at the earlier study session including linkage between properties, crosswalks, sense of place, and access to the nearby park. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff the proposed fourth floor and whether it is necessary for it to stay. Mr. Mendrin said the applicant has removed units from the fourth floor since the study session. Comm. Hendricks asked about the back side of the buildings and the concern of the look being plain with staff saying some changes were made to make the back side more interesting and that there are conditions of approval requiring additional work. Comm. Hendricks asked about General Plan changes needing to be in the public interest. Ms. Ryan explained how this finding could be made. **Kathryn Berry**, Senior Assistant City Attorney, added that this is a finding that comes from the Municipal Code, that the General Plan is the constitution of the City, and there is a public process to change it. Ms. Berry said the changes have to serve the good of the City, and be logical and sensible and that it is the Planning Commission's job to determine if the finding can be made. Comm. Hendricks asked about a nearby Lotus project confirming with staff that this is a new residential development to the south of the site. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff parking impacts on the surrounding area, and that the location seems like a good choice as it is near resources for the residents.

Chair Larsson asked staff about RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Allocation) goals and whether we are close to achieving the City goals. Ms. Ryan discussed RHNA, planning for low income housing and extremely low income housing, the cycles and housing goals, entitlements, and the difficulty in funding and building housing for very low income households. She noted that Sunnyvale has completed one project of 124 units affordable to very low income in the past seven years towards the RHNA goals.

Chair Larsson opened the public hearing.

Kathy Robinson with Charities Housing and **Jan Lindenthal** with MidPen Housing, applicants, presented the project. Ms. Robinson discussed Charities Housing and Ms. Lindenthal discussed MidPen Housing. Ms. Robinson said property management is part of their service and that it is very important discussing the rigorous screening of residents, the resident services, range of rents and incomes, and onsite services. Ms. Robinson discussed similar projects and who the residents are of this type of housing. She discussed prospective residents and data gathering used to determine who they are serving and where they come from. She said residents in similar types of developments have a range in occupations and include a high number of seniors. Ms. Robinson said they have tried to respond to what they have heard from the community, including providing generous setbacks and lots of open space. They discussed the studio apartment development and family development. Ms. Robinson commented about community outreach, and that the proposal exceeds the green building requirements. Ms. Lindenthal discussed comments from the study session and said they are requesting some concessions, however they have tried hard to meet the spirit of the rules. Ms. Lindenthal discussed the location and design approach for the development addressing concerns about the fourth story by reducing a couple of units from the fourth floors and locating the fourth story building on part of the site where it would have the least impact. Ms. Lindenthal discussed that when looking at the buildings the landscaping is what is seen and not the parking. Ms. Robinson commented about the solar study and shadowing, and that they exceed the City parking standards. Ms. Robinson commented about the great proximity to transit and resources and services for the residents and off-site improvements.

Comm. Melton asked the applicants about safety and security. The applicant said they provide security cameras, rigorous screening of residents, and an electronic lockable gate on the garage, and a lockable facility with a key fob system for residents, which helps the residents feel safe. Comm. Melton asked Ms. Robinson about these facilities whether there would be a preference system for Sunnyvale residents. Ms. Robinson said this would be up to the local

jurisdiction. Ms. Lindenthal said they would welcome it at it is good for students. Ms. Ryan said that the City Council would probably consider the applicant preference criteria; however it is not the Planning Commission's purview.

Comm. Olevson asked about a condition regarding an easement agreement with the property to the southeast. Ms. Robinson said they have been speaking with the church for about 1½ years and that her expectation is the agreement will be in place as required. Comm. Olevson asked about design changes included in the conditions. Ms. Robinson said they know they need to do more work on the design and one area they need to work on is the sloping roof.

Comm. Hendricks confirmed with staff that they are comfortable that the easement requirement will be met. Comm. Hendricks discussed with the applicants the average length of stay of most residents for both types of housing ranging from five to seven years.

Chair Larsson discussed with Ms. Lindenthal that the waiting lists for properties in Sunnyvale is about 2,300 residents and that it could be many years before someone on the list is contacted. Chair Larsson had Ms. Lindenthal discuss the complex funding sources for affordable housing. She said there would be a minimum of five different sources, including the City and housing tax credits. Chair Larsson asked about the impact of the housing on schools. Ms. Robinson responded that is uncommon to have children in the studio developments and Ms. Lindenthal said that the family housing may have about 50 children. Chair Larsson had Ms. Lindenthal comment about the afterschool program that would coordinate with the local school district.

Comm. Olevson confirmed that the housing is not funded by section eight funding.

Barbara Fukumoto, a Sunnyvale resident, spoke in support of the proposal discussing the need for affordable homes in Sunnyvale. She discussed that the applicants build and manage the housing and that this housing would add to the City's affordable housing stock providing permanent rather than temporary housing. She said this is a good location with public transit and encouraged the Planning Commission to recommend support for this proposal.

Maria Pan, a Sunnyvale resident, said everyone would like to see this project succeed to provide housing for the low income population. She expressed her concern about the family housing being located next to the single room housing. She suggested that the Planning Commission consider recommending that either all family housing or all single room housing be provided instead of the proposed mix of housing types as she thinks it could be a risk for the children in the family units to live next to the single room studio housing.

Martin Landzaat, a Sunnyvale resident, said he sees there is a waiver of park dedication fees, and wondered if the applicants would be paying any school impact fees. He referred to Attachment H, the 2012 Balanced Growth Profile, saying he does not think the school numbers include the high schools and that he thinks they should be included in the calculations.

Chair Larsson asked staff about school impact fees. Ms. Ryan said she does not think the school has an exemption for the fees. She said the Sunnyvale Municipal Code exempts affordable rental housing projects from park dedication fees.

Ms. Lindenthal said they are happy to answer questions.

Comm. Melton asked Ms. Lindenthal to comment about the mixture of housing in regards to the safety of children. Ms. Lindenthal said that MidPen owns a number of mixed properties and think the mixed properties create a healthy community. She said both buildings will be secured and not interchangeably secured. She said they do rigorous screening and they would evict if there were a problem. Ms. Robinson said that on similar developments they have not had

incidences. She said the need is so great that if there are any problems they would not be tolerated. Ms. Robinson said they think the mixed housing makes for an interesting and diverse community.

Chair Larsson asked about auto and bike parking. Ms. Robinson said the vehicle parking exceeds the requirements and acknowledged that bike parking congestion can occur. She said they are trying to learn from that and hope they have incorporated adequate bicycle parking. Ms. Lindenthal commented and said they think they have provided enough parking.

Chair Larsson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Hendricks moved for Alternative 2, to recommend to City Council to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment E), amend the General Plan, Rezone properties and approve the Special Development Permit with the following actions: to adopt a Resolution to amend the General Plan (Attachment F) to Change the General Plan land use designation of 620 E. Maude Avenue from Industrial to Residential Medium Density (ITRMED) to Residential High Density (RHI); to introduce an ordinance to rezone 620 E. Maude Avenue from Industrial Service/Industrial to Residential/Medium Density/Planned Development (M-S/ITR/R3/PD) to High Density Residential Planned Development (R4/PD) (Attachment G); and to approve the Special Development Permit with conditions listed in Attachment D. The motion includes two modifications: that Attachment B, page 2, under the parking section of the data table, be modified that the number of required standard spaces should be 156, the proposed standard spaces should be 147 and the required covered spaces should be 117; and in Attachment D, page 4, under PS-3 that the address referenced should be 675 East Taylor Avenue. Comm. Melton seconded the motion.

Comm. Hendricks said he can make the findings and that it is easy to deem this proposal to be in the public interest. He said he has concern about the fourth floor, however other than that he can only be supportive of the proposal. He said he does not think the Onizuka site would have been the best place to go. He said this proposal has good parking, a nearby park and school, and that he likes the joint partnership. He said the architecture fits in neighborhood. He said he hopes the City Council approves the proposal.

Comm. Melton said he agrees that this proposal is in the public interest. He thanked the members of the public for their input. He said when the Planning Commission provides recommendation to Council so he puts the proposal through the ringer to come up with reasons that could trip up the project. He said in this case he can make the findings. Comm. Melton commented that since the City is putting in the \$7.4 million, that he would like to see Council consider providing a preference to Sunnyvale residents.

Comm. Kolchak said he would be supporting the motion. He said he can make the findings and that he thinks this is a great affordable housing project. He said he can support everything they are doing, especially the after school program, that this is in an ideal location with a park and public transit and he wishes them all the best.

Comm. Olevson thanked the applicants for their presentation. He said he visited other properties of the applicants and said they were high quality, appropriate for their neighborhoods and well maintained. He said he thinks this proposal is definitely in the public interest. He said he thinks this project will benefit the current neighborhood. He said he can whole heartedly recommend support for the project.

Comm. Chang said he can make the findings and would be supporting the motion. He said he looks forward to seeing this come into fruition.

Chair Larsson said he would be supporting the motion. He said there is a great need for affordable housing and the City has only built one project towards affordable housing in seven years. He said there are long waiting lists. He said there are challenges and complexities in funding a project like this. He said this is an opportunity and this is a great site with the public transit, and afterschool programs. He said he cannot say enough good things about the project.

ACTION: Comm. Hendricks made a motion on 2013-7112 to recommend to City Council to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment E), amend the General Plan, Rezone properties and approve the Special Development Permit with the following actions: to adopt a Resolution to amend the General Plan (Attachment F) to Change the General Plan land use designation of 620 E. Maude Avenue from Industrial to Residential Medium Density (ITRMED) to Residential High Density (RHI); to introduce an ordinance to rezone 620 E. Maude Avenue from Industrial Service/Industrial to Residential/ Medium Density/Planned Development (M-S/ITR/R3/PD) to High Density Residential Planned Development (R4/PD) (Attachment G); and to approve the Special Development Permit with conditions listed in Attachment D. The motion includes two modifications: that Attachment B, page 2, under the parking section of the data table, be modified that the number of required standard spaces should be 156, the proposed standard spaces should be 147 and the required covered spaces should be 117; and in Attachment D, page 4, under PS-3 that the address referenced should be 675 East Taylor Avenue. Comm. Melton seconded. Motion carried 6-0, with Vice Chair Dohadwala absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This recommendation will be provided to City Council and is scheduled to be considered at their meeting on April 30, 2013.

4. Standing Item Potential Study Issues

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, said four study issue papers were provided to Planning Commission for consideration. The titles are: Public Hearings on Legislative Actions (RZ, GPA) Prior to Public Hearings on the Related Development Projects; Review of General Plan Policies regarding Noise Impacts to Residential Developments near major Transportation Thoroughfares; Study of the Use of Parking Stackers in Residential Developments; and Individual Lockable Storage Requirements for Multi-Family Housing.

Comm. Hendricks said he suggested the first study and **moved to add the study issue “Public Hearings on Legislative Actions (RZ, GPA) Prior to Public Hearings on Related Development Projects” to the list of potential study issues for 2014. Comm. Melton seconded the motion.**

Comm. Olevson said he agrees that with the concept and would be supporting this.

ACTION: Comm. Hendricks made a motion to add the study “Public Hearings on Legislative Actions (RZ, GPA) Prior to Public Hearings on the Related Development Projects” to the Potential Study Issue list for 2014. Comm. Melton seconded. Motion carried 6-0, with Vice Chair Dohadwala absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This item will be added to the list of Potential Study Issues for 2014 and be considered in the ranking by Planning Commission later this year.

Comm. Melton said he had suggested the item related to noise. He discussed with staff that the entire General Plan was recently reformatted and LUTE (Land Use and Transportation Element) which is already in process will be followed by the air quality and noise study. He said since the noise element is already scheduled for update that he would not make a motion for this to be a study issue.

Comm. Melton commented that he appreciates the process of Commissioners being able to propose study issues.

Comm. Melton said he had suggested the parking stackers item and subsequent to his suggesting it, he saw on Vice Mayor Griffith’s blog that the Council would be considering this subject so he would not make a motion on it.

Comm. Hendricks added, regarding the parking stackers item, that if the Council is going to look at this issue that he would encourage staff to encourage the Council to also look at how this applies to tandem parking spaces.

Comm. Melton said that the lockable storage item was suggested by Vice Chair Dohadwala and suggested deferring it to a future meeting so she could be part of the discussion. Staff said they would bring the lockable storage item back for consideration at a future meeting.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

- COMMISSIONERS ORAL COMMENTS
- STAFF ORAL COMMENTS

City Council Meeting Report

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, said no Planning related items have been considered by City Council in the past two weeks. She said staff is scheduling a couple of Joint Study Sessions with the Planning Commission and City Council and will advise the Commission as soon as the dates are set.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS – None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the Commission meeting adjourned 10:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Trudi Ryan
Planning Officer