

CONSENT CALENDAR

- 1.A. Approval of Minutes: April 22, 2013**
- 1.B. File #: 2013-7035**
- Location: 1010 S. Wolfe Rd. (APN: 213-47-009)**
- Proposed Project: Use Permit** to allow a new 85-foot tall wireless telecommunications facility (slimline monopole) at Sunken Gardens Golf Course.
- Applicant/Owner:** Ridge Communications, Inc. for Verizon Wireless / City of Sunnyvale
- Environmental Review:** Negative Declaration
- Staff Contact:** Gerri Caruso, (408) 730-7591, gcaruso@sunnyvale.ca.gov
- Note:** *Staff recommends continuance to Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 7:00 p.m., Special Meeting.*

ACTION: Comm. Hendricks moved to approve the Consent Calendar with modification to the minutes in 1.A: to modify Comm. Hendricks comment, paragraph 3, page 3 to read “confirmed with staff that the applicant needs to address the solar access and the Commission has no flexibility on this issue.” Comm. Kolchak seconded. Motion carried, 3-0, with Vice Chair Dohadwala abstaining, and Chair Larsson, Comm. Chang and Comm. Melton absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action serves as the legal notification of the continuance of Project 2013-7035 to the May 29, 2013 meeting.

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: Gerri Caruso, (408) 730-7591,
gcaruso@sunnyvale.ca.gov
Note: Continued from April 22, 2013.

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, presented the staff report.

Comm. Hendricks confirmed with staff that the project is now in compliance with the solar shading requirements. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff the 35% second floor to first floor ratio and whether this is a guideline rather than a requirement with staff saying it is guidance and that there is a range of interpretation on the guideline. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) which is currently proposed at 53.5% and asked how much square footage would need to be removed to reduce the FAR to the staff recommendation of 52%. Ms. Ryan said she would calculate it, however not very much.

Vice Chair Dohadwala opened the public hearing.

Jasbir Tatla, the applicant, said since the April 22, 2013 Planning Commission meeting that they worked with staff and have met the solar requirements. He said as far as the FAR, that he cannot figure out how staff is coming up with the square footage; however he thinks they are very close to what staff has recommended. He said they wanted to keep the four bedrooms upstairs so the house design has a nicer shape. He said he did not see any hard guidelines for the 35% ratio of the second floor to the first floor. Designer **Jeannie Aiassa** said there are other two-story houses in the neighborhood that have more than the 35% ratio. She said they have complied with the solar study. She said she believes if one of the bedrooms were moved downstairs that they would still be over 52% FAR.

Comm. Olevson commented that he is perplexed why staff and Mr. Tatla do not agree on the square footage of the project. Mr. Tatla discussed that the proposed second floor is about 900 square feet and the first floor is about 1,800 square feet for a total of 2,700 square feet. Mr. Tatla reviewed some of the history of the project. He said they wanted to start building this past March. Ms. Ryan said from what the applicant said about the square footage that he appears to be comparing the 900 square feet to the total 2,700 square feet which would be about a 33% ratio. She said the way the design guidelines are written is that the 900 square foot second floor in relationship to the 1,800 square foot first floor would be a 50% ratio.

Comm. Kolchak discussed with the applicant about possibly moving one bedroom from the second to the first floor. Mr. Tatla said he is not opposed to this however he does not think the design would look as good and would negatively impact the home by reducing square footage in the backyard. Mr. Tatla said the difference they are requesting seems to be very small and he does not think it will impact anyone.

Vice Chair Dohadwala closed the public hearing.

Ms. Ryan said that the Commission should note that the lot for this home is 5,240 square feet and the current lot minimum is 6,000 square feet. She commented that this home is on a legal,

non-conforming lot which means the lot is a bit small which could be taken into account if considering adding square footage to the first floor.

Vice Chair Dohadwala confirmed with staff that if the FAR on this project were not over 45% that the Planning Commission would not be considering the project, that the decision would be made by staff and would only be heard by Planning Commission if the decision were appealed.

Comm. Hendricks moved for Alternative 2 to approve the Design Review with modified Findings and with the conditions in Attachment B, with one modification, to remove condition PS-1 regarding required revisions to the project plans for FAR and the reduction of the second floor area. The motion died for lack of a second.

Comm. Olevson moved for Alternative 1, to deny the design review as he agrees with the findings as proposed by staff. **Vice Chair Dohadwala seconded the motion.**

Comm. Olevson said he appreciates the length of time applicant has spent on the project, however after driving around the neighborhood he said he finds the mass on the second story out of character with the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Dohadwala said she agrees with the staff on the findings. She said older neighborhoods in Sunnyvale are developing yet still maintain the character, which she gives credit to the City for maintaining. She said she has seen other Cities transition older neighborhoods with newer houses and the homes look very different from each other and the neighborhood messy. She said transitioning requires respecting the bulk and mass of the surrounding homes.

Comm. Hendricks said he would not be supporting the motion as he thinks the difference in the numbers being required is small. He said the property is smaller and there is no housing across from the property. He said there are very few other second story homes in the neighborhood and that should not be held against the applicant. He said they have met the solar requirements and he feels the applicant has tried to conform. He said the applicant has considered privacy, that the Commission has some latitude to work with the numbers, and good development changes might happen in the neighborhood. He encouraged his colleagues to approve the project or defer it until a full commission is present.

Comm. Kolchak said that at the previous hearing he agreed with the comments of the other commissioners that if the applicant met the 52% guideline and solar regulations that he would be happy with it. Following along with Comm. Hendricks comments about this project he noted it could start a little movement for the neighborhood. He noted the school across the street and the good design, and said he thinks it would be acceptable to move forward on this, so he would not be supporting the motion. He said he wished he had had a little more time before the previous motion was made as he might have seconded it.

The motion failed 2-2 with Comm. Hendricks and Comm. Kolchak dissenting.

Comm. Hendricks moved to continue this item to the May 29, 2013 Planning Commission meeting until more Commissioners are present. Comm. Olevson seconded the motion.

Ms. Ryan recommended checking with the applicant noting that the meeting is on Wednesday, May 29, 2013 and begins at 7 p.m.

Vice Chair Dohadwala reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Tatla said he is really disappointed with the City process. He said they have been trying to get this project done since December, that they have been on time, have had difficulty dealing with staff and that there have been many delays. He said they have tried to do everything they can and this project should make the neighborhood better.

Ms. Ryan discussed possible options including continuing the item to a date certain to have a full commission, or trying a different motion. **Vice Chair Dohadwala** asked what happens with a hung motion with Ms. Ryan saying there would be no action for the applicant to appeal at this point, further discussing options.

Vice Chair Dohadwala closed the public hearing.

Comm. Kolchak said he would be supporting the motion.

Comm. Hendricks said he understands the challenges the applicant has had, and he has tried to move this project forward. He said he thinks the current motion is the best course of action to get definitive closure and then depending on what happens at the next meeting he could appeal the decision to City Council. He said generally the Planning Commission does not see a project three times. He said if the applicant would prefer a denial so they could appeal this to City Council sooner that might be possible. He said there are limits to what the Planning Commission can decide.

Comm. Olevson said he is disappointed that they do not have an odd number of Commissioners present this evening and that is why he is supporting the motion.

ACTION: Comm. Hendricks made a motion on 2012-7986 to continue this item to the Wednesday, May 29, 2013 Planning Commission meeting (Special Meeting beginning at 7 p.m.) to allow more Commissioners to be present to break the tie vote. Comm. Olevson seconded. Motion carried 4-0, with Chair Larsson, Comm. Chang and Comm. Melton absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action serves as the legal notification of the continuance of this item to the Wednesday, May 29, 2013 meeting at 7:00 p.m.

3. **File #:** 2012-7461
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, one office condominium 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

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, presented the staff report.

Vice Chair Dohadwala disclosed she met with the applicant and that she knows the project manager professionally. She said there is no conflict of interest for her on this project.

Comm. Kolchak disclosed that he is employed by Valley Medical Foundation and is organizing a Health and Diversity Awareness Fair. He said the applicant's nonprofit foundation has paid for some of the expenses for the Fair and after discussing this situation with Kathryn Berry, Senior Assistant City Attorney, he has concluded that he does not have a conflict of interest nor would the relationship influence his decision on this project. Ms. Berry confirmed she agrees with this statement. He disclosed he met with the applicant regarding this project.

Comm. Olevson discussed with staff the parking stalls and the model used to determine the parking requirements for mixed use parking. Staff said the model used was from the Urban Land Institute (ULI), versus Institute of Transportation Engineers which does not have a standard for mixed use. Comm. Olevson discussed with staff the vision triangle requirement not being met, the driveway of the parking garage and whether this area might be dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Ms. Ryan said Traffic staff reviewed the plans and staff does not believe this area endangers anyone.

Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff why this project needed a Special Development Permit (SDP) and that there is a heritage resource structure located to the south side of the project. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff the private balconies and privacy issues. Comm. Hendricks asked staff about the mixed use model for parking for this site and whether this model would be setting a precedent for downtown. Ms. Ryan noted that there are other projects in the downtown that have used this model. Comm. Hendricks further discussed with staff the model and the project being located near transit. Comm. Hendricks asked about on-street parking on Mathilda Avenue in front of this project and the vision triangle. Ms. Ryan discussed both. Comm. Hendricks asked further about traffic and expressed concern about the vision triangle and pedestrian safety and whether a different texture or pebbling could be used on the sidewalk to direct pedestrians. Staff said the applicant could work with staff to identify opportunities to do that. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff that the Commission could request that staff look at the appropriateness of allowing on-street parking on Mathilda Avenue. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff the deviation for lot coverage and why staff is supportive. Comm. Hendricks said the architecture for this project was previously addressed at a study session.

Vice Chair Dohadwala discussed with staff the trash collection plans for the project including that the Traffic staff would determine the appropriate striping or signage to mark the area off for the trash collection vehicles. Vice Chair Dohadwala discussed with staff the storage for the project.

Vice Chair Dohadwala opened the public hearing.

Sanjeev Acharya, applicant with SiliconSage Builders, provided a PowerPoint presentation discussing the project. He discussed the details of the floor plans, parking and amenities for the 15 residential condos and office space. He discussed the three levels of residential, the garage, ground level parking, the courtyard on the second level, and the roof top garden, spa and tot lot. He said they have designed the massing away from the neighbors and discussed the multiple rounds of changes made to the plans. He said they were able to take maximum advantage of assembling the parcels. He discussed the Mission-style architecture and addressed the changes made to architecture based on the study session comments provided by the Commission. He discussed parking, the close proximity to transit, the Parking Management Plan, the Vision Triangle and the lot coverage.

Comm. Hendricks asked the applicant specific questions about the project including a roll-up gate restricting the parking for residents only, bike racks and their location and the possibility of moving them, street access and security for the residents. Mr. Acharya introduced the architect for the project who explained that there would be keyed access for the residents and that the security would be addressed in the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC & Rs). Comm. Hendricks discussed further with the applicant the private balconies, and on-street parking. Mr. Acharya said that they have a letter of support from the neighbors with Comm. Hendricks asking if the neighbors had an option to provide any comments regarding concerns about the project. Mr. Acharya commented about on-street parking.

Comm. Olevson asked the applicant about the mixed use and who would maintain the structure of the housing units. The architect said there would be two sets of CC & RS, one for the office space and one for the residential. She said the structure would be maintained by the Homeowner's Association. She said these are condominiums. Comm. Olevson said he just wanted to make sure the mixed use area would not start deteriorating.

Comm. Kolchak discussed the vision triangle with the applicant, and possible options for making the area safer.

Anant Uttazwar, a Sunnyvale resident, spoke in support of the project saying this project would improve the downtown by replacing old buildings with the new development. He said he thinks people would enjoy living in this area. Comm. Hendricks commented that there are several other residential developments in the area for those who might be interested in owning or renting a unit in the downtown.

Jennifer Hicks, a Sunnyvale resident, spoke in support of the project. She said her only concern is traffic congestion in the mornings on Mathilda Avenue and said the lights seem slow.

Vinh Nguyen, a Sunnyvale resident, said he thinks the buildings on the project look very nice and spoke in support of the project.

Mr. Acharya said they have put a lot of work into the project and requested the Commission approve the project. He said his neighbor to the right, Frank Hampton, asked him to convey that he is not opposed to the balconies on the project. Mr. Acharya said this is a high quality design project and he believes it is in line with City's vision for the downtown. He said he thinks this will be a catalyst for good development in the area. He said they have worked with staff to make the entrance and exit safer and he is open to making this a better place.

Comm. Hendricks referred to Attachment D, the conditions of approval, and confirmed with the applicant that he has no concerns with any of the conditions.

Vice Chair Dohadwala closed the public hearing.

Comm. Olevson referred to a typo on page 7 of the report which staff acknowledged.

Comm. Hendricks moved for **Alternative 2**, to adopt the **Mitigated Negative Declaration** and approve the **Special Development Permit and Tentative Map** with modified conditions. The modified conditions are: for the applicant to work with staff on providing sidewalk treatment to help with the vision triangle issue to encourage people to use the full sidewalk; and for the applicant to work with staff to eliminate on-street parking, at least a car length of no parking on the south side and no on-street parking in front of the property. **Comm. Kolchak** asked that the motion include that the applicant explore with staff other visualization methods for traffic safety with **Comm. Hendricks** agreeing and **Comm. Kolchak** seconded the motion.

Comm. Hendricks said the architecture was discussed in the study session and he thinks this is a nice looking project. He said his biggest concern was with the vision triangle and he hopes staff will work on no on-street parking. He commented about the parking and said that this is a new direction that the City wants to go with the sharing of parking. He said he is comfortable with the lot coverage after staff's explanation and said this is a good project.

Comm. Kolchak said he appreciates the applicant's changes on the architecture following the Commission's comments in the study session. He said he likes the changes and the unique roof top elements. He said he was a little confused about the mixed use parking model however he is okay with staff's explanation. He said he would like to see the vision triangle worked out as best as possible and looks forward to seeing this project come into fruition.

Comm. Olevson said he would be supporting the motion. He said he can clearly agree with findings to support the project. He said this project makes a nice transition from where City is now and where it is going.

Vice Chair Dohadwala said she would be supporting the motion and that she can make the findings. She said she was concerned about the parking, the ULI materials were helpful and she supports the shared parking. She said this would be setting a good precedent and she looks forward to seeing this project completed.

Comm. Hendricks added that he could make the findings.

ACTION: Comm. Hendricks made a motion on 2012-7461 to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Special Development Permit and Tentative Map with modified conditions: for the applicant to work with staff on providing sidewalk treatment to help with the vision triangle issue to encourage people to use the full sidewalk; for the applicant to work with staff to eliminate on-street parking, at least a car length of no parking on the south side and no on-street parking in front of the property; and for the applicant to explore with staff other visualization methods for traffic safety. Comm. Kolchak seconded. Motion carried 4-0, with Chair Larsson, Comm. Chang and Comm. Melton absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than May 28, 2013.

4. **File #:** **2013-7155**
- Location:** **955 and 975 Stewart Dr.** (APN: 205-22-027, 205-22-028)
- Proposed Project:** Application(s) for the development of 57 multi-family rental units (Stewart Village II), Vesting Tentative Map located at 975 Stewart Drive and modifications to the previously approved application for 955 Stewart (#2012-7381) in M-S/ITR/R-3/PD Zoning District (APN: 205-22-027&28): **Vesting Tentative Parcel Map** for the merger of two lots; **Special Development Permit** to allow the development of 57 Dwelling Units at 975 Stewart Drive, relocation of parking and use of remaining Green Building Incentive dwelling units for 955 Stewart Drive (Planning Application 2012-7381).
- Applicant/Owner:** Irvine Co / 955-995 Stewart Drive Llc
- Environmental Review:** Mitigated Negative Declaration
- Staff Contact:** Shaunn Mendrin, (408) 730-7429, smendrin@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He said Exhibit 1 to the Conditions of Approval has been provided on the dais and should be included with the conditions. He referred to Attachment D, the Conditions of Approval and said condition BP-12 on page 6 regarding Transportation Impact Fees should be removed.

Comm. Kolchak asked staff to discuss the deviations from Phase I on the adjacent property to Phase II, the proposed project. Mr. Mendrin discussed the deviations and said that combining the two phases eliminates one of the deviations.

Comm. Hendricks asked questions about the merging of Phase I and Phase II of the developments expressing concern about how this works. Mr. Mendrin discussed the history of how the two phases resulted and the merging of some portions commenting about Green Building provisions. Comm. Hendricks said he is having trouble determining if the merging is what the City should be doing. **Trudi Ryan**, Planning Officer, further discussed why staff felt the two projects could be merged and that there would be sharing of circulation and resources between the projects. Comm. Hendricks said he would feel better about the merging of the two phases if he had known about Phase II when reviewing Phase I and requested that in the future staff would mention that there might be a Phase II. Comm. Hendricks asked staff to talk about the third story deviation being requested with staff explaining the code requirements are for the buildings to be two story and the applicant is requesting three story. Ms. Ryan explained that staff looks at several things including height limit and the way a development fits in the neighborhood when considering a deviation. Comm. Hendricks asked about policy verses what is thought to be appropriate and discussed discretion. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff setbacks, the EIR (Environmental Impact Report) for this area and significant mitigation, and the emergency response for the properties. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff noise levels in the area, inside and out of the units. Comm. Hendricks discussed with staff relocated parking from Phase 1 and the moving of parking with staff referring to Attachment G in the report which provided a clearer illustration of the relocated parking.

Comm. Olevson confirmed that the buildings for Phase 1 and Phase II are both proposed to be 39 feet in height. Comm. Olevson said this project used the 2007 EIR and discussed the overriding considerations which were air quality and overriding economic considerations. Comm. Olevson asked about the greenhouse gas study that differed from the 2007 EIR with Mr. Mendrin responding that the Phase II project is within the thresholds.

Comm. Hendricks asked further by about the 2007 EIR confirming with staff that the City is not doing anything outside the EIR. **Kathryn Berry**, Senior Assistant City Attorney, discussed the assumptions about the project, said that Phase II does not trigger any thresholds and the project is within the assumptions of the original EIR.

Vice Chair Dohadwala discussed with staff the density and the properties, taking advantage of combining the densities for Phase I and Phase II and bringing the combined projects up to the green building standards.

Vice Chair Dohadwala opened the public hearing.

Kerry Williams, Vice President with the Irvine Co., said they went before the Planning Commission last July with a proposal for 186 homes which was Phase I of Stewart Village. She said they are before the Planning Commission tonight with Phase II requesting approval to develop the remaining two acres. She said at the time of the Phase I application they had not acquired the Phase II property in time for it to be included with Phase 1. She said this application for 57 apartment homes will complete this community providing moderate density residential units. She discussed the zoning for the property, the density, pedestrian circulation, onsite amenities, and that the project meets LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Silver standards. **Tim Mustard**, with TCA Architects discussed the project including landscaping, circulation, pedestrian connections, enhanced character of the site, the amenity features, and enhancements provided in Phase II.

Comm. Hendricks asked staff about a letter provided on the dais questioning school capacity. Ms. Ryan said the author of the letter feels this development would impact the schools. Ms. Ryan said that the City is not allowed to ask for more school impact fees as the developers are required to pay these to the school district. Comm. Hendricks confirmed with staff that the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is satisfied because of the school district fee. Ms. Berry referred to page 8 of Attachment E, item 24 which references this issue. Ms. Berry said that the project is identified as an impact and CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) says that adequate mitigation for traffic, park deficiencies, and school impacts can be met with fees; however the City does not have the authority over calculating or knowing what the school impact fees are. She said the applicant will have to pay the school impact fees. Ms. Ryan noted that residential and nonresidential applicants are required to pay school impact fees to the school districts. Comm. Hendricks confirmed with the staff that there are no setback deviations for the Phase II development.

Mr. Mustard discussed the parking and car charging stations. Ms. Williams added that they are sorry they were unable to come forward with the complete project last July, and ultimately this project is an amendment to the initial Phase I. She said there are fewer deviations than before. She said this is a lower density apartment style project. She said they have achieved a balance of maximizing the housing numbers while being respectful of the surrounding area.

Comm. Hendricks asked if there are any plans for solar panels on the roofs with Ms. Williams saying no, however the electric car chargers are very desirable. Comm. Hendricks asked why they are not proposing solar panels. Mr. Mustard said it comes down to economics. Comm. Hendricks asked the applicant about the request to go to three stories. Ms. Williams said for multi-family apartment homes this is a pretty low density project even with the three stories. Comm. Hendricks discussed with the applicant the status of the park site.

Vice Chair Dohadwala closed the public hearing.

Comm. Kolchak moved for Alternative 2 to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Special Development Permit and Vesting Tentative Map with modified

conditions as suggested by staff: to add Exhibit 1, the East Sunnyvale Industrial-to-Residential (ITR) Project document to the Conditions of Approval; and to eliminate condition BP-12 regarding Transportation Improvement Fees from the Conditions of Approval. Comm. Olevson seconded the motion.

Comm. Kolchak said he remembers Phase I of this project, understands why the applicant is taking this approach and that Phase II matches the height and stories of Phase I. He said this is a nice addition and completes the project. He said he can make the findings and looks forward to seeing this come into fruition.

Comm. Olevson said he can make the findings, and he was glad to see that the construction of Phase I has not covered the neighboring properties in dust. He said he is familiar with this builder and thinks they have a good history. He said he can easily support this project subject to the conditions.

Comm. Hendricks said he would be supporting the motion and that he can make the findings. He said the Commission talked about the architecture at the study session. He said the consistency of the architecture for the two phases makes sense, however he has some concern about the third story. He said he thinks he voted against the Phase I project due to deviations, however this time there are fewer deviations. He said he looks forward to seeing the whole project completed.

Vice Chair Dohadwala said she would be supporting the motion. She said she liked Phase I of the development, that she likes the architecture and the different product type, and that she can make the findings. She said she thinks this will be a seamless transition for the two sites and that she likes that the applicant was able to combine the two parcels.

ACTION: Comm. Kolchak made a motion on 2013-7155 to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Special Development Permit and Vesting Tentative Map with modified conditions as suggested by staff: to add Exhibit 1, the East Sunnyvale Industrial-to-Residential (ITR) Project document to the Conditions of Approval; and to eliminate condition BP-12 regarding Transportation Improvement Fees from the Conditions of Approval. Comm. Olevson seconded. Motion carried 4-0, with Chair Larsson, Comm. Chang and Comm. Melton absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than May 28, 2013.

5. Standing Item Potential Study Issues

Vice Chair Dohadwala said she had originally suggested the potential study issue “Individual Lockable Storage Requirements for Multi-Family Housing” and discussed her reasons for suggesting it. She discussed with staff about including additional language to the potential Study Issue paper with staff saying the description could be adjusted to include location and what could be counted towards storage in the interior.

Vice Chair Dohadwala moved to submit this item as a potential Study Issue. Comm. Hendricks seconded the motion.

Comm. Olevson asked for clarification on the motion with Vice Chair Dohadwala and staff discussing the staff write-up and additional items that might be included to broaden the study including the **review of locations for lockable storage**.

Comm. Hendricks said what he thought what he was seconding was the five bullet points listed on the staff write-up.

ACTION: Vice Chair Dohadwala made a motion to add the study “Individual Lockable Storage Requirements for Multi-Family Housing” with the addition of “review locations for lockable storage” to the study to the Potential Study Issue list for 2014. Comm. Hendricks seconded. Motion carried 4-0, with Chair Larsson, Comm. Chang and Comm. Melton absent.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This item is not appealable. 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.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

- COMMISSIONERS ORAL COMMENTS
- STAFF ORAL COMMENTS

City Council Meeting Report

Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, said staff is scheduling a couple of Joint Study Sessions with the Planning Commission and City Council and that staff would advise the Commission as soon as the dates are confirmed.

Ms. Ryan reminded the Commission that there would be no Planning Commission meeting on Monday, May 27, 2013 due to the Memorial Day Holiday, and that a Special Meeting would be held instead on Wednesday, May 29, 2013 with a special start time of 7 p.m.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS –

Comm. Kolchak announced that Sunnyvale World Multi-Cultural Day, which is an awesome, free event, would be held on May 19, 2013 from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. at the Sunnyvale Community Center located at 550 East Remington Drive.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the Commission meeting adjourned 11:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Trudi Ryan
Planning Officer