



# City of Sunnyvale

## Notice and Agenda - Final Planning Commission

---

Monday, January 25, 2021

7:00 PM

Telepresence Meeting: City Web Stream |  
Comcast Channel 15 | AT&T Channel 99

---

**Special Meeting - Study Session - Canceled | Public Hearing - 7:00 PM**

### TELECONFERENCE NOTICE

*Because of the COVID-19 emergency and the “shelter in place” orders issued by Santa Clara County and the State of California, the meeting of the Sunnyvale Planning Commission on January 25, 2021, will take place by teleconference, as allowed by Governor Gavin Newsom’s Executive Order N-29-20.*

- *Watch the Planning Commission meeting on television over Comcast Channel 15 and AT&T Channel 99, or at <https://Sunnyvale.ca.gov/YouTubeMeetings> or <https://Sunnyvaleca.Legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>*
- *Submit written comments to the Planning Commission up to 4 hours prior to the meeting to [planningcommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:planningcommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov) or by mail to Sunnyvale Planning Division, 456 W. Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA 94086-3707.*
- *Teleconference participation: You may provide audio public comment by connecting to the teleconference meeting online or by telephone. Use the Raise Hand feature to request to speak (\*9 on a telephone):*

*Meeting Online Link: <https://sunnyvale-ca-gov.zoom.us/j/91827390357>*

*Meeting call-in telephone number: 833-548-0276 | Meeting ID: 918 2739 0357*

*Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Executive Order N-29-20, if you need special assistance to provide public comment, contact the City at least 2 hours prior to the meeting in order for the City to make reasonable alternative arrangements for you to communicate your comments. For other special assistance, please contact the City at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. The Planning Division may be reached at 408-730-7440 or at [planning@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:planning@sunnyvale.ca.gov) (28 CFR 35.160 (b) (1)).*

**STUDY SESSION CANCELED****7:00 PM PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING****CALL TO ORDER**

*Call to Order via teleconference.*

**ROLL CALL****ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

*This category provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the commission on items not listed on the agenda and is limited to 15 minutes (may be extended or continued after the public hearings/general business section of the agenda at the discretion of the Chair) with a maximum of up to three minutes per speaker. Please note the Brown Act (Open Meeting Law) does not allow the Planning Commission to take action on an item not listed on the agenda. If you wish to address the Planning Commission, please refer to the notice at the beginning of this agenda. Individuals are limited to one appearance during this section.*

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

*All matters listed on the consent calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items. If a member of the public would like a consent calendar item pulled and discussed separately, please refer to the notice at the beginning of this agenda.*

1. [21-0218](#) Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 11, 2021

**Recommendation:** Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 11, 2021 as submitted.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS**

*If you wish to speak to a public hearing/general business item, please refer to the notice at the beginning of this agenda. Each speaker is limited to a maximum of three minutes.*

2. [21-0193](#) Selection and Ranking of Potential 2021 Study Issues

**STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES**

**NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS**

**-Commissioner Comments**

**-Staff Comments**

**ADJOURNMENT**

*Notice to the Public:*

*Any agenda related writings or documents on this agenda distributed to members of the Planning Commission are available by contacting the Planning Division at [planning@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:planning@sunnyvale.ca.gov). Agendas and associated reports are also available at [sunnyvaleca.legistar.com/calendar.aspx](http://sunnyvaleca.legistar.com/calendar.aspx) 72 hours before the meeting.*

*Planning a presentation for a Planning Commission meeting? To help you prepare and deliver your public comments, please review the "Making Public Comments During City Council or Planning Commission Meetings" document available on the City website.*

*PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that if you file a lawsuit challenging any final decision on any public hearing item listed in this agenda, the issues in the lawsuit may be limited to the issues which were raised at the public hearing or presented in writing to the City at or before the public hearing.*

*PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.6 imposes a 90-day deadline for the filing of any lawsuit challenging final action on an agenda item which is subject to Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5. Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if you need special assistance in this meeting, please see the notice at the beginning of this agenda.*



# City of Sunnyvale

## Agenda Item 1

---

**21-0218**

**Agenda Date:** 1/25/2021

---

**SUBJECT**

Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 11, 2021

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 11, 2021 as submitted.



# City of Sunnyvale

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

---

Monday, January 11, 2021

7:00 PM

Telepresence Meeting: City Web Stream |  
Comcast Channel 15 | AT&T Channel 99

---

**Special Meeting - Study Session - Canceled | Public Hearing - 7:00 PM**

### TELECONFERENCE NOTICE

#### **STUDY SESSION CANCELED**

#### **7:00 PM PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Howard called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

#### **ROLL CALL**

**Present:** 7 - Chair Daniel Howard  
Vice Chair David Simons  
Commissioner Sue Harrison  
Commissioner John Howe  
Commissioner Ken Olevson  
Commissioner Ken Rheaume  
Commissioner Carol Weiss

#### **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

#### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Commissioner Weiss seconded the motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes: 7 -** Chair Howard  
Vice Chair Simons  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Olevson  
Commissioner Rheume  
Commissioner Weiss

**No: 0**

1. [21-0149](#) Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2020

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS**

2. [21-0122](#) **Proposed Project:**  
**DESIGN REVIEW** for a first-story addition of 293 square feet and second-story addition of 206 square feet to an existing two-story home resulting in 2,956 square feet (2,501 square feet of living area and 455 square feet garage) and 47.5% floor area ratio (FAR).  
**Location:** 1519 Emperor Way (APN: 309-36-015)  
**File #:** 2020-7639  
**Zoning:** R-0 - Low Density Residential  
**Applicant / Owner:** Emerald Design Group, LLC (applicant) / Tamer M Mahmoud and Dina M Hadi (owners)  
**Environmental Review:** Class 1 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).  
**Project Planner:** Momoko Ishijima, (408) 730-7532, [mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

Senior Planner Momoko Ishijima shared the staff report with a slide presentation. She noted that Recommended Conditions of Approval EP-1 and EP-3 in Attachment 4 should be removed as the Department of Public Works determined that EP-1 is not applicable to the proposed project and EP-3 was included in error.

Commissioner Weiss asked staff if the proposed project is subject to the new Reach Codes. Senior Planner Ishijima stated that the Reach Codes have an anticipated effective date of January 27, 2021 and would not apply to proposed projects deemed complete before that date.

Vice Chair Simons asked if staff recommended the change in front door style. Senior Planner Ishijima responded that the applicant proposed the front door modification.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Dina Hadi and Tamer Mahmoud, homeowners, presented information about the proposed project.

Commissioner Weiss asked the homeowners if the new kitchen would include energy efficient upgrades. Mr. Mahmoud stated that most of their existing appliances are newer and energy efficient and they plan to use LED lighting throughout the home. Ms. Hadi added that they would also repurpose existing materials such as cabinetry.

Vice Chair Simons asked the homeowners how the second floor loft would be used and Mr. Mahmoud explained that it is intended as additional living space. Vice Chair Simons complimented the front door modification and cautioned the homeowners that a portion of the roof on their existing home forms a valley which is prone to leaks.

No members of the public spoke and the homeowners chose not to share any additional information about the proposed project.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Commissioner Weiss seconded the motion for Alternative 2 - Approve the Design Review with modified conditions.

The modified Condition of Approval is as follows:

1. Remove Recommended Conditions of Approval EP-1 and EP-3 in Attachment 4 as the Department of Public Works determined that EP-1 is not applicable to the proposed project and EP-3 was included in error.

Commissioner Howe stated that the proposed project looks good and noted that none of the neighbors expressed any concerns about it. He commented that privacy concerns on the left elevation have been addressed and wished the homeowners and their family well.

Commissioner Weiss complimented the homeowners' efforts to update their home to accommodate their growing family and keep them living in Sunnyvale. She stated

that no deviations have been requested and she can make the findings and she hoped the other Commissioners will support the motion.

Vice Chair Simons stated that he can make the findings and the proposed project would improve the home with respect to the neighborhood. He commented that the proposed project would enhance the existing architecture with no impacts to the back of the home and with improvements to the front. He recommended the homeowners explore mossy brown and green exterior colors and stated that he supports the proposed project.

Commissioner Harrison stated that the proposed project is a nice addition to the existing home and that she will support the motion.

Chair Howard restated the motion and voiced his support for it, expressing his hope that if the motion passes, the family enjoys the improvements and the constructions goes smoothly.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes: 7 -** Chair Howard  
Vice Chair Simons  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Olevson  
Commissioner Rheaume  
Commissioner Weiss

**No: 0**

Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that this decision is final unless appealed or called up for review by the City Council within 15 days.

3.      [21-0142](#)      **Proposed Project:**  
**SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT** to allow a 12-story mixed use development on Subblock 3 South in Block 18 of the DSP, adjacent to Redwood Square, with 479 units and approximately 30,000 square feet of ground floor retail/restaurant space and two levels of below grade parking.  
**VESTING TENTATIVE MAP** to allow modifications to lot line locations and the creation of commercial condominium spaces.  
**Location:** 200 S. Taaffe Street (APNs: 209-35-023 & 022)



**File #:** 2020-7262

**Zoning:** DSP (Downtown Specific Plan)/Block 18

**General Plan:** Downtown Specific Plan

**Applicant / Owner:** STC Ventures LLC (applicant and owner)

**Environmental Review:** No additional review required as per CEQA Guidelines 15168(c)(2) and (4) - environmental impacts of the project are addressed in the Downtown Specific Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse #2018052020).

**Project Planner:** Shaunn Mendrin, (408) 730-7431,  
smendrin@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Principal Planner Shaunn Mendrin shared the staff report with a slide presentation and noted that Recommended Condition of Approval TM-3 in Attachment 4 has been revised to allow the applicant flexibility with ownership management and the association for common area improvements throughout Block 18.

Vice Chair Simons stated his concern that the balconies are too minimalist and suggested using architectural elements from the cover of the entryway as part of the base of each balcony, or supports similarly used with awnings, or removing the plain, vertical railing so the balconies tie in more with the rest of the building. Principal Planner Mendrin stated that the Architect can provide more insight on the balconies and added that fritted glass would be used for some of them for visual interest. Vice Chair Simons observed that the corner of the building depicted in P1.0 in Attachment 5, Proposed Site and Architectural Plans, is flush which is not consistent with the rest of the building; asked what the street lighting would be; commented that the bicycle racks are too generic-looking; asked about the concept for the gateway interior walls and ceiling; expressed his hope for varied exterior sign types including those that project; and stated his concern that the building bulk might be disproportionate to the landscape and the pedestrian experience. Senior Assistant City Attorney Rebecca Moon reminded the Commissioners that this portion of the public hearing is dedicated to asking staff questions.

Commissioner Harrison confirmed with Principal Planner Mendrin that page one of Attachment 2, Project Data Table, should read that 479 is the maximum number of units.

Commissioner Howe asked staff how much of the mechanical equipment on top of the building would be visible from the ground level or from Murphy Avenue. Principal Planner Mendrin and Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that an imperceptible amount might show depending where one is on the ground. Commissioner Howe asked staff how many of the 479 residential units would have balconies and if staff

would be amenable to a condition that directs the staff and applicant to work together to increase the number of balconies. Principal Planner Mendrin answered that 196 units would have balconies and that staff would be amenable to the condition but suggested Commissioner Howe also ask the applicant. Assistant Director Miner confirmed with Commissioner Howe that he is only interested in maximizing the number of balconies as feasible as multiple factors might make adding a certain number of balconies difficult to achieve.

Commissioner Rheume asked staff about truncated domes and the difference between a detectable warning and driveway/flush curb sidewalk edge as referenced on page L0.3 in Attachment 5. Principal Planner Mendrin and Assistant Director Miner explained that the detectable warning curbs have truncated domes, yellow surfaces with bumps that provide warning to people with visual impairments of potential hazard when entering the street. Principal Planner Mendrin remarked that for added safety, flush curbs are limited to McKinley Avenue and the intersections of Murphy and McKinley avenues and Murphy Avenue and the new private street.

Commissioner Olevson asked staff why only 470 of the 479 residential units would have an assigned parking space. Principal Planner Mendrin responded that nine units would have dedicated spaces in the public parking garage across the street on South Taaffe Street, adding that the remainder of the site's parking for guests and non-residential uses would also be located in the parking garage across on Taaffe. He added that Walker Consultants conducted a comprehensive parking analysis for all of Block 18. Chrissy Mancini Nichols, City-hired consultant representing Walker Consultants, explained that their model recommended a supply of 417 residential spaces and not a one to one parking ratio because of commuting and vehicle ownership factors. She further remarked that there would be ample public parking available considering the existing and future parking demand, with 817 public parking spaces total available on Block 18 once all new parking is built.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Travis Duncan, representing Sares Regis, residential developer for STC Venture LLC; and Marcel Wilson with Bionic presented images and information about the proposed project with a slide presentation.

Commissioner Howe asked Mr. Duncan if they are amenable to a condition that would require the staff and applicant to work together to explore adding more balconies. Mr. Duncan answered that they welcome the opportunity to study the

option and that creating more visibility to the plaza is important. Commissioner Howe stated that more balconies enhance plaza visibility and therefore safety. Jeffrey Heller, Architect with Heller Manus Architects, expressed concern that too many balconies might alter the nature of the design and could result in a repetitive, less friendly, and less quality project. Commissioner Howe clarified that the intent of the motion would be for staff and the applicant to agree to add balconies only as feasible and appropriate. Mr. Heller stated that the caution was important to mention and added that the ample open space opportunities would also provide visibility to the plaza.

Commissioner Weiss asked Mr. Duncan if the proposed project could be built without pile driving which would be prohibited by Recommended Condition of Approval GC-20 in Attachment 4. Mr. Duncan stated that they would use a mat foundation instead, a four- to five-foot-thick reinforced concrete slab. He also stated that their geotechnical and structural engineers deemed it appropriate based on a soil analysis of the site. Commissioner Weiss expressed concern that the two- and three-bedroom floor plans do not provide storage areas beyond closets. Mr. Duncan explained that the two- and three-bedroom units would all have walk-in closets, with each closet approximately three to four times larger than a standard bedroom closet. He added that it was more important to them to provide more housing units than bigger closets. Commissioner Weiss stated her concern that residents would use the balconies as storage if not supplied adequate storage space inside the units. Mr. Duncan responded that they do not want that to happen and their other projects have not had that issue. He stated that the storage at The Flats apartments across the street is significantly underused, another reason why they believe the walk-in closets inside the units are sufficient. He added that they distributed the storage throughout the units which is more desirable and functional. Mr. Heller and Mr. Duncan further remarked that Sares Regis, as a property manager, does not allow storage on balconies. Commissioner Weiss asked how the elevators would work in the event of a power outage and Mr. Duncan answered that an emergency generator on the building's roof would supply power. Commissioner Weiss questioned why the east lobby is named such when it appears to be on the west side as depicted on page A1.3 of Attachment 5. Mr. Duncan responded that it is considered the east entrance to Building 1.

Commissioner Rheume expressed concern that the concrete columns as depicted in A2.7 in Attachment 5 are too industrial-looking and the storefronts in A2.3 are too generic, and asked if the columns could be softened and the tenant spaces designed more uniquely with different types of canopies, textures and recessed

entries. Mr. Duncan stated that the renderings provide an idea of what the storefronts could look like and the final designs are subject to the Tenant Design Guidelines and would be determined as the tenants occupy the spaces, adding that they are open to softening the columns in conjunction with staff. Assistant Director Miner clarified that the Commissioners can request specific design elements for the tenant spaces. Commissioner Rheume voiced interest in the staff and the applicant working together so that the new private street north of the project site is friendly and welcoming. Assistant Director Miner noted that Commissioner Rheume might pursue a modification that directs the applicant to submit a Miscellaneous Plan Permit for staff to review based on the Commissioners' feedback. Commissioner Rheume asked if any of the residential units would be for sale and when construction is expected to begin if the proposed project is approved. Mr. Duncan stated that all the residential units are apartments and only the ground floor commercial spaces would be condominiums and that they hope to break ground this year if the economy and other factors improve. Mr. Duncan added that construction timing for the Block 3 South and Block 3 North sites is important as their parking garages would be excavated as one. Commissioner Rheume voiced his support for a statement piece of art that improves Redwood Square, similar to the image of hippopotami in his virtual background screen. Mr. Duncan replied that they are working with the Arts Commission and they hope to provide a piece that is big, beautiful and exciting.

Chair Howard noted that he also likes the art as part of the pedestrian space in Commissioner Rheume's virtual background screen.

Vice Chair Simons asked the applicant team to address his concern about the plain appearance of the balconies and his suggestions for improving them. Vice Chair Simons asked Chair Howard how the applicant team should proceed with answering his questions if they answer while displaying slides containing new information.

Commissioner Howe asked Senior Assistant City Attorney Rebecca Moon to address his concern that members of the public would not have a chance to respond if the applicant presents new information and images about the proposed project after they have had a chance to speak. Senior Assistant City Attorney Moon stated that the Commissioners could agree to reopen the meeting to members of the public so that they could provide additional comments. Commissioner Howe agreed with Chair Howard's suggestion to allow the applicant team to share the first part of their presentation to address balconies and then finish the remaining part of their presentation after members of the public have spoken.

Vice Chair Simons added that in addition to his concerns stated earlier, he would like the applicant team to address if there would be attachment points on the gateway for hanging art, if there would be any lighting behind the mesh on the gateway, if there would be any restrictions on what is placed on the gateway glass from the interior, and if retail and information signage could be improved so that they are varied, less flat, and more visible from down the street. Mr. Duncan stated that they are open to submitting a Miscellaneous Plan Permit for Tenant Design Guidelines for commercial tenant space to ensure the final designs address Vice Chair Simons's concerns. Vice Chair Simons restated his remaining questions for the applicant team. Vice Chair Simons agreed with Commissioner Rheame that the columns and windows on the ground floor look generic and he is in favor of any different textures and recessed entries that can improve them.

Mr. Heller presented the first part of the applicant team's second presentation with additional images and information about the proposed project.

Vice Chair Simons proposed ideas for making the balconies more interesting such as shaping their undersides to match the geometric shape of the South Taaffe Street covered entrance and adding struts for aesthetic purposes. Mr. Heller stated that they can study those options and that color is a possibility for the undersides if they can maintain the overall building design. Vice Chair Simons also suggested a chain link design for the balconies' guards. Mr. Duncan agreed with Vice Chair Simons that the balconies have a subtle design and that his suggestions are worth exploring but added that any changes would be subtle so as not to detract from the park and pedestrian experience and to ensure that the building itself is the attraction. Vice Chair Simons noted that the balconies could be noticed for being too generic.

Assistant Director Miner summarized for Mr. Duncan that he believes the Commissioners are trying to maximize the tenants' amenities and improve their experience while maintaining the overall building design. Assistant Director Miner asked Commissioner Howe and Vice Chair Simons if that is the intent of their potential conditions. Commissioner Howe clarified that with regard to the number of balconies, the applicant would not be required to add more and would only be obligated to work with staff to identify opportunities to add more if feasible, with any additions approved at the staff level. Vice Chair Simons agreed that the goal is to enhance the tenant experience and commented that modern architecture looks great when the design is consistent, that some modern architecture becomes more

ornate just by the addition of balconies, and that changing architecture could become a concern with adding a lot of balconies.

Vice Chair Simons asked if the windows and window frames are flush on the corner of the building depicted on page P1.0 of Attachment 5. Mr. Heller responded that the corners are intended to be articulated with more glass and agreed that the South Taaffe Street and McKinley Avenue corner could use more articulation like the rest of the building. Vice Chair Simons confirmed with Mr. Heller that the applicant team would be open to working with staff to enhance the articulation. Vice Chair Simons stated that more visually interesting bicycle racks would significantly improve the public realm at very little cost. Assistant Director Miner stated that it might be possible to work with the Department of Public Works if the change would be limited to just the plaza. Vice Chair Simons appreciated the legal concern and commented that it does not make sense to limit consideration of the bicycle racks considering the detail with which the Commissioners review proposed projects. Assistant Director Miner stated that the Department of Public Works's adopted standard must be followed and Senior Assistant City Attorney Moon added that the bicycle racks are within that department's purview, but the Commissioners can make recommendations to that department's staff. Assistant Director Miner stated that if both he and the applicant are interested in pursuing more unique bicycle racks, then staff would commit to advocating for them with that department based on his feedback.

Chair Howard commented that he understands Redwood Square to be the focus of the site such that the building itself and the architecture exist to complement the plaza and not detract from it. He also stated he wished there was more bicycle parking in downtown, bicycle racks' functionality is more important than their aesthetics, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission is better qualified to critique bicycle racks.

Mike Serrone praised the applicant for the proposed project, voiced support for it, and commented that it might be possible to update the bicycle racks later on, that more electric vehicle charges are needed, and that it would nice if an architectural element such as the entrance overhangs could be a repeated element throughout downtown.

Janet Hamma expressed concerns about Redwood Square's Redwood trees that need plenty of water and air, the proposed project blocking light from the retailers across the street, and the likelihood of the residences being occupied during the

pandemic.

Michael Johnson, Executive Director with the Sunnyvale Downtown Association, voiced support for the proposed project and expressed that it would strengthen the downtown community.

Mr. Duncan presented additional information about the proposed project.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

Assistant Director Miner stated the potential conditions of approval regarding Tenant Design Guidelines, new street design and balconies that Commissioner Howe and Commissioner Rheume requested staff draft. Vice Chair Simons confirmed with Assistant Director Miner that the Tenant Design Guidelines motion can be modified to include opportunities for varied sign types, including projecting signs. Vice Chair Simons added that he is interested in a condition that directs staff and the applicant to work together to develop potential uses for the gateway, requires attachment points be hung in the upper part of the gateway and instructs them to explore different lighting and materials for the area.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe and Commissioner Weiss seconded the motion for Alternative 2 - Make the required Findings required to approve the CEQA determination that the project is consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan's Program Environmental Impact Report and no additional environmental review is required, and approve the Special Development Permit and Vesting Tentative Map based on Findings in Attachment 3 and Recommended Conditions of Approval in Attachment 4 subject to modified Conditions of Approval.

The modified Conditions of Approval are as follows:

1. Add a Condition of Approval to Attachment 4 regarding Tenant Design Guidelines to read as follows:

**Tenant Design Guidelines**

Applicant shall submit a Miscellaneous Plan Permit for Tenant Design Guidelines for retail and commercial tenant space to ensure final design includes uniqueness between tenants, addition of canopies and recessed entries, and different textures and opportunities for varied sign types, including projecting signs, subject to review and approval by the Director of Community Development. [COA] [Planning]

2. Add a Condition of Approval to Attachment 4 regarding new street design to read as follows:

#### New Street Design

Applicant shall submit a Miscellaneous Plan Permit for the final design of the new private street to the north of the project site to review street design, landscaping, street furniture and driveway design subject to review and approval by the Director of Community Development. [COA] [Planning]

3. Add a Condition of Approval to Attachment 4 regarding balconies to read as follows:

#### Balconies

Applicant shall work with staff to identify opportunities to maximize the number of balconies for the residential units, as long as additional balconies can be accommodated into the existing design without compromising architectural elements or structural integrity of the building. [COA] [Planning]

4. Modify Recommended Condition of Approval TM-3 in Attachment 4 to read as follows:

#### Owners Association Creation

Any Owner's Association formed by developer/Owner shall comport with the state law requirements for Common Interest Developments. Covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs) relating to the development are subject to review for consistency with the Conditions of Approval by the City Attorney and Director of Community Development prior to recordation of Condominium Map or alternative as defined in the approved DA. [COA] [Planning]

Commissioner Howe stated that he can make the findings and the proposed project has significantly improved over time, noting that the building height was determined when the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) was approved in 2020. He commended the applicant team on the proposed project, acknowledged staff's work on it, and stated that the Commissioners' modifications would improve it. Commissioner Howe expressed his thankfulness for being a part of the proposed project and stated that it would be a wonderful addition to downtown.

Commissioner Weiss stated that she is excited about the proposed project and is



looking forward to spending time in Redwood Square. She recognized the proposed project for its central location to retail and transportation, vital housing opportunities including below market rate units, porte-cochere design, striking colors and materials, and the vibrancy and life it would provide downtown. She also appreciated the design's holistic approach and CityLine's involvement. She added that it would be a great, visible symbol of the new downtown Sunnyvale and further remarked that she can make the recommended findings and hoped that the other Commissioners will also support the motion.

Chair Howard restated the motion.

Commissioner Rheume stated that he will support the motion and can make the findings and applauded the applicant team, Principal Planner Mendrin and staff on their work to improve the proposed project. He noted that he particularly likes the signature archway, how the focus is on Redwood Square where people could sit among the Redwood trees and how the top floors have been stepped back to look more like a residential building, adding that those small details make a big difference long term. He stated that because the proposed project is so large, it is still important for the staff and applicant to continue to work together on details like the storefronts and balconies. He hoped for construction to begin soon and for the final product to turn out as well as everyone hopes and he urged the Commissioners to support the motion.

Commissioner Harrison noted that her favorite aspects are the vistas created from different angles that accentuate the importance of Redwood Square and the uplifting nature of the porte-cochere which is modern art. She stated that the balconies are perfect in number, rhythm and simplicity and the focus should not be on them but instead on the people and the surrounding activity. She thanked the applicant team for their hard work as the project has evolved and stated that it is a big project beautifully done and she will support the motion.

Commissioner Olevson thanked the applicant team as the project is large and has evolved over the years. He stated that he is pleased that Redwood Square has been integrated into the proposed project with the focus on restaurants and balconies, transforming it into an essential part of downtown. He commented that he likes the overall architecture and that the applicant team documented their response to each Commissioner's comments from the Study Session. He voiced his hope that the proposed project can be built as soon as possible. Commissioner Olevson stated that he cannot find any reason not to approve the proposed project and

commented that it would blend in with the DSP and enhance downtown development. He added that he supports the project wholeheartedly.

Vice Chair Simons thanked the applicant team for their hard work as the proposed project has progressed. He stated that there are architectural elements that could be improved with consistency, projections, and revealing different shapes in the building, but he believes they would not be improved to the level he expects for downtown. He noted other issues such as his belief that downtown would have a much more transient feel with the rental units that the proposed project would supply than if downtown incorporated a mix of housing types such as townhomes and condominiums. He stated that although he supports the Redwood trees for the plaza, the site would benefit from modifications to the landscaping plan to make it more useful. He further remarked that he hopes the project turns out well and he will not support the motion.

Chair Howard stated that he will support the motion, can make the findings, and is enthusiastic about the proposed project while noting his fear that there will be another economic downturn that would halt downtown redevelopment again. He commented that he understands Redwood Square is the focus of the area and the building's architecture serves to compliment it and not upstage it. He stated that the mid-rise apartments are another type of lifestyle opportunity to serve the diverse needs of people today and the thought of living downtown near restaurants and close to public transportation appeals to him. Chair Howard appreciated Vice Chair Simons's comments on ownership versus renting in downtown and stated that larger apartment management companies often encourage residents to get involved in the community more instead of with ownership units where the landlord is often off site or absent.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes: 6 -** Chair Howard  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Olevson  
Commissioner Rheume  
Commissioner Weiss

**No: 1 -** Vice Chair Simons

Assistant Director Miner stated that this decision is final unless appealed or called up for review by the City Council within 15 days.

### **STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES**

### **NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS**

#### **-Commissioner Comments**

Vice Chair Simons asked for an update on the status of the recommendations made at the Join Meeting of City Council with Board and Commission Chairs and Vice Chairs on November 17, 2020. Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that a City Council Subcommittee will be formed to explore some of the recommendations, and he welcomed the Commissioners' feedback on anything that is within staff's ability to improve.

Commissioner Rheume asked Assistant Director Miner to provide an update on new proposed projects submitted, projects moving towards construction, and any projects that have stalled.

Chair Howard thanked Commissioner Howe for questioning the order of the applicants' presentations and comments from members of the public and asked if it is advisable to allow the downtown applicants additional time to present. Senior Assistant City Attorney Rebecca Moon stated that the Chair has discretion to allow members of the public more time to present and that it is appropriate for more complex items for consideration and that it does not set a precedent and can be considered based on the circumstances.

#### **-Staff Comments**

Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that at the next meeting on January 25, 2021 the Commissioners will rank study issues and there will be a Study Session to educate the Commissioners on staff's application review process in preparation for an upcoming appeal on a completeness item. He also gave an updated status of projects in the City and encouraged the Commissioners to participate in the next Moffett Park Specific Plan workshop on transportation and infrastructure on February 1, 2021 from 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Howard adjourned the meeting at 10:09 PM.



# City of Sunnyvale

## Agenda Item 2

---

21-0193

Agenda Date: 1/25/2021

---

### REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

#### **SUBJECT**

Selection and Ranking of Potential 2021 Study Issues

#### **REPORT**

Attached is a list of Study Issues the Planning Commission will review for 2021. The list includes:

- One (1) new CDD Study Issue; and
- Two (2) Study Issues that were deferred/below the line in 2020.

The Study Issue papers can be found on the City's website at the following link:

<https://sunnyvale.ca.gov/government/council/study/studyissues.htm>

At the hearing on January 25, 2021, the Planning Commission will recommend to the City Council whether an item should be ranked, deferred, or dropped (or "no recommendation", if so desired). The Planning Commission will then rank the items not recommended for deferral, drop, or no recommendation per the City's ranking policy. The Planning Commission's recommendations will be transmitted to the Council as input for decisions on the potential Study Issues.

Although the ranking format used in previous years will be largely followed, in lieu of each Commissioner having an individual ranking sheet to fill out independently staff will call on Commissioners to give their rankings verbally due to the virtual setting of the hearing.

The annual City Council public hearing on potential study issues and budget issues for calendar year 2021 was held on Tuesday, January 12, 2021. The City Council will rank the study/budget issues at the Council Workshop on Thursday, February 25, 2021.

Prepared by: Amber Blizinski, Principal Planner

Reviewed by: Andrew Miner, Assistant Director, Community Development Department

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. 2021 List of Study Issues

**2021 PLANNING COMMISSION  
STUDY ISSUES RANKING**

<b>STUDY ISSUE TITLE</b>	
<b>CDD 19-07</b>	<b>Develop Citywide Guidelines or Criteria for Allowing Reduced Parking for Development Projects and for Future Conversions of Parking to other Uses*</b>
<b>CDD 20-02</b>	<b>Develop Landscape Design Standards for Development Projects*</b>
<b>CDD 21-01</b>	<b>Consider Allowing Expansions/Modifications for Existing Legal Non-Conforming Single-Family Uses in Non-Residential Zoning Districts</b>