



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Monday, June 22, 2015

7:00 PM

Council Chambers and West Conference
Room, City Hall, 456 W. Olive Ave.,
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

7:00 P.M. PLANNING COMMISSION - STUDY SESSION - WEST CONFERENCE ROOM

- 1 [15-0567](#) **File #:** 2015-7264
Location: 755-777 East Evelyn Avenue (APNs: 209-01-018, -023, -024)
Zoning: M-3/ITR/R-3/PD (General Industrial/Industrial-to-Residential/Medium Density Residential/Planned Development)
Proposed Project: Related applications on a 2.05-acre site: **SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT** to construct 42 townhomes; and **VESTING TENTATIVE MAP** to subdivide two lots into 43 lots, including 42 ownership lots and one common lot.
Applicant / Owners: Classic Communities (applicant/owner)
Environmental Review: Mitigated Negative Declaration
Project Planner: George Schroeder, (408) 730-7443, gschroeder@sunnyvale.ca.gov

2 Public Comment on Study Session Agenda Items

3 Comments from the Chair

4 Adjourn Study Session

8:00 P.M. PLANNING COMMISSION - PUBLIC HEARING - COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Melton called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Chair Melton led the salute to the flag.

ROLL CALL

Present: 6 - Chair Russell Melton
Vice Chair Ken Olevson
Commissioner Ralph Durham
Commissioner Sue Harrison
Commissioner Larry Klein
Commissioner David Simons
Absent: 1 - Commissioner Ken Rheaume

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Recognition of Service

Mayor Jim Griffith presented certificates of appreciation to Comms. Durham and Simons for their volunteer service on the Planning Commission, and expressed appreciation to all the Commissioners for their service to the City.

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENTS

Comm. Klein announced that the application deadline for all City Boards and Commission openings is Friday, June 26, 2015.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1.A [15-0644](#) Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of June 8, 2015

Comm. Durham moved to approve the draft minutes. Comm. Harrison seconded. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Melton
Vice Chair Olevson
Commissioner Durham
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Klein
Commissioner Simons

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheaume

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

2 [15-0574](#)**File #:** 2015-7201**Location:** 1336 Cordilleras Avenue (APN: 323-08-059)**Zoning:** R1**Proposed Project:**

DESIGN REVIEW: To allow a new two-story single-family residence resulting in 3,877 square feet (3,462 square feet of living area and a 415 square-foot garage) and 40% FAR. The existing 1,685 square-foot one-story single-family home will be demolished.

Applicant / Owner: GP Residential Designs (applicant)/ William Schmoranc (owner)

Environmental Review: Categorical Exemption, Class 3

Project Planner: George Schroeder, (408) 730-7443,
gschroeder@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Chair Melton recused himself from this item as he owns property within 500 feet of the subject property.

George Schroeder, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Comm. Klein confirmed with Mr. Schroeder that the proposed plantings that would address the privacy issue would be in the rear yard.

Vice Chair Olevson opened the public hearing.

William Schmoranc, the project applicant, gave a presentation on the proposed project.

Comm. Klein confirmed with Mr. Schmoranc the height of the rear fence, and confirmed that the proposed trees in the rear will grow to 50 feet.

Comm. Simons confirmed with Mr. Schmoranc that the driveway will be ripped out, and discussed the planting or material that may be placed along the left between lot line and driveway. Mr. Schmoranc noted that there is a water line beneath that area and once it is located he will determine what to place there. Comm. Simons also discussed with Mr. Schmoranc the age of the home and sewer line.

Vice Chair Olevson closed the public hearing.

Comm. Durham confirmed with Mr. Schroeder that generally there are no additional Green Building points available if graywater systems are installed on properties.

Comm. Klein moved Alternative 1 to approve the Design Review with the conditions

in Attachment 6

Comm. Simons seconded.

Comm. Klein said he was able to make the findings, and that this is a good improvement compared to other neighborhoods. He said this design might have issues because of the size of the second floor and the ratio of first floor to second floor area, but that what makes this different is other homes in the neighborhood have greater ratios and the size of the lot is very large. He said we do not see many 9,600 plus square foot lots unless it is being subdivided, and having the original owner invest in an original home in Sunnyvale is a positive thing. He applauded the applicant for looking at how it fits in with the community, for working with staff on the issues and making the job of the Planning Commission easy. Comm. Klein added that he looks forward to the project moving forward.

Comm. Simons offered a friendly amendment for the stone veneer to wrap around the sides of the house to meet the fence.

Comm. Klein accepted.

Comm. Simons said the applicant triggered the requirement for a public hearing, but that this is a relatively easy project to support and he can make findings.

Comm. Durham said he can make the findings, that this new house will be an improvement over what is there already and will bring up the value of the property and the lifestyle of the applicant. He said the only thing he is concerned with is the privacy issue, especially on the second floor, the walls of which look like solid masses. He said there could be some way of using window treatments to allow more light in during the day as the windows get to be cave-like and result in using more electricity. He recommended this be kept in mind for future buildings, and said he can make the findings and wished the applicant luck.

Vice Chair Olevson commended the owner for keeping the home through multi-generations and improving the property. He said not too long ago this Commission approved a new development and found that the owners were very active during the outreach process to help shape the neighborhood and keep it one that is very attractive in Sunnyvale. He said he will be supporting the motion, and that he is pleased with all of the work the applicant has done in terms of design and working with the neighbors to help enhance Sunnyvale.

MOTION: Comm. Klein moved Alternative 2 to approve the Design Review with a

modified condition:

1) The stone veneer shall wrap around the sides of the house to meet the fence.

Comm. Simons seconded. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Vice Chair Olevson
Commissioner Durham
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Klein
Commissioner Simons

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheaume

Recused: 1 - Chair Melton

3

[15-0580](#)**File #:** 2014-7624**Location:** 1026 Lois Avenue (APN: 198-34-011)**Zoning:** R-0**Proposed Project:**

DESIGN REVIEW to allow construction of a new two-story home with a total floor area of 2,993 square feet (2,566 square feet living area and a 427-square foot garage) resulting in 49.8% floor area ratio (FAR) for review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Applicant / Owner: BO Design (applicant) / Haiyan Gong (owner)**Environmental Review:** A Class 1 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from California Environmental Quality Act provisions and City Guidelines.**Project Planner:** Shétal Divatia, (408) 730-7637, sdivatia@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Gerri Caruso , Principal Planner, presented the staff report.

Chair Melton discussed with Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, whether the City Council motion limits anything within Planning Commission purview tonight.

Comm. Harrison verified with Ms. Caruso that all findings have been met for this project, and confirmed that an air conditioner can be placed in the back if it meets setback requirements. Ms. Ryan added that the adjacent neighbor requested the unit be relocated due to potential noise concerns.

Vice Chair Olevson confirmed with Ms. Caruso that the homeowner would have to meet the noise standard of the Municipal Code with regard to placement of the air conditioner.

Comm. Klein clarified the noise ordinance with Ms. Caruso, and confirmed with Ms. Ryan when the staff report was available on the City webpage.

Chair Melton opened the public hearing.

Frank Gong, the project applicant, gave a presentation on the proposed project.

Comm. Simons discussed with Mr. Gong whether obscure glass was considered for use on the north window in the stairway.

Annie Shiau, a nearby Sunnyvale resident, discussed her opposition to the proposed project.

Robert Nuttall, a nearby Sunnyvale resident, discussed his opposition to the proposed project.

Lorraine Nishikawa, a nearby Sunnyvale resident, discussed her opposition to the proposed project.

Mary Perkins, a nearby Sunnyvale resident, discussed her opposition to the proposed project.

Ava Mokhber, a nearby Sunnyvale resident, discussed her opposition to the proposed project.

Paul Clark, a nearby Sunnyvale resident, discussed his opposition to the proposed project.

Chair Melton confirmed with Mr. Clark the location of his home and that the air conditioner would not be adjacent to his home.

Comm. Simons verified with Mr. Clark that the window in the stairway was not a concern of his.

Chair Melton called Ms. Mokhber back to the podium.

Comm. Simons confirmed with Ms. Mokhber that obscured glass address the concern about the window in the stairway, and Ms. Mokhber added that the structure and design of the home create an invasion of privacy.

Jeanne Waldmann, a nearby Sunnyvale resident, discussed her opposition to the proposed project.

Mr. Gong addressed the neighbors' concerns.

Chair Melton closed the public hearing.

Comm. Harrison and Ms. Ryan discussed a typical percentage of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for a two-story home, and Comm. Harrison asked what the FAR of the home would be without the garage. Ms. Caruso said staff would calculate it and respond shortly.

Comm. Simons moved Alternative 2 to approve the Design Review with modified conditions:

- 1) Correct the project data table and change the height of the structure from 24'4" to 23'4";
- 2) The veneer brick on the home shall extend to meet the fence on the sides of the house;
- 3) The selection of box trees shall be long lived, large scale species;
- 4) The applicant has the option of adding the window on the north side of the stairwell if the glass is obscured;
- 5) The applicant has the option to place the HVAC condenser on the side yard and must meet noise requirements.

Comm. Durham seconded.

Comm. Simons said the main goal for the neighborhood is being consistent, that the City has gone through a process over ten years creating the Design Guidelines for situations similar to this in which homes were built to the maximum in Eichler and single-story neighborhoods. He said the characters of the homes were disruptive and applicants made changes like adding more plantings to regain privacy, and that in response to these conflicts the City created the single story overlay so neighborhoods could be restricted to single stories. He said the Design Guidelines were created to minimize bulk while allowing homeowners to expand their homes and stay in the City, and said he understands that individuals have issues with this particular design and that even though the applicant has come before the Planning Commission multiple times modifying every step of the way to better meet the Design Guidelines, the neighborhood does not feel comfortable with it. He said he heard a lot of discussion about restricting this particular project but nothing about how to restrict the neighborhood as a whole, and that it is not an issue of personality but is always about the use. He said if there is a character in a particular part of the City that should be the reason for asking the City for restrictions that would apply specifically to that neighborhood, and that for Eichlers a single story overlay was applied for that. He stated he cannot deny an applicant who made all the modifications to reduce the second story and then say it still does not meet the character of the neighborhood. He noted the concern about house sizes increasing, and said generally when people expand their homes they stay within the intent of the neighborhood. He said this neighborhood has a unique character with houses smaller and closer in size to one another, but that it has had the ability to add on second stories, which has been done in different parts and that those homes are now grandfathered in. He said many of them could not be developed today, and he recommends the neighbors consider what it is that is unique about the neighborhood and what it should look like. He said it is inappropriate to single out one project because of perceived incompatibility and that many things have been done to reduce the bulking of this house which is not

the same house that was originally brought before the Planning Commission.

Comm. Durham said he will be supporting the motion, that the applicant came up with good plan and fine tuned it a lot. He stated that he was not thrilled with the first plan, that a lot has been corrected and the size and mass has been dropped. He said the project falls well within all of the guidelines except the FAR, that he can support having the air conditioner on the side of the house if it meets noise standards which should not be problem because the neighbor could put up the same thing if installing a replacement unit. He noted that the the biggest drawback is the second floor and by comparing plans to the neighbors the second story will be 50 percent of one story higher than existing houses and if it is within all of the setbacks and the size for second story fits in the Design Guidelines and does not raise the roof too high, the view angles out from the neighbors will not be impeded.

Comm. Klein said he will be supporting the motion, that we are here to comply with the Design Guidelines and rules of the City, and that the FAR is just a threshold for Planning Commission review, not a limit as to what the homeowner can build. He noted that there are other two-story homes on Lois, that the applicant has worked to improve the privacy issues and the modifications of the motion will help to address those. He said the biggest issue that has been improved is the plate height, which is now similar down the street, and that he can support the motion and make the findings. He said when he denied the project the first time and approved it the second time he suggested the neighbors continue to look at doing a single story overlay district, which would mean going to the neighbors to get signatures and putting together money to put into law that only single story homes can be built in the area. He said he hopes the neighbors can work with the applicant and hopes the applicant reaches out, and that while he understands that the applicant is trying to build his dream home, it does collide with the neighborhood. He said the guidelines we follow give us the maximum size goals and the FAR from first to second story, that this design meets that and the applicant has tried to improve it with Council direction, therefore he is supporting the project.

Vice Chair Olevson said he will be supporting the motion, that when he saw the project the last time he did not support it, but he feels the applicant has come a great length to meet the intent and letter of various design criteria imposed on projects of this type. He said it is not the Commission's job to set policy as is done by the City Council, and in looking at the policy they have set this applicant has done a good job of meeting the criteria. He noted that the neighborhood is in transition with two-story homes coming in and around it, and that most people living in Sunnyvale do not realize what can happen in a given zoning area until it starts happening and it is too late. He encouraged neighbors to pursue the single story

overlay if they feel strongly enough before further changes occur, and that if a majority of neighbors do not support the change, the Design Guidelines and other policies in place now are ones we must live with.

Comm. Harrison said she will be supporting the motion, that she appreciates the impassioned view points of the public and the applicant, but that there is no way for her to not grant the applicant his desires because he has met every single rule. She said the neighbors asked how the Commissioners would feel if this were happening in their neighborhood, and that if it were her she would want to get approval for her project if she met every rule.

Chiar Melton said he will be supporting the motion, that this is the fourth public hearing on this project and that what he regrets the most is that he did not make himself clearer when the project came to the Planning Commission in the Spring and feedback was provided to the applicant. He said the Design Review was declined in October and then came back in March and was approved and he realizes he did not make it clear that even though the square footage remained largely the same it was the reallocation of square footage from the second to the first floor that was the tipping point for him. He echoed what the other Commissioners have said about the single story overlay and he does not know if anything would have been different if there was forward motion made on the single story overlay between public hearings, but that he sees all of the energy from the neighbors and hopes it can be used to plow forward on the signatures and dollars required for the single story overlay district. He said that is the legislative action you have to take to achieve the vision the neighbors are expressing to the Planning Commission. He said the applicant has been difficult, that Councilmember Davis expressed feelings he would agree with but that this is about following policy and the applicant has made many changes to the design, which started with something that absolutely did not pass but is a totally different project now. He said people may say the Planning Commission is coming to the wrong judgment but it is one that has to be made. He thanked the applicant for his passion, the neighbors for coming out to speak four times and thanked the City Council who spent three hours on a public hearing for this project.

MOTION: Comm. Simons moved Alternative 2 to approve the Design Review with modified conditions:

- 1) Correct the project data table and change the height of the structure from 24'4" to 23'4";
- 2) The veneer brick on the home shall extend to meet the fence on the sides of the house;
- 3) The selection of box trees shall be long lived, large scale species;

- 4) The applicant has the option of adding the window on the north side of the stairwell if the glass is obscured;
- 5) The applicant has the option to place the HVAC condenser on the side yard and must meet noise requirements.

Comm. Durham seconded. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Melton
Vice Chair Olevson
Commissioner Durham
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Klein
Commissioner Simons

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheume

4

[15-0531](#)**File #:** 2014-7900**Location:** 625-627 E. Taylor Ave. (APNs: 205-29-006 and 205-29-007)

Proposed Project: Related applications on a 0.9-acre site:
SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT for 20 townhome-style condominiums and site improvements, including a request to deviate from side yard and distance between buildings requirements; and
VESTING TENTATIVE MAP to create one common lot and 20 condominiums.

Applicant / Owner: 627 Taylor LLC**Environmental Review:** Mitigated Negative Declaration**Project Planner:** Rosemarie Zulueta, (408) 730-7437, rzulueta@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Rosemarie Zulueta, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Comm. Harrison confirmed with Gerri Caruso, Principal Planner, that a Climate Action Plan (CAP) checklist is included with Mitigated Negative Declarations and Negative Declarations, and discussed item EC 2.2 on the CAP checklist regarding requiring energy efficient siting of buildings. Ms. Caruso said the applicant would discuss proposed landscaping with regard to siting. Comm. Harrison and Ms. Caruso also discussed item CTO 1.3 regarding cross-parcel access and whether it is possible to achieve with this site and the adjacent Mid-Pen site. Comm. Harrison confirmed with Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, that current City standards allow six foot sidewalk widths so people can walk side by side, and confirmed with Ms. Caruso that the buildings on this site are the same height and will create no issue regarding shading buildings on site.

Comm. Klein confirmed with Ms. Zulueta that fire code restricts the height of the proposed planters at the front of the property, and Ms. Zulueta noted that the applicant's landscape architect could answer additional questions about the plantings. Comm. Klein discussed with Ms. Zulueta the color of the garage doors and the requested deviation for the setback.

Chair Melton said he is happy to see the number of projects going up on Taylor Avenue, and confirmed with Ms. Zulueta that this project is required to underground one of the two utility poles across the street from the subject site. Chair Melton also confirmed with Ms. Zulueta that vapor barrier installation is required for this project.

Comm. Durham and Ms. Ryan discussed future plans to mitigate traffic impacts on Fair Oaks Avenue.

Comm. Simons verified with Ms. Zulueta that the proposed driveway will be pervious.

Comm. Melton opened the public hearing.

Bob Iwerson, the project applicant, gave a presentation on the proposed project and answered several Commissioner questions.

Comm. Harrison confirmed with Mr. Iwerson the color of the score joints and that the lap siding is a wood element.

Comm. Klein confirmed with Kevin Levesque, Landscape Architect, the types of plantings proposed for the site.

Comm. Simons verified with Mr. Levesque the materials for the pervious drive aisle and sidewalks and discussed the species and locations of the larger trees proposed for the site.

Comm. Klein discussed with Mr. Iwerson the color and composition of the garage doors.

Chair Melton verified with Mr. Iwerson that exiting and entering through the den on the ground floor is not possible, and discussed the reason that space was not planned as a fourth bedroom.

Mr. Iwerson addressed the concern about water treatment, and Mr. Levesque discussed the goals of the outdoor living spaces and landscaping water usage.

Comm. Harrison and Mr. Iwerson discussed the potential for approaching Mid-Pen regarding cross-parcel access.

Samir Sharma, property owner, said that after review of cross-parcel access, he would consider having that conversation with Mid-Pen.

Comm. Harrison moved Alternative 2 to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Special Development Permit and Vesting Tentative Map with a modified condition:

1) The applicant is encouraged to approach the neighboring property owners to the north regarding the provision of cross-parcel access and a linkage from the subject property to the park

Comm. Simons seconded.

Comm. Harrison said the Sunnyvale vision encourages projects to have a slightly different look from one another, and that although there are projects on same street of a similar size and type, this project accomplishes a different look with a very modern, young and high quality appearance with regard to the score joints, the stainless look and translucent garage doors. She said the applicant has done a good job having a palatable driveway entrance that is not just solid walls and having different planes, although they are only offset a few inches. She said the project meets the findings even with the deviations for the smaller building to building sizes.

Comm. Simons offered a friendly amendment to modify BP-10 regarding Green Point Rating to allow the additional five feet in building height that requires a minimum of 110 points on the Green Point Rated checklist.

Comm. Harrison accepted.

Comm. Simons offered a friendly amendment to recommend staff and the applicant review the tree species selection and use another low water oak rather than the *Quercus suber*.

Comm. Harrison accepted.

Comm. Simons said he will be supporting the project, that he likes the look of it and does not have strong opinion about the garage doors and thinks they may work. He said while he was looking at the panels and colors he thought that firestone would have higher performance roofing material that could be used. He said updated modern architecture that is true to the look is really nice and will become very popular, and added that he can make all the findings.

Comm. Klein offered a friendly amendment to have the applicant and/or the Director of Community Development review the color and design of the garage doors to add variety.

Comms. Harrison and Simons accepted.

Comm. Klein said he will be supporting the motion, and that it is good to see how the project has developed. He applauded the developer for listening to Commissioner comments by first improving the elevations and adding more variety, looking at the color scheme, stone enhancements and porous concrete, which we

do not see often. He said the developer is looking for ways to improve the project and has made a good project overall, that the deviations are only at the higher level so they have met the spirit of what we are achieving here and noted that the inter-building setbacks are a common deviation as we deal with the sites in this area. He applauded the applicant for filling in this neighborhood, which is in transition, and said the site will become much better and will add to the community and help the view of how the neighborhood sees itself. He said removing one of the last industrial sites along this street will make it more of a community and that the project has a unique design. He noted that we often get similar architecture side by side and added that he looks forward to the project moving forward and that he can make the findings.

Vice Chair Olevson said he will be supporting the motion, that he can make the finding that the project meets the General Plan and cannot make the negative findings that would preclude approving this project. He thanked the applicant for listening to the Planning Commission during the study session, and said his first impression of the first iteration was this was something out of a 1960s song being tacky tacky. He said he recognizes that the applicant is trying to do something different in this area, and that the modifications made will make the project the contrast with other projects going in. He applauded the color and elevation changes as they will add to existing projects and will be a nice connector to newer projects to the north, so he will be voting to approve the project.

Comm. Durham said he will be supporting the motion and can make the findings. He said he likes the overall plan, that this is a good product that will be an enhancement to the neighborhood. He said he likes the way the front end is being treated and the breakup of the back, and said he hopes there will be a good set of trees in the back to provide privacy, cooling and shading for the units.

Chair Melton said he will be supporting the motion and can make the findings to approve the Special Development Permit and not make negative findings that would disqualify the Tentative Map. He thanked the applicant for the nice parcelization, which he likes to see because gives developers a bigger turf area to work with. He appreciates the applicant's work since the study session which shows they listened to Commissioner comments and said we are ending up in a good position. He said sometimes a project is not only about what is going into a parcel but it is also about the prior use that will not be there anymore, which will come a long way to stitching together a neighborhood and bringing it closer to completion, so removing the old industrial uses are positive. He said he is comfortable with the minor deviations requested which make good sense and is not a difficult thing to approve.

MOTION: Comm. Harrison moved Alternative 2 to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Special Development Permit and Vesting Tentative Map with modified conditions:

- 1) The applicant is encouraged to approach the neighboring property owners to the north regarding the provision of cross parcel access and a linkage from the subject property to the park;
- 2) Modify BP-10 regarding Green Point Rating to allow the additional five feet in building height that requires a minimum of 110 points on the Green Point Rated checklist;
- 3) Recommend staff and the applicant review the tree species selection and use another low water oak rather than the *Quercus suber*; and,
- 4) The applicant and/or the Director of Community Development review the color and design of the garage doors to add variety.

Comm. Simons seconded. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Melton
Vice Chair Olevson
Commissioner Durham
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Klein
Commissioner Simons

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheume

- 5 [15-0389](#) Approve the Parking Structure Design Guidelines for Projects in All Zoning Districts and Find that the project is exempt under CEQA pursuant to Guidelines 15060(3) and 15378(b)(5) (Study Issue)

Stephanie Skangos, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Comm. Klein discussed with Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, wrapping art around garage structures and potentially using it to satisfy art in private development requirements. Comm. Klein and Ms. Ryan also discussed the type of materials used for wrapping art on the exterior of a building, and confirmed that item three under the Bike Parking section specifying the type of bike rack to be used should have been removed.

Comm. Harrison confirmed with staff that the phrase "should be" which appears throughout the draft document means variations could occur with merit, and discussed with Ms. Ryan the reason pedestrian access points should be minimized. Comm. Harrison confirmed with Ms. Ryan that the 15 foot landscaped setback between office park above grade parking structures and adjacent public streets is a requirement.

Chair Melton noted that he supports removal of the third paragraph of the Bike Parking section, and discussed with Ms. Ryan the potential reasons that full below grade parking may not be feasible.

Chair Melton opened the public hearing, and upon seeing no speakers for this item, closed the public hearing.

Comm. Klein moved to recommend to City Council Alternative 1 to find that the project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15060(c)(3) and 15378(b)(5), and Alternative 3 to Approve the Parking Structure Design Guidelines with modifications:

- 1) Remove number 3 under the Bike Parking section; and,
- 2) Have staff investigate a proposal to add large scale art and colored materials to wrap the side of the parking structures

Comm. Simons seconded.

Comm. Klein noted that he proposed this issue not too long ago, is surprised by how quickly this issue moved forward, and said he is happy that City Council saw this as a requirement. He said parking structures are too often the after thought of design and that although we see the final plans of a project, the rest is left to the Director of Community Development and we never get an idea of the relationship

between the structure and design of the buildings. He applauded staff for how quickly this issue has moved forward, and said it will hopefully help developers, the Planning Commission and City Council resolve issues before they happen in the future. He noted that the guidelines would have prevented some of the issues seen around the City today, and that this is a great step toward trying to codify or give guidelines for what is a good design. He said it captured all of the issues brought up by the Planning Commission, that staff laid them all out well, and that he looks forward to Council approving this and making it part of a standard package of guidelines. He recommended Council get a colored version of the report, and said that once it is in place we will have better community with projects that require parking structures.

Comm. Simons offered a friendly amendment to add the noise and security sections in the Report to Council.

Comm. Klein accepted.

Comm. Simons noted that grammatical and format corrections suggested by staff should be changed, and Comm. Klein agreed.

Comm. Simons offered a friendly amendment to minimize auto ingress and egress as appropriate, and add wording that pedestrian access should be designed for safe access and designing pedestrian access to not rely on walking in auto travel lanes

Comm. Klein accepted.

Comm. Simons requested keeping item 3 of the Bike Parking section with language that encourages a variety of bike rack options that could become part of the art in public space consideration.

Comm. Klein accepted.

Comm. Durham said he supports the motion, and that it is a great document. He applauded the amendment regarding bike racks and said he would like to see people who have bikes help make a determination about whether certain types of bike racks are useful or not for locking up bikes, and that he has seen a fair number of racks that look nice but he has no idea how they really work with regard to securing bikes properly. He said new guidelines will be useful as less time will be spent during meetings discussing what developments need in terms of parking structures. He said with mixed use developments we allow mixed parking and he

would like to see in the future developments that do not use the full amount normally used for apartments and office because at different times of the day when there is much office use of parking residents will be out of their apartments, which can reduce the size and bulk of the parking structure.

Vice Chair Olevson said he will be supporting the motion, and that as part of the motion we have asked staff to look at a variety of additional items before finalizing the report and sending it to Council. He said he supports the concept of having art on the side of a building but that it may conflict with a recommendation that was added after the last study session in which the Commission suggested that parking structures should be consistent in format and look of the building it is supporting. He said if the main building does not have art work and the parking structure does it will stand out, so he encourages the addition of wording that explains that the two are not mutually exclusive. He added that staff has done an excellent job of incorporating comments from seven people, each with varying ideas on how the City ought to be structured.

Chair Melton said he will be supporting the motion, that staff has done a great job, and he commended Comm. Klein for putting this forth as a study issue, which exhibits great leadership. He said looking at the projects on Weddell and Fair Oaks were the first signals that we needed design guidelines, and he highlighted language from the Design Guidelines that says parking structures are expected to be more than utilitarian boxes, which was a key sentence for him. He said too often we have seen utilitarian boxes where the developer has run out of ideas, energy or money after building the big thing that they wanted to build which is the office or the housing development and the parking structure becomes an after thought. He said this draft is a great effort by staff and the consultant to synergize a lot of information from various sources and come out with a high quality document. He added that he hopes City Council has good time reviewing this document.

MOTION: Comm. Klein moved Alternative 1 to find that the project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15060(c)(3) and 15378(b)(5), and Alternative 3 to Approve the Parking Structure Design Guidelines with modifications:

- 1) Staff investigate a proposal to add large scale art and colored materials to wrap the side of the parking structures;
- 2) Addition of the noise and security sections in the Report to Council;
- 3) Minimize auto ingress and egress as appropriate, and add wording that pedestrian access should be designed for safe access and designing pedestrian access to not rely on walking in auto travel lanes; and,
- 4) Encourage a variety of bike rack options that could become part of the art in public space consideration.

Comm. Simons seconded. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Melton
Vice Chair Olevson
Commissioner Durham
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Klein
Commissioner Simons

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheaume

6 [15-0645](#) **Standing Item:** Potential Study Issues for 2016

Comm. Simons suggested a potential study issue to create web and mobile capabilities that allow the public to review previous project plans and view and report roadway information. Ms. Ryan said an interactive map to view pending and approved projects is currently being developed and will be available soon.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

-Commissioner Comments

Comm. Durham said it has been an entertaining time on the Planning Commission, and thanked the City for helping him further his goal of pushing the City in a direction he thinks is best. He noted that the Mayor stated that the Commission works for no pay, but he feels he is paid by having a better City. He thanked staff for their hard work and patience bringing him up to speed and educating him on the City, and thanked his fellow Commissioners for their work and commitment. He also thanked the City Council for trusting him to be up on the dais, and thanked the public, especially those who take the time to come and speak during public hearings.

Chair Melton said he gives props to City staff, that he attended the ground breaking for Fire Station 5 and through the land swap agreement managed by City staff, Sunnyvale will be getting a new fire station that will have a training room and gun range, that we will be getting a new fire engine and new road that hopefully will help untie the knot of the Mathilda and Highway 237 underpass. He said it is worth noting all of the work staff put into making this deal happen.

-Staff Comments

Ms. Ryan thanked Comm. Durham for his service. She noted that there is a shared parking provision in the zoning code so that the total amount of parking can be reduced when you have two uses on the same site, which addresses Comm. Durham's earlier concern. She also discussed several items that City Council will consider at the next Council meeting.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business Chair Melton adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 11:24 p.m.