



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

Monday, October 26, 2020

7:00 PM

Telepresence Meeting: City Web Stream |
Comcast Channel 15

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: 6 - Chair Daniel Howard
Vice Chair David Simons
Commissioner Sue Harrison
Commissioner John Howe
Commissioner Ken Olevson
Commissioner Carol Weiss
Absent: 1 - Commissioner Ken Rheume

Commissioner Rheume's absence is excused.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

CONSENT CALENDAR

Commissioner Howe asked staff if the request for continuance to a date uncertain for Agenda Item 1.B is so that the applicant does not have to pay additional fees. Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that the purpose is to give the applicant more time to modify the proposal which could change the staff recommendation from denial to approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Commissioner Olevson seconded the

motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Howard
Vice Chair Simons
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Howe
Commissioner Olevson
Commissioner Weiss

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheume

1.A [20-0912](#) Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of October 12, 2020

1.B [20-0909](#) **CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 12, 2020**
REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE TO A DATE UNCERTAIN
Proposed Project: General Plan Amendment Initiation request to consider amending the General Plan designation from Commercial to Low Density Residential for the northwest portion of the site.
Location: 1689 S. Wolfe Road (APN: 309-51-028)
File #: 2020-7436
Zoning: C-1 (Neighborhood Business)/PD (Planned Development)
General Plan: Commercial
Applicant / Owner: PSR Development Inc. (applicant and owner)
Environmental Review: The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(a).
Project Planner: Kelly Cha, (408) 730-7408, kcha@sunnyvale.ca.gov

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

2. [20-0910](#) **Proposed Project:** Related application on a 5,617 square foot site:
 DESIGN REVIEW to allow a 197 square foot first floor addition and 864 square foot second floor addition (1,061 square foot total) to an existing one-story single-family home, resulting in 2,818 square feet (2,434 square foot living and 384 square foot garage) and 50% floor area ratio.
Location: 1235 Pecos Way (APN:104-27-009)
File #: 2019-7599
Zoning: Low Density Residential (R-0)
Applicant / Owner: Dennis Schafer (applicant) / Kevin and Jeanna Lurie (owner)

Environmental Review: Projects which are disapproved are exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (CEQA Section 15270).

Project Planner: Cindy Hom, (408) 730-7411,
Chom@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Associate Planner Cindy Hom shared the staff report with a slide presentation.

Commissioner Howe asked Associate Planner Hom if the nearby two-story homes would be approved today if reviewed using the current Single Family Home Design Techniques guidelines. Associate Planner Hom responded that staff would most likely not approve them and would require a design consistent with the current design guidelines. Associate Planner Hom emphasized that the design guidelines promote neighborhood compatibility and harmonious design and protect neighbors from homes that are out of scale and character with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Harrison asked staff if the applicant is aware that the proposed project must meet strict, objective design guidelines. Assistant Director Andrew Miner clarified that the objective standards required for other projects do not apply to single family homes. Associate Planner Hom added that staff met with the applicant and reviewed multiple resubmittals to try and achieve a design that meets the guidelines, but the homeowners were ultimately insistent on the current design.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Jeanna and Kevin Lurie, homeowners, and Dennis Shafer, applicant and Architect, presented information about the proposed project.

Commissioner Harrison asked Mr. Shafer if he understands that the Commission must make the necessary findings to approve the proposed project. Mr. Shafer stated that the home next door and other homes in the neighborhood have side entries; they tried to reduce the second story area; they would use wood and stucco, the same materials as the existing home; and their design has a front balcony, two-story wall, and the same roof pitch similar to a newly constructed home at 1180 Blazingwood Drive. Commissioner Harrison asked Mr. Shafer if they submitted different designs that met certain design guidelines such as a second floor with an area no greater than 35% of the first floor and the addition pushed to the rear instead of the front of the home with setbacks at the front and on the sides. Mr. Shafer responded that they did not explore those options due to cost and the homeowners' needs and design preference. Commissioner Harrison asked Mr. Shafer if her understanding is correct that he does not agree with the findings that

must be met and that he did not attempt to create designs that were consistent with the design guidelines. He stated that he tried to make the plans work with the design guidelines, but it was not possible, further remarking that home design is his area of expertise and the guidelines are not requirements. Mrs. Lurie added that her proposed project would improve the neighborhood and that her family needs the extra space and wants to remain in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Weiss commented that the Commission is concerned with how second stories are designed and the Commissioners are sympathetic to the Luries' need for a larger home. Commissioner Weiss asked Mr. Shafer to confirm the percentage of solar shading on the neighbors' homes. Mr. Shafer answered that the next-door home would be shaded 9.3% during sunset and the other next-door home would be shaded 6.9% in the morning. Commissioner Weiss confirmed with Mr. Shafer that according to the first floor plan, the backyard is behind Bedroom 1 and there is 11 feet between the back wall of the family room and the rear property line. Commissioner Weiss asked if it is possible to replace the den with a bedroom and move the den behind Bedroom 1 so that Bedroom 3 on the second floor over the garage would not be needed, effectively pushing back the second story. Mr. and Mrs. Lurie expressed concern for windows, egress and ingress, and a reduction in their yard space with the configuration. Commissioner Weiss commented on the possibility of keeping the porch and relocating the balcony to the back of the house and asked how the neighbors feel about the proposed project. Mr. Lurie answered that his neighbors are aware and not opposed to it.

Vice Chair Simons asked Mr. Shafer to comment on the circular window on the exterior wall that in his opinion is not typical mid-century architecture. Mr. Shafer responded that the element is a nice form that brings light into the home and that he strived to create a design that is more modern but incorporates elements that are reminiscent of the home's history. Vice Chair Simons stated his concern for homes that have additions that are not similar to each other and are evident of the era in which they were built. Vice Chair Simons also commented that the design guidelines have become more restrictive over time and have made second story setbacks more difficult to achieve on narrower lots. Mr. Lurie added that homeowners value expanding their homes as properties in Sunnyvale are expensive.

Commissioner Olevson asked Mr. Shafer why the second story is not set back on the east side of the home and not set back five to ten feet in the front consistent with the design guidelines. Mr. Shafer stated that the eastern side is not set back because the structural changes would be costly and the side yard setback is more

than ten feet and the front is not set back more because the homeowners did not want the kitchen affected and want to live in the home as long as possible during construction.

Associate Planner Hom reminded the Commissioners that the Recommended Conditions of Approval in Attachment 4 includes a list of changes that staff recommends. She added that the homeowners are entitled to propose an addition, but staff does not recommend approval of the current design because it is inconsistent with the design guidelines. Assistant Director Miner clarified that staff is only concerned about the design of the addition and not that an addition has been proposed.

Chair Howard honored Commissioner Howe's request to question staff during the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Howe asked staff about the specifics of the single family home project at 1180 Blazingwood Drive as it could potentially influence this proposed project. Assistant Director Miner stated that 1180 Blazingwood Drive is 1,500 feet from the proposed project. Principal Planner Noren Caliva-Lepe stated that construction was completed in December 2019 and the project was a first story addition and a new second story of 940 square feet and was approved at the staff level with a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 44.9%. Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe clarified that the Commission must review any project that exceeds 45% FAR.

Mr. Shafer shared additional information about the proposed project.

Commissioner Harrison confirmed with Assistant Director Miner that it is possible to continue the proposed project to another meeting to allow the applicant time to submit redesigned plans without paying another fee. Assistant Director Miner added that it would be helpful for the Commission to give staff and the applicant direction on the necessary modifications. Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe suggested that the Commissioners use Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2 that lists staff's recommended changes as guidelines for providing staff and the applicant direction.

Commissioner Howe asked staff if it is better to continue the proposed project to a date certain or a date uncertain. Assistant Director Miner stated that a continuance to a date uncertain is similar to a denial and recommended continuing it to a date certain of December 14, 2020.

Chair Howard obliged Commissioner Howe's request to ask the applicant if they are amenable to a continuance date of December 14, 2020.

Mr. Lurie and Mr. Shafer agreed to a continuance date of December 14, 2020.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Commissioner Harrison seconded the motion to continue the proposed project to the December 14, 2020 meeting to allow staff and the applicant more time to work together to address staff's recommended modifications to the project plans as listed in Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2.

Commissioner Howe stated that the Commissioners should encourage the homeowners' efforts to expand their home and stay in the neighborhood and agreed with staff that the proposed project cannot be approved with its current design. He directed Mr. Shafer and the homeowners to work with staff to return to the Commission with a modified design that meets the design guidelines and benefits the neighborhood.

Commissioner Harrison appreciated the homeowners' desire to expand and remain living in the city. She stated that she can only make one of the ten recommended findings which prevents her from approving the proposed project as presented. She agreed with all of staff's recommended changes in Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2, commenting that the 1180 Blazingwood Drive home has a second to first floor ratio below 35%, that the second story can be set back from the front an additional five to ten feet without interfering with the kitchen, that the second story plate height should be no greater than eight feet, and that the east elevation should have a symmetrical gable to reduce the height.

Commissioner Olevson stated that he will support the motion and agreed with Commissioner Harrison's assessment of the proposed project's areas for improvement. Commissioner Olevson explained that the City Council-approved design guidelines establish development requirements and the Commission's goal is to approve as many projects within those requirements or very close to them. He stated his concern with the two-story exterior wall and although the home at 1180 Blazingwood Drive does not look dramatically different, he stated he cannot approve the proposed project because of the information staff provided about that home and because he cannot make the findings. He further remarked that he hopes Mr.

Shafer and the homeowner will submit a design that meets the guidelines, recognizing that the new design will most likely increase the cost of their proposed project.

Vice Chair Simons commented that he believes the front door does not need to face the front of the home although it is desirable and recognized that it is difficult to expand on a smaller lot and be the first on the block to redevelop when the general requirement is to respect the neighborhood's existing character. Vice Chair Simons stated that he agrees with staff that the second floor appears larger than the first floor from the front and recommended slightly raising the garage roof to correct the floors' scales. He remarked that he believes the second story located closer to the front of the home works and commented that when second stories are moved back they can create privacy issues for neighbors. He further remarked that he will support the motion and hoped that the redesign meets the guidelines but maintains its mid-century architecture, adding that the home would be a great addition to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Weiss recognized the Luries' needs and stated her appreciation for the front porch. She stated that she cannot support the proposed project and she cannot make the findings as the design is inconsistent with the development standards. She stated that she looks forward to a revised design that addresses the suggested changes in Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2, adding that the design guidelines are not intended to promote designs that lack individuality and that adhering to the guidelines would ultimately increase the home's value.

Commissioner Howe asked Assistant Director Miner for staff to share with Mr. Shafer and the Luries the Final Conditions of Approval for 1180 Blazingwood Drive as well as the communication between staff and that applicant. He also asked staff to include the communication in the December 14, 2020 staff report. Assistant Director Miner agreed.

Chair Howard stated that he will support the motion and recognized that it can be difficult to determine how to develop within the design guidelines, mentioning that the design guidelines may be more difficult to work with for the smaller homes on smaller lots in northern Sunnyvale. He stated his support for a forward-facing front entrance and commented that it is worth considering the second floor located towards the front since the home is already set back towards the rear of the lot. He added that he is pleased that the proposed project will be continued instead of denied.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Chair Howard
Vice Chair Simons
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Howe
Commissioner Olevson
Commissioner Weiss

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheume

Assistant Director Miner requested that Mr. Shafer and the Luries work closely and quickly with staff in anticipation of the December 14, 2020 meeting. He stated that the proposed project will be continued to the December 14, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

3. [20-0763](#) **Proposed Project: Peery Park Plan Review Permit** to construct two five-story office/R&D buildings totaling 391,131 square feet in floor area and 100% floor area ratio (FAR), and a six-level parking structure.
Location: 888 Ross Drive (APNs: 110-07-035, 036)
File #: 2019-7860
Zoning: Peery Park Specific Plan/Innovation Edge (PPSP/IE)
Applicant / Owner: Perry Hariri / STP Property LLC
Environmental Review: The project is exempt from CEQA review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 (c)(2) and Public Resources Code Section 21094 (c). The project is within the scope of the Peery Park Specific Plan Program EIR as no new environmental impacts are anticipated and no new mitigations are required.
Project Planner: Margaret Netto, (408) 730-7628, mnetto@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Senior Planner Margaret Netto shared the staff report with a slide presentation. She added that Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2 in Attachment 4 should be removed as the applicant has updated the parking count on Level 6 of the parking structure and the CEQA Checklist in Attachment 6 should be revised to reflect the updated parking count of 1,260 and the updated heritage tree removal count of 58.

Commissioner Weiss asked the status of the Peery Park shuttle program. Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that the program is anticipated to begin in late 2021 or early 2022, which is when staff believes there will be enough development and

people might begin returning to the workplace. He added that there have been legal issues to work through with Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the City Manager has authorized funds for marketing the program.

Vice Chair Simons stated his disappointment that the staff report did not include the images that he requested at the Study Session that should have incorporated the future Mary Avenue overcrossing. He stated that the images could have depicted a generic structure using the known bridge specifications and that it is unacceptable as without the images, the Commissioners will not have a proper understanding of the proposed project's design and how the structure would impact it. Assistant Director Miner asked Vice Chair Simons what he wants to determine from the images. Vice Chair Simons responded that he wants to see how the proposed project looks with the bridge above it and mentioned questions he has about the proposed project that involve the bridge. Assistant Director Miner answered the design is unknown at this point and staff does not know if there will be pedestrian access connecting the bridge and the property, whether there will more than one vehicle access point to the proposed project, and that the applicant has agreed to an easement on the property for one of the bridge's support beams. Vice Chair Simons asked if any land has been allocated to allow employees to travel to and from the bridge. Assistant Director Miner stated that any allocation would be difficult since the bridge has not been designed. Vice Chair Simons restated that the bridge would significantly impact the proposed project's design and the views in the area.

Commissioner Howe asked how the images that Vice Chair Simons requested could be provided. Assistant Director Miner replied that the architect can more appropriately respond and asked how the images would be helpful. Vice Chair Simons stated that the images would help determine the architectural context of the proposed project and how the design works with the bridge. Commissioner Howe asked the applicant to address the requested images at the beginning of their presentation.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Perry Hariri with Miramar Capital and Wright Sherman, Architect with WRNS Studio, shared images and information about the proposed project.

Commissioner Weiss asked the applicant how many parking spaces would be equipped with electric vehicle charging stations. Mr. Sherman responded that more than five percent of the total parking spaces would have charging stations and they

plan to configure their electrical service to support the installation of more over time. Commissioner Weiss confirmed with Mr. Sherman that the shuttle pick-up and drop-off area would also be intended for ride sharing vehicles. Commissioner Weiss asked if the surface parking or area near it could support food trucks. Mr. Sherman answered that food trucks would most likely continue to operate in the turnaround area just outside the property line and could also operate with enough room in the planned loop road on the site.

Vice Chair Simons named potential solar shading and research and development view restrictions from the bridge as reasons for requesting the Mary Avenue overcrossing images. Mr. Hariri responded that it is unfair to ask them to create a design for the conceptual City-owned bridge and that they should not be required to do so because it is outside the proposed project's scope. Vice Chair Simons replied that the bridge in the images could have been a generic structure representing the space that it would occupy, adding that he was clear about requesting the images at the Study Session. Mr. Hariri responded that the overcrossing bridge would be approximately 150 feet away from their closest building and the bridge would not block solar panels on the roof because it is taller than a future bridge. Mr. Hariri also stated they do not plan to require that the building's interior not be viewed from the bridge. Vice Chair Simons asked how bicycles would travel west of the proposed project. Mr. Sherman responded that traveling east is the only option and the western connection could possibly improve if the bridge is built. Vice Chair Simons also asked the applicant if they are interested in connecting to the light rail station and if they would be willing to work with the relevant jurisdictions on pedestrian access to the bridge. Mr. Sherman and Mr. Hariri stated that they would welcome a connection but can only work within their property line and cannot comment on or take any action on anything that involves the conceptual bridge. Senior Assistant City Attorney Rebecca Moon stated that it would be difficult to create any enforceable condition about a future overcrossing since there is no approved design at this point. Chair Howard added that there is a significant-sized part of the property located next to the area dedicated to the support beam that could be used for this type of access in the future. Assistant Director Miner suggested that Vice Chair Simons direct the applicant and staff to work together at the time the bridge is designed to explore pedestrian access between the bridge and property. Vice Chair Simons confirmed with Mr. Sherman that the buildings would be taller than the overpass and not obstruct it and the bridge would not affect the solar panels as they would be located on the garage on the other end of the property. Vice Chair Simons asked the applicant how they plan to use the passive open space areas considering the site's high noise levels. Mr. Sherman stated that the tall buildings would help

mitigate the sound level and there would be a few pockets on the site that would shield some of the sound. Vice Chair Simons stated that he would have liked to have seen the buildings surrounding the open space.

Commissioner Harrison asked the applicant if they considered relocating the building that would be closest to the bridge to the northeast to allow room for a potential pedestrian connection to the bridge. Mr. Sherman answered that there would be enough of a buffer space between the bridge and the nearest building and that the asphalt in that area would be a flexible space to use in a variety of ways if the connection is explored. Commissioner Harrison confirmed with Principal Planner Noren Caliva-Lepe that the proposed project would not affect the adjacent cold weather shelter at 999 Hamlin Court. Commissioner Harrison also asked if it is possible to relocate the 14 Redwood trees planned for removal to City properties throughout the city where Redwoods have died. Assistant Director Miner and Rich Sharp, Landscape Architect with Studio Five Design, stated it is not possible as the trees can only be transported upright for short distances.

Commissioner Olevson stated that page G-004 of Attachment 9 shows that Building B is located significantly far away from where the bridge would be and the building would be difficult to move because it is located next to the turnaround area. Mr. Sharp added that relocating it would damage some of the preserved Redwood trees on the site.

Mr. Hariri, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Sharp, and Raul Garduno, Architect with WRNS Studio, presented additional images and information about the proposed project.

Chair Howard asked if the existing Redwood trees could be transplanted to another location on the site if they had to be removed to allow space for the bridge's support beam. Mr. Sharp stated that they would have to look into it as it would most likely be difficult. Chair Howard stated that it is an issue for the applicant to consider for the future and hoped that the Department of Public Works would work to minimize tree loss.

Vice Chair Simons asked the applicant what material uses the lime green color and Mr. Sherman stated that the material is similar to acrylic. Vice Chair Simons stated that he likes bold statements but commented on how quickly colors and architecture fall out of popularity and that is helpful to be able to update these as trends change.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Weiss moved and Commissioner Harrison seconded the motion for Alternative 1 - Recommend that the City Council make the required Findings to approve the California Environmental Quality Act determination that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 (c)(2) and Public Resources Code Section 21094 (c) as it is within the scope of the Peery Park Specific Plan (PPSP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and no additional environmental review is required in Attachment 6 to the Report; make the Findings for the Peery Park Plan Review Permit and Sense of Place Fee in Attachment 4 to the Report; and approve the Peery Park Plan Review Permit subject to PPSP Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program in Attachment 7 to the Report and recommended conditions of approval set forth in Attachment 5 to the Report.

Commissioner Weiss stated her appreciation for the proposed project's building asymmetry, materials, open space in front of the buildings that provides a campus feel, amenities, community gardens, forum between the buildings and varying building planes that provide visual interest, and the parking structure. She recognized that the applicant listened and responded to the Commissioners' comments from the Study Session and urged the Commissioners to support the motion.

Commissioner Harrison stated that she can make the findings with regard to the CEQA determination and the Peery Park Specific Plan. She commented that the parking structure is the most beautiful she has seen and has a lovely architectural composition.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Commissioner Howe offered a friendly amendment to specify that Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2 in Attachment 4 be removed as the applicant has updated the parking count on Level 6 of the parking structure and that the CEQA Checklist in Attachment 6 be revised to reflect the updated parking count of 1,260 and the updated heritage tree removal count of 58, as stated during Senior Planner Netto's staff presentation. Commissioner Weiss and Commissioner Harrison accepted the friendly amendment.

Commissioner Howe stated that he likes the proposed project and commented that it is unfortunate that the images that Vice Chair Simons requested during the Study Session were not provided.

Commissioner Olevson commented that he will support the motion and thanked staff for diligently answering his questions about the proposed project prior to the hearing. He stated that it is a great proposed project that would improve this area of Sunnyvale and provide a modern feel to the city as viewed from the nearby freeways. He thanked the applicant team and commended them on an outstanding job, adding that it is easy decision for him to recommend the proposed project to the City Council.

Vice Chair Simons asked staff for recommendations on the best language to use to encourage the applicant to connect the proposed project to any future bridge, adding that it benefits the applicant to connect to the light rail station, the applicant would receive more Transportation Demand Management Program points, and that it is beneficial to coordinate projects to avoid issues in the future. He further remarked that approving the proposed project without a condition of this nature eliminates the possibility for the connection. Assistant Director Miner suggested language stating that the applicant must work with the City to determine if there is potential to create access between the future bridge and the proposed project. Senior Assistant City Attorney Moon stressed that it would be a voluntary condition and would only commit the applicant to working the City. She added that a condition that directs the applicant to work with staff in good faith does not bind the applicant considering there are so many unknowns about the bridge, but a hypothetical, opened-ended condition also does not accomplish his goal. She proposed recommending to the City Council to direct staff to explore pedestrian access at this location with the property owner at the time the bridge is designed. Vice Chair Simons stated that he will not support the proposed project because the non-sports use open areas would be too noisy to be functional; there is an absence of different bicycle connections, particularly one to the light rail station that could benefit residents and other properties; and because lack of coordination on pedestrian access to the bridge is a lost opportunity. He encouraged the applicant to consider the connection for the future.

Chair Howard stated that he will support the motion and appreciated Vice Chair Simons's concerns with ensuring the connection to the bridge and he hoped that it can be accomplished in the future, noting that the burden is on the City to work with the property owner to determine a solution. He added that the 523 VTA bus connects from Mathilda Avenue and Ross Drive to the downtown Sunnyvale Caltrain station. He added that he likes the architecture, the fact that it would be Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Gold certified, and that he believes it would be an asset to Sunnyvale.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Chair Howard
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Howe
Commissioner Olevson
Commissioner Weiss

No: 1 - Vice Chair Simons

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheume

Assistant Director Miner stated that this recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at the Tuesday, November 17, 2020 meeting.

STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES

Principal Planner Amber Blizinski presented the potential study issue.

Chair Howard stated that he submitted the potential study issue after a member of the public brought it to his attention. He stated that he thought it was worthy of consideration even though future State law might supersede it and some of it may be addressed as part of the City's Housing Strategy, adding that there is a lot of flexibility in how to address the issue.

Commissioner Harrison asked about the status of the potential study issue she submitted that would study an increase to requirements for electric vehicle charging stations Citywide. Senior Assistant City Attorney Rebecca Moon stated that staff is presenting an Ordinance to City Council to increase the requirements for electric vehicle charging stations as a part of the Reach Code efforts. She stated that that amendments to these requirements were added after the Planning Commission considered the Reach Codes and would increase the percentage of electric vehicle chargers and the pre-wiring of chargers that developers or property owners are required to develop. Commissioner Harrison stated that she believes that the Ordinance's proposed changes are better than her proposed study issue and staff said they would keep Commissioner Harrison abreast of what the City Council approves.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved to sponsor the proposed study issue.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

There were no public speakers for this agenda item.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

The motion tied by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Chair Howard
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Howe

No: 3 - Vice Chair Simons
Commissioner Olevson
Commissioner Weiss

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Rheume

Commissioner Howe stated that the Commission should recommend the study issue to the City Council for review since it is currently the only study issue proposed for calendar year 2020.

Principal Planner Blizinski stated that staff is open to the study issue idea; however, it was a Tier 3 implementation item from the Housing Strategy and may be more appropriate to consider after some of the other Tier 1 and 2 implementation items are studied.

The Commissioners decided to let the tie vote stand and not recommend the potential study issue to move forward for the City Council's consideration.

4. [20-0913](#) Potential Study Issue for 2021: Deemphasizing du/ac and Encouraging Missing Middle Housing

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

-Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Olevson thanked staff again for responding to his questions ahead of the meeting so that he does not take time during the public hearing getting them answered. Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that it is helpful for staff to have advance notice of any questions that Commissioners might have so that staff can provide an appropriate response.

-Staff Comments

Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that the City Council considered the Draft 2020 Housing Strategy and Implementation Schedule Study Issue on October 13, 2020. He added that on October 27, 2020 the City Council will consider the Phased Reach Codes Program that the Commission recommended to the City Council on September 14, 2020 and the Master Plan for Public Art that the Commission recommended to the City Council on September 28, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Howard adjourned the meeting at 10:22 PM.