



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

15-0739

Agenda Date: 9/29/2015

Study Session Summaries of August 18, 2015:

Item A: 15-0671 Transportation Initiatives, Proposed Ballot Measure, and Upcoming Update to the Transportation Impact Fee and Project Prioritization

Item B: 15-0606 Update on Draft Land Use and Transportation Element and Consideration of Land Use Alternatives for Environmental Impact Report

Item C: 15-0631 Peery Park Specific Plan - Consideration of Land Use Alternatives for the Environmental Impact Report and Community Benefits Program

Item D: 15-0797 Transportation Impact Fees: (1) Review of Projects and Funding, (2) Discussion of an Updated Fee

Call to Order:

Mayor Griffith called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

City Councilmembers Present:

Mayor Jim Griffith

Vice Mayor Jim Davis

Councilmember David Whittum

Councilmember Pat Meyering

Councilmember Tara Martin-Milius

Councilmember Glenn Hendricks

Councilmember Gustav Larsson

City Councilmembers Absent:

None.

Item A: 15-0671 Transportation Initiatives, Proposed Ballot Measure, and Upcoming Update to the Transportation Impact Fee and Project Prioritization

Public Comment:

John McAlister

Lenny Siegel

Andrew Boone

Chris Lepe

Varsha Srivastava

John Cordes

Tom Dougherty

Adina Levin

Ralph Durham

Study Session Summary:

Director of Public Works Manuel Pineda provided a slide presentation on the upcoming process for

the proposed ballot measure, City priorities, and the North County process.

Councilmembers offer comments and questions on:

General Topics

- What are the timeframes for the ballot measure
- How are the preferred projects going to be selected
- What will be the VTA process
- Concern about how much funding San Jose will receive for BART
- Discussion on the North County process and signing the support letter
- Discussion on the City's priorities and how they were selected
- Discussion of adding the Lawrence Expressway grade separations as City

Members of the Public provided comments:

- Support for the proposed priorities
- Concern about the transportation priorities being focused on automobiles
- Request to support a transit project for the North County area
- Concerns about the amount of funding required for the Lawrence Expressway grade separations
- Support for multimodal funding

Council recessed at 8:13 p.m.

Council reconvened at 8:28 p.m. with all Councilmembers present.

Item B: 15-0606 Update on Draft Land Use and Transportation Element and Consideration of Land Use Alternatives for Environmental Impact Report

Public Comment:

John Cordes

Adina Levin

Dave Jones

Mike Serrone

Gerry Glaser

Study Session Summary:

Planning Officer Trudi Ryan provided a slide presentation of the Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) update providing a examples of mixed use development, updated policies, community outreach and EIR alternatives.

Councilmembers offer comments and questions on:

General Topics

- Is there statutory schedule to update the LUTE?
- We should find a way to talk about change with the community

- Outreach and review should note that the City is not an island
- City should find ways to deal with conflict before it is a major issue
- Discussion of impacts on schools, parks, sewer and water is needed
- What are the trends with the General Plan?
- Concern that the economy is not sufficiently diversified - that Sunnyvale is putting all its "economic eggs" into one basket--which is tech
- Is the LUTE a place to be spending time on Transportation Demand Management (TDM)?
- Is consolidation of private driveways for properties along transit corridors addressed in LUTE, because this is important to accommodate transit and alternative modes on corridors?
- The trends in the LUTE suggest that things are not getting better, but getting worse
- Concerned that LUTE presents one perspective and dismisses community opposition

Mixed Use and Villages

- Parking reductions for mixed use: is that a viable business model?
- More information is needed on the design and appearance of the villages (e.g. guidelines on setback, terracing, building entrances). Concerns with mixed expectations between community and property owners
- Need to think about communicating to the public that transition is and will be evaluated by staff and the council whenever new development is considered, especially in mixed use areas near single-family home neighborhoods.

Jobs/Housing Ratio (J/H Ratio)

- The Council does not have an agreed upon definition of Jobs/housing balance that is desirable or how we measure this
- Selecting an specific J/H ratio to evaluate seems premature
- What is the range of J/H ratios for cities in the area?
- How do we know what J/H ratio we should seek?
- J/H ratio does not directly control the issues of where people will work and where people will live. The best we can do is create the most livable community we can.
- Concerns that a higher jobs to housing ratio than current conditions will result in more expensive housing and more traffic.
- The average residents want a vision that is pursuing solutions to traffic and housing costs.
- Sees J/H ratio as a knob to push trends one way or the other and thinks the current LUTE will enforce current negative trends toward unaffordable housing and lots of commuter traffic
- Concerned that the assumptions used in the LUTE to estimate jobs is too low.

Balanced Growth Profile (BGP)

- BGP needs update and its use needs to be more clearly defined.
- BGP should not be prescriptive

EIR Alternatives

- EIR alternatives are appropriate
- Alternative 3 and the redistribution of growth to north south transit corridors is potentially desirable
- Interested in development in relation to trails

- Consider an EIR alternative that lessens the amount of development on the ground today and that has a stricter requirements for level of infrastructure (water, parks, schools) required before new development is allowed

Members of the Public provided comments:

- We should not be looking at a jobs/housing ratio as high as 1.5 let alone 1.7
- Consider that as we have a larger retired community, the housing availability for workers will be even lower
- We should evaluate a jobs/housing ratio of 1.1
- Consider evaluating alternatives using vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita
- Studies by Silicon Valley and Downtown Palo Alto indicate a ratio of 200-250 square feet per worker
- Need to consider addressing the trend of lower and middle income individuals being priced out of housing in the city
- Should consider villages in ITR areas
- Land is too valuable to use for parking-should be housing

Item C: 15-0631 Peery Park Specific Plan - Consideration of Land Use Alternatives for the Environmental Impact Report and Community Benefits Program

Councilmember Whittum reported he is a consultant for a tenant of the location, recused himself, and left the room.

Councilmember Meyering reported his residence is within 500 feet of the location, recused himself, and left the room.

Public Comment:

Richard Kolber

Ann Davis

Adina Levin

Dave Jones

Dwight Davis

Study Session Summary:

Director of Community Development Hanson Hom presented information on the potential alternatives for the Peery Park draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and discussed several advantages and disadvantages of each of the alternatives. The three alternatives presented were:

1. No project/existing General Plan;
2. Mixed-Use Housing; and
3. Higher Intensity Buildout with 30% TDM Goal.

The Councilmembers raised concern with potential alternative 2 (increased housing units in the plan area); however, they agreed that it should be studied as an alternative in the DEIR because it had been requested by several members of the community in various Community Workshops and Public Hearings. Councilmembers also expressed the need for convenient retail uses, open space and other amenities within Peery Park to serve employees. It was noted that Alternative 3 could generate

more community benefits. The Council directed staff to proceed on the DEIR with the three alternatives mentioned above.

After discussion on the project alternatives for the DEIR, Director Hom explained the concept of community benefits and incentive zoning. Teifion Rice-Evans, consultant from Economic and Planning Systems (EPS), explained the findings of the market analysis that they prepared for the City to determine the level of financial benefits that could be considered for Peery Park projects. Director Hom then laid out the framework for the proposed community benefits program for the Peery Park Specific Plan.

Councilmembers asked questions of staff regarding the community benefits concept. Questions were raised about the maximum development potential that could be allowed on a property with community benefits. Questions were also raised about the voluntary versus mandatory aspects of a community benefits program. Councilmembers commented that community benefits should extend beyond Peery Park, and interest was expressed for an infrastructure fee and a community benefits fund.

Councilmembers Whittum and Meyering returned to the room and took their seats at the dias.

Item D: 15-0797 Transportation Impact Fees: (1) Review of Projects and Funding, (2) Discussion of an Updated Fee

Public Comment:

Dave Jones

Study Session Summary:

Director of Public Works Manuel Pineda presented a slide presentation on the priority projects as part of the Traffic Impact Fee program and the upcoming Traffic Impact Fee update

Councilmembers offer comments and questions on:

General Topics

- Question regarding how the priorities were selected
- Questions regarding how we expect to fund the projects
- Discussion and question of nexus requirements related to the fee
- Support regarding 101/237/Mathilda as first priority
- Support for the Lawrence grade separations as a priority
- Discussion of the Bernardo Undercrossing and support for the project
- Concern regarding Mary Avenue Overcrossing and discussion of whether it should be removed from the General Plan or if it should be considered last as part of all transportation priorities

Members of the Public provided comments:

- Supporting multimodal projects

Adjournment:

Mayor Griffith adjourned the meeting at 1:33 a.m.