



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

---

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Lowe. The Planning Commission held a hybrid meeting in the Council Chambers and virtually via Zoom.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

Present: CHAIRPERSON: Lowe  
COMMISSIONERS: Franco-Clausen, Goodbody, Haman, Hardy, Meyers,  
Stevens

Absent: COMMISSIONER:

Staff Members Present: Allen, Cole-Bloom, Ochinero, Richard, Schmidt, Tabari,  
Vigilia

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There being no public comment, Chair Lowe opened and closed public comment at 7:03 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**For agenda item No. 1 the Planning Commission may make a recommendation to the City Council.**

1. Proposed Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 10 (Planning, Zoning and Subdivisions) of the Hayward Municipal Code and Finding that no Further Environmental Review is Required Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Associated with Implementation of the Hayward 2023-2031 Housing Element **(PH 24-049)**

Associate Planner Richard provided a synopsis of the staff report.

Commissioner Haman asked if the Hayward Municipal Code, Chapter 10, Article 18, addresses matters related to mining to which Associate Planner Richard clarified there are no planned modifications to Article 18 at this time. Commissioner Haman stated that the revisions to the Hayward Municipal Code are listed as being made to Articles 1, 2, 24, and 18. Associate Planner Richard clarified the previous statement contained a typographical error, noting that the revisions are being made to Articles 1, 2, 24, and 28, not Article 18, and that Article 28 pertains to the Downtown Code

Commissioner Haman inquired about the definition of "publicly owned land" in the context of innovative housing options and requested examples of proposed locations where this



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

might apply. Associate Planner Richard asked for clarification on the specific reference, whether it related to a Housing Element Action, and the page number in the staff report where it could be found. Commissioner Haman noted the summary mentions exploring innovative housing options on private and public properties. Chair Lowe suggested referencing a specific attachment and page for clarity, and Commissioner Haman indicated the information is on page 2 of 9 in the report. Associate Planner Richard clarified the reference pertains to Housing Element Action 13.1. Associate Planner Richard elaborated that some of the innovative housing options being proposed include Single Room Occupancies (SROs) and group homes, and explained that the primary focus is on allowing SROs, which are currently only permitted in one zoning district. Principal Planner Schmidt clarified that the actions listed were already adopted by the City Council in 2023. Principal Planner Schmidt emphasized that the actions themselves are not being amended, but rather, the focus is on implementing them through the proposed regulations.

Commissioner Haman asked if public land was to be used as an option for innovative housing, where such land would be located. Principal Planner Schmidt replied that there are various publicly owned parcels throughout the city, and maps are available online showing these properties, as required by state law. She explained that if a property were to be used for affordable housing, it would need to go through the Surplus Land Act, which is mandated by state law. This process would allow the land to be used for affordable housing or purchased by a nonprofit service provider for such purposes. Principal Planner Schmidt added that there are likely hundreds of publicly owned properties throughout the City, but none are specifically under consideration at this time.

Commissioner Haman inquired if private land, such as the St. Regis property or Southland Mall, could be utilized for innovative housing options. Principal Planner Schmidt replied that both private and publicly owned land could be used for innovative housing options, provided they comply with the proposed regulations. This could include obtaining an administrative use permit or a conditional use permit, or in certain circumstances, the use could be permitted as described by Associate Planner Richard.

Commissioner Haman inquired about whether the City is proposing five tiny home projects exclusively or if the plan includes five tiny home projects in addition to five SROs (Single Room Occupancies) and five supportive housing developments. Associate Planner Richard stated that the City's overall goal is to encourage various types of developments that include five different types of developments within the current planning cycle.

Commissioner Haman inquired about Action 13.1, expressed support for amending the Hayward Municipal Code to allow it by right, and asked if this would burden the building department. Associate Planner Richard assured him that it would not.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

---

Commissioner Haman asked about the typical permit processing times under the proposed changes. Associate Planner Richard clarified that administrative use permits usually take 3-5 months, conditional use permits 6-9 months due to hearings, and site plan reviews 3-5 months. Building permit timelines vary, with first-round comments returned in 15 business days and subsequent rounds in 10 business days, depending on plan completeness and review cycles.

Commissioner Haman acknowledged the process is still quite lengthy, despite the urgency of the matter. Associate Planner Richard explained the processing times are standard and could be shorter, depending on how quickly the applicant responds to staff comments. She noted that City staff follows a set timeline, providing comments within 30 calendar days of receiving an application and delays often occur when applicants take time to address staff comments.

Commissioner Haman asked if day centers were included. Associate Planner Richard clarified that the code already permits day centers and no amendments are proposed for them. Principal Planner Schmidt added that the current amendments focus on residential uses, such as residential care centers, group homes, and overnight facilities, not day centers.

Commissioner Haman asked for clarification on Action 19.11 specifically regarding what constitutes "safe camping". Associate Planner Richard clarified that the current regulations do not include safe camping provisions and that the focus will initially be on safe parking, where designated areas allow individuals to park and sleep in their cars. She mentioned that some safe camping sites exist in Southern California, such as in San Diego, as well as in the Bay Area, but emphasized that no amendments are being proposed to allow safe camping at this time.

Commissioner Haman questioned the limited responses to public outreach and why the homeless population was not consulted. Associate Planner Richard explained that the City contacted 74 organizations and made efforts to facilitate engagement but could not comment on the lack of responses. She added that service providers were relied upon to represent unhoused individuals' needs. Community Services Manager Cole-Bloom added that the proposed amendments align with strategies from the "Let's House Hayward" strategic plan, adopted by the City Council in 2021. She explained the strategies, which informed the amendments, were developed with input from individuals with lived experience of homelessness, as well as service providers and developers. She noted that while their feedback did not directly inform the specific item being discussed, it played a key role in shaping the strategic plan, which aligns with the current recommendations, including topics like safe parking and flexible solutions.

Commissioner Haman inquired whether any of the responding groups included



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

organizations such as Ruby's Place, La Familia, or John George. Associate Planner Richard replied that La Familia and Ruby's Place were engaged in the process, attending several work sessions and providing comments throughout the project, and that she didn't believe John George was involved. She noted that the City reached out to various service providers across different sites. Community Services Manager Cole-Bloom clarified that John George is a psychiatric inpatient hospital and is not typically part of their outreach, as it serves a very specific type of work, but that they could include them in future communications.

Commissioner Haman asked why boarding homes and fraternity/sorority houses were removed from the definitions. Associate Planner Richard explained it was to eliminate redundancy, as group homes, which include these uses, are already permitted in the same areas.

Commissioner Haman inquired whether there would be any restrictions for safe parking, specifically regarding the use of drugs, alcohol, and smoking. He also mentioned that there might be a smoking ban in Hayward, though he wasn't sure if it had been implemented yet, and wondered if the proximity of cars in safe parking would make it similar to multifamily living. Associate Planner Richard responded that a management plan will be required for all safe parking operations, which will outline the rules for the site. She mentioned that cities like Union City and Fremont have implemented rules that prohibit parties, drinking, and the use of alcohol and drugs on site. Planning staff will review these rules and likely implement similar ones when evaluating the management plans for each safe parking operation.

Commissioner Haman asked if the 75-bed limit for emergency shelters was based on occupancy, fire codes, or available services. Associate Planner Richard clarified it was 45 beds, modeled after San Leandro's regulations, though Fremont and Oakland allow 100 beds. She noted shelters must still meet building and fire codes and explained the 45-bed limit was based on best practices.

Commissioner Haman inquired about the reasoning behind the requirement for shelters to be a minimum of 300 feet apart from one another. Associate Planner Richard explained that state law limits the requirements for emergency shelters to a few specific things, one of which is a distancing requirement. She stated that, given these limitations, the City decided to implement all requirements, including the 300-foot spacing. Associate Planner Richard noted that this spacing was intended to prevent shelters from being concentrated in one area, ensuring that neighborhoods are not overly burdened. She also mentioned that the Commission is welcome to recommend removing this requirement if desired.

Commissioner Haman asked whether there has ever been any danger to residents living in proximity to psychiatric and rehabilitation care centers. Associate Planner Richard replied that, to her knowledge, there has not been any danger to residents living near psychiatric



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

and rehabilitation care centers. She added that these facilities are typically locked, meaning individuals are not allowed to come and go freely. Community Services Manager Cole-Bloom explained that psychiatric and rehabilitation care centers are typically 24/7 facilities, or in the case of crisis stabilization units, they provide care for up to 23 hours and 59 minutes. She emphasized that these are not walk-in or walk-out facilities; individuals are always transported in and out, and there is a designated discharge destination, meaning they are not discharged directly into the community.

Commissioner Haman inquired about how pets are addressed in these facilities. Associate Planner Richard asked which type of use he was referring to. Commissioner Haman clarified that he was referring to all uses, specifically the homeless population that often have dogs. Associate Planner Richard explained that there are no specific regulations related to pets in the current proposal. However, low-barrier navigation centers are designed to allow pets, as they are intended to be accessible and flexible. Community Services Manager Cole-Bloom clarified that the zoning changes do not govern whether facilities can allow pets. She noted that the providers the City works with typically run low-barrier facilities. For example, the navigation center allows pets, and residents have even had pets like parrots and turtles. She added that pet policies would likely be included in the management plans.

Commissioner Goodbody asked if the management plans for the operators of the sites would be presented to the Commission or Council before being adopted. Associate Planner Richard responded that all the proposals being discussed tonight, except for large, licensed group homes, require the approval of an administrative use permit, which is handled at the staff level unless appealed. If the permit were appealed, the Commission would review the management plan. She clarified that staff would review the management plan, taking public feedback into account, as they have done with similar projects, to ensure the plans do not result in nuisances.

Commissioner Goodbody shared a personal experience from her college years volunteering at a domestic violence shelter and asked if there was a way to expand the definition of homelessness to include individuals escaping domestic violence situations. She emphasized that she did not want people in these circumstances to be turned away from seeking help, as they would technically still have a home but might be in immediate danger. Associate Planner Richard explained that there is flexibility in interpreting what homelessness means and that the definition was revised to prevent it from being misinterpreted as emergency shelters for natural disasters, which are typically handled by the City Council. She acknowledged that the definition could be further clarified to include individuals who do not have a safe home by adding terms like "housing insecure" to refine the definition and ensure that individuals in situations like domestic violence could be included.

Commissioner Goodbody inquired about the plan to prioritize Hayward residents for



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

---

housing before individuals from other cities, emphasizing that this is an important consideration for both staff and operators when administering or approving the emergency shelter permits. Community Services Manager Cole-Bloom addressed the previous comments and explained that under the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) definition of homelessness, individuals fleeing domestic violence or intimate partner violence are considered homeless. Regarding prioritizing Hayward residents for housing, she clarified it depends on the funding source for the program. If the funding comes from county, state, or federal sources, it is likely that the coordinated entry system will be used, which serves the entire county. In such cases, Hayward residents would be prioritized based on their position in the queue. However, if the program is funded by local sources, such as the Hayward general fund, the City can prioritize Hayward residents for available beds.

Commissioner Goodbody asked about the situation where the site for the proposed housing or shelter is located on private nonprofit property, such as a church, as mentioned in the presentation. Community Services Manager Cole-Bloom explained that if a church is independently funding the operation of the site, it would likely not have to go through the coordinated entry system. However, she noted that she was not aware of any nonprofits or churches that have the resources to operate at that level independently.

Commissioner Stevens inquired about Attachment 4, comment 39, which discusses the appropriateness of using an administrative use permit for safe parking. He noted that the response indicates the City Council supports allowing safe parking with an administrative use permit, and references comments 53, 59, and 82. However, when he looked at comment 53, he noticed that it did not seem to correlate with the statement. He asked for clarification on whether the response indicating City Council's support is the correct interpretation. Associate Planner Richard explained that the response is likely a typo. She mentioned that the City Council explicitly stated they were comfortable with the administrative use permit process, as it would avoid overburdening applicants with a longer permitting process requiring a higher level of approval.

Chair Lowe inquired about why the 300-foot distancing requirement applies to emergency shelters but not to group homes. She acknowledged the previous explanation about avoiding overburdening certain neighborhoods and asked for further clarification on why this requirement applies to one but not the other. Associate Planner Richard explained that distance requirements are rare in the City's code, with exceptions for uses like cannabis, tobacco, and drive-throughs. She clarified that the state heavily limits what can be required for emergency shelters, including not allowing the City to mandate a use permit for such shelters. As a result, the City decided to implement a 300-foot distancing requirement to ensure that emergency shelters are spaced out, as the City doesn't have the same authority to review and potentially deny permits for them, unlike with medium and large group homes.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

---

Chair Lowe asked why there is no distance requirement for group homes, as there is for emergency shelters. Associate Planner Richard explained that there has never been a distance requirement for group homes in Hayward, as the City has allowed group homes for a long time without such a requirement, and that staff did not consider adding one, as there is no area in Hayward that is overly burdened with group homes. She noted that outreach efforts revealed that many group homes are closing due to funding challenges and difficulty meeting state and local requirements.

Chair Lowe asked if, based on past precedence, there have been any neighborhoods in Hayward that have been overly burdened by group homes. Associate Planner Richard replied that, based on her experience working for Hayward, she has not observed any neighborhoods being overly burdened by group homes. Principal Planner Schmidt clarified that the state has a minimum requirement of 300 feet between state-licensed group homes. She explained that there is a distinction between state-licensed and unlicensed group homes, with the former being subject to state regulations.

Commissioner Meyers raised a question about Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotels, asking whether these typically reach out to the City on their own or if the City encourages them to initiate contact. Associate Planner Richard clarified that hotels interested in converting to Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units typically reach out to the City to request approval for such a conversion and that the city does not actively seek out hotels to convert. Community Services Manager Cole-Bloom explained that since the state introduced the Home Key program (and its predecessor, Room Key) to convert motels and hotels into permanent supportive housing for homeless individuals, many motel and hotel operators now reach out to the City to explore partnership opportunities for Home Key applications. She mentioned that the City recently submitted a Home Key request for information and will be presenting it to the Housing Policy and Resource Committee on December 19, 2024.

Commissioner Meyers inquired if any other buildings or entities, aside from hotels and motels, could potentially join the Single Room Occupancy (SRO) program. Associate Planner Richard explained that any building could potentially convert to an SRO, provided the zoning ordinance permits it and they obtain an administrative use permit. She noted it's unlikely that other types of buildings would convert, as hotels and motels are more suitable due to their existing building standards, which require less capital investment for conversion.

Commissioner Meyers estimated a \$250,000 to \$300,000 annual loss from the transit occupancy tax, less than 1% of revenue. Associate Planner Richard clarified the loss would be about \$3,000 or 0.7% of total revenue, noting most transit occupancy tax revenue comes from hotels unlikely to convert to SROs.

Commissioner Meyers inquired if there are any other costs or loss of revenue the City might



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

incur when a hotel or motel converts to an SRO. Associate Planner Richard responded aside from the loss of transit occupancy tax, she doesn't foresee any additional costs for the City when a hotel or motel converts to an SRO. She mentioned that the City could actually see revenue from building permits and potential impact fees, as well as cost savings in public safety, as housing individuals reduces the need for fire and police interventions at the street level.

Commissioner Meyers asked whether there is a minimum length of stay or if it is a long-term stay for individuals who enter SROs. Associate Planner Richard explained that SROs are used for a variety of populations and do not have a set length of stay. While some funding programs may impose a limit for transitional housing, SROs are often used by seasonal workers, interns, and individuals in need of transitional housing and the length of stay can vary depending on the population and specific circumstances.

Commissioner Meyers asked about the parking requirement in Attachment 3, stating one space per three employees. Associate Planner Richard clarified it applies to emergency shelters and is based on Oakland's regulations. This balances parking needs without overburdening shelters, as state mandates require fewer spaces than residential projects. She noted shelters are typically located near high-frequency transit, reducing the need for excessive parking. Associate Planner Richard added that the Planning Commission is welcome to make a recommendation if they would like the City Council to explore a different regulatory approach regarding parking requirements for emergency shelters.

Commissioner Meyers noted a typographical error in Attachment 3D, page 4, section G, where "there's no uses beginning with F" is repeated. Associate Planner Richard confirmed the error would be corrected before submitting the document to the City Council.

Commissioner Meyers noted a typo in Attachment 4, page 12, item 49, where the response incorrectly referenced "comment forty-nine." Associate Planner Richard confirmed the error and explained the comment addressed concerns about state mandates, emphasizing the need to comply with state law to avoid fines and builder's remedy applications, which could bypass local zoning controls.

Commissioner Meyers raised concerns about the "by-right" approval process for new projects like low-income or homeless centers and stressed the need to learn from past projects to avoid repeating mistakes. He suggested involving Planning Commission members with firsthand experience to offer valuable insights, as he worries that making these projects "ministerial" could overlook lessons learned and potentially hinder improvements. While acknowledging the goal of reducing NIMBYism, he questioned whether pushing projects forward without considering past successes and challenges was the best approach. He also asked whether the commission would vote or provide recommendations to the City Council.





**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

---

Associate Planner Richard clarified that the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the zoning text amendments to explore certain issues or make amendments in response to concerns. She explained that the only "by-right" uses being proposed in the regulations are emergency shelters and low-barrier navigation centers, both of which are required by state law. She noted that City staff's decision was to allow licensed group homes to operate by right, as the state mandates them for group homes of six or more residents. The City is proposing to allow up to eight by right, given challenges group homes face in securing funding and navigating lengthy permitting processes.

Commissioner Meyers asked to publicly share ongoing issues in his neighborhood. Chair Lowe suggested addressing them during the comments section unless he had further questions, to which Commissioner Meyers agreed.

There was no public comment on this item.

Commissioner Meyers shared a series of issues affecting his neighborhood, which he felt were important to raise. He mentioned the increase in neighborhood problems since the opening of the new development, including trash being dumped in front of his home, dog waste from unleashed dogs, human waste on properties, and a decrease in safety, with incidents like broken streetlight boxes and car break-ins. He also noted concerns about sex offenders living in the area and a recent shooting involving a homeless individual. He acknowledged that while some issues are inevitable, the situation had worsened and was negatively affecting the quality of life. He proposed creating a neighborhood accountability group that could collaborate with shelters or city representatives to improve the situation.

Commissioner Franco-Claussen shared personal experiences from her own neighborhood, including safety concerns such as sideshows, shootouts, and unsafe driving by big rigs, along with issues like PG&E wires and tree maintenance. She emphasized the importance of community involvement and highlighted how the Hayward app can be a tool for residents to report issues and advocate for change. Reflecting on her own background as a former foster child who lived in group homes, she spoke to the difficulties group homes face when barriers are placed in front of them. She encouraged further conversation on neighborhood quality and the need to communicate effectively with the City Council to help shape the future of Hayward. She concluded by expressing her commitment to being a partner in addressing these issues moving forward.

Commissioner Hardy made a motion to approve the recommendations as presented, with the addition of a suggestion to include a community liaison or similar program to support the neighborhoods where the proposed developments or changes would be implemented. Commissioner Hardy requested clarification or restatement of the recommendation to



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

---

ensure this aspect was incorporated. Associate Planner Richard confirmed that the motion, including the addition of a community liaison or support program, would be shared with the Council.

Commissioner Meyers suggested adding verbiage to the motion to create a neighborhood accountability group, which would include a City staff liaison. Commissioner Meyers seconded the motion.

Commissioner Goodbody requested clarification, asking if her suggestion to expand the definition of people eligible for the centers to include those experiencing homelessness would also cover individuals escaping domestic violence. Associate Planner Richard confirmed that the clarification of the definition of homelessness, along with the correction of the two errors pointed out by Commissioner Myers could be included as part of the motion.

Commissioner Goodbody recommended adding verbiage such as "for persons escaping domestic violence" or "for persons seeking safety" to the definition of eligibility for the centers. Associate Planner Richard responded that they could mirror the definition of homelessness shared by Community Services Manager Cole-Bloom from HUD, which includes individuals escaping domestic violence.

Commissioner Hardy expressed that they initially thought the inclusion of individuals escaping domestic violence was already part of the definition, but it seems that it may not be in their current code. She then accepted the friendly amendment to incorporate this clarification.

Commissioner Stevens expressed concern about allowing an administrative use permit for safe parking in certain areas. He felt the Council was being naive in permitting such actions, particularly as some of the potential sites are near developed neighborhoods. Commissioner Stevens argued that many residents might not understand why this use is being allowed in their areas. Instead, he suggested that a conditional use permit would be more appropriate, as it would provide an opportunity for public comment and awareness about the plans, whereas an administrative use permit would limit local residents' ability to provide input. He also raised concerns about the City's ability to adequately oversee these activities, emphasizing that while the policies sound good, the practical implementation would require substantial resources and effort, which they believed the City may lack. Chair Lowe asked for clarification, specifically whether he was referring to the safe parking use. Commissioner Stevens confirmed that he was referring to the approval of safe parking use through an administrative use permit. Chair Lowe invited Commissioner Stevens to make a friendly amendment if they wished to do so.

Commissioner Stevens expressed a desire to make a friendly amendment but clarified that



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

he would not be disappointed if others did not agree with it. Commissioner Hardy expressed agreement with Commissioner Stevens' suggestion and stated she would accept the friendly amendment.

Senior Assistant City Attorney Vigilia noted that since a friendly amendment had been proposed, the seconder of the motion would need to state whether they still supported the motion and would continue to second it. Commissioner Franco Clausen confirmed that they could still second the motion, as they had already done so, but for the record, Commissioner Meyers would second the motion instead.

Chair Lowe expressed appreciation for the outreach conducted, the alignment with the strategic plan, and the staff's patience in addressing all questions. Chair Lowe also noted that the packet, particularly the section with responses to public comments, was very helpful in focusing her own questions. She also expressed support for Commissioner Stevens' friendly amendments.

Commissioner Haman thanked everyone for their hard work on the housing element, acknowledging the large amount of information to review. He noted that Hayward's homeless count of 512 is more manageable compared to larger cities, allowing for a meaningful impact. He supported staff's recommendations on innovative housing options and emphasized the importance of being responsible when suspending local zoning regulations. Commissioner Haman expressed agreement with the proposed zoning changes but urged consideration of neighborhood dynamics. He also supported the revisions for single-room occupancy units, group homes, and psychiatric care facilities, with a focus on safety, security, and public transportation access. Lastly, he endorsed the proposed amendments and recommended moving them forward to the City Council.

Chair Lowe asked Commissioner Hardy if her motion included the finding that no further environmental review was required pursuant to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act). Commissioner Hardy confirmed that she did not explicitly state it but believed that it was included and asked if she needed to formally state it. Senior Assistant City Attorney Vigilia clarified that Commissioner Hardy's motion was to approve the staff's recommendation, which had been seconded by Commissioner Meyers. The motion included several friendly amendments: adding a neighborhood liaison group, modifying the definition of homelessness to align with the HUD definition, requiring a conditional use permit (CUP) for safe parking uses, and addressing minor grammatical and typographical issues. All these amendments were accepted by Commissioner Hardy and Commissioner Meyers, and that is the motion being voted on.

The motion passed with the following roll call votes:



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

---

AYES: Commissioners Franco-Clausen, Goodbody, Haman, Hardy, Meyers,  
Stevens  
Chair Lowe

NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

**COMMISSION REPORTS**

Principal Planner Schmidt mentioned the January 9, 2025, meeting would be canceled, noting Senior Secretary Khan had already sent out the notice. However, an item was expected for the second meeting in January, so commissioners were asked to plan to attend. Principal Planner Schmidt also reminded the group about the Planning Commissioner Academy in March, which will be held in Sonoma. Planning Manager Lochirco had emailed the commissioners about it and requested that they confirm their attendance by January 10, 2025. She concluded by wishing everyone a nice holiday.

Chair Lowe asked if the next meeting would be on January 23, 2025, to which Principal Planner Schmidt replied yes.

**ORAL REPORT ON PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS**

There were none.

**COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS, REFERRALS**

**2. 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule RPT 24-101**

Commissioner Franco-Clausen announced that she would not be attending the January 23, 2025, meeting, and would not be participating remotely.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Lowe adjourned the meeting at 8:18 pm.

**APPROVED:**



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)  
PARTICIPATION  
Thursday, December 12, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

---

Karla Goodbody, Secretary  
Planning Commission

**ATTEST:**

---

Briea Allen  
Planning Commission Secretary  
Office of the City Clerk