

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Vice Chair Lowe. The Planning Commission held a hybrid meeting in the Council Chambers and virtually via Zoom.

Commissioner Patterson arrived in the Council Chambers at 7:51 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Present: COMMISSIONERS: Franco-Clausen, Goodbody, Meyers, Stevens

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Lowe

Absent: COMMISSIONER: Patterson

CHAIR: Ali-Sullivan

Staff Members Present: Madhukansh-Singh, Ochinero, Schmidt, Pearson, Colucci, Tabari,

Vigilia

PUBLIC COMMENTS

David Whatley, a former resident of Hayward, shared a community initiative that he started in Los Angeles County a few years ago called Padres, Madres y Parientes Unidos, which sought to address and remedy community issues that adversely impact Latinos, African Americans, and their families. He indicated that it was his understanding that he did not need to obtain a permit to introduce a community initiative in Alameda County.

PUBLIC HEARING

For agenda item No. 1, the decision of the Planning Commission is final unless appealed. The appeal period is 10 days from the date of the decision. If appealed, a public hearing will be scheduled before the City Council for final decision.

1. Proposed Development of 13 Townhome Condominium Units and Related Site Improvements Including a Minor Modification on a Vacant 0.47-Acre Site at 22810 Atherton Street and 22809 Watkins Street (APNs 428-0081-011-02; 428-0081-012-02; and 428-0081-013-00), Requiring Approval of Tentative Tract Map for Condominium Purposes (8625) and Site Plan Review Application No. 202105719 and a Class 32 Exemption, In-Fill Development Project, Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); Rodolfo Chacon for Chacon Architecture (Applicant); on behalf of Jim Zomorrodi of KZ Investment Funds Inc. (Owner). (PH 23-050)

Principal Planner Schmidt provided a synopsis of the staff report.



Vice Chair Lowe opened the public comment period at 7:20 p.m.

Planning Commission Secretary Madhukansh indicated that a public comment card had been received; however, the speaker had left the Council Chambers.

Vice Chair Lowe closed the public comment period at 7:21 p.m.

Commissioner Meyers stated that the proposed development was an attractive building, he liked the layout, did not have any concerns about changing rowhouses per run as it added to the features of the project, that the proposed project would add to the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) count. He requested that staff address how the project would address drainage from the currently vacant site. Principal Planner Schmidt responded that every development project was subject to a C.3 Stormwater permit that required developments to retain and treat stormwater on the site, and underscored that engineering staff review every project to ensure compliance.

In response to Commissioner Meyers' question if every garage would have electric vehicle (EV) charging capabilities, Principal Planner Schmidt confirmed that this was correct per Environmental Services Manager Pearson who was one of the authors of the Reach Code.

Principal Planner Schmidt indicated that the applicant responded to Commissioner Meyers' question via email communication prior to the meeting and she noted that the applicant would not replace the existing rear yard fence. Commissioner Meyers commented that some homes have rear garages that do not have a fence and wondered if water would enter the water runoff treatment area. Ms. Schmidt agreed this would be a good question for the applicant to address as the development would have areas with just a building wall and no fence. Mr. Meyers expressed concern that there may be a property line conflict in the future if the applicant does not build a new fence.

Rodolfo Chacon with Chacon Architecture addressed the question noting that per the original plans, a fence was not to be installed at this location; however, the applicant was open to suggestions. He clarified that the area in question was not a garage but the side wall of a home, adding that the entire back area adjacent to the walkway was a bioretention area where water would be percolated with metals being removed, followed by water entering the storm network. He noted for Commissioner Meyers that he did not speak to any of the existing homeowners about the perimeter.

Principal Planner Schmidt confirmed for Commissioner Meyers that the PG&E vault existed and was underground.

Commissioner Franco-Clausen appreciated the questions asked by Commissioner Meyers,



noting that in prior meetings questions about walls had come up and the possibility of conflict among neighbors arising related to separation of property.

Commissioner Goodbody appreciated the modern amenities and overall look of the project; however, she expressed that the roofline appeared overbearing, and wondered if thought had been given to making the appearance more pitched to match other townhomes in the area. Principal Planner Schmidt indicated that per staff, flat roofs were typical for contemporary architectural styles which is what the applicant presented, stating that staff felt it was not necessary to match surrounding developments for the proposed to be a good quality development. Mr. Chacon noted that the proposed did feature a flat roof, the goal was to avoid a boxy design, felt that the rowhouse had a prominent presence enhanced by the sloped roof and a little overhang. He commented that the adjacent property appeared to be boxy and the proposed deviated from that style and was believed to enhance the look of the block.

Vice Chair Lowe liked the architecture of the project as it was different from what the Planning Commission had previously seen. She asked if the proposed project was an example of a project size that staff preferred in-lieu fees rather than on-site affordable. Principal Planner Schmidt confirmed that was correct as including on-site affordable would result in a single affordable unit upon complying with the code and added that for fractional units, developers usually opted to pay in-lieu fees. Ms. Schmidt indicated that if the applicant had offered an affordable unit, staff would have approved it; however, she stated that it becomes administratively difficult to monitor income levels for smaller projects.

Vice Chair Lowe asked if the applicant would be amenable to adding solar panels for EV chargers. Jim Zomorrodi, project applicant, confirmed the project would include EV charging stations, noted it would be difficult to install solar panels on the flat roofs, but he would attempt this. Mr. Chacon confirmed that every unit would have an 8x12 balcony.

Vice Chair Lowe asked if it would be possible to install some type of public art along the pedestrian walkway facing D Street to beautify the community, suggesting a statue or sculpture. Mr. Chacon commented that there was not much space in the breezeway as there was a mailbox and bike rack located nearby and that it would have to be evaluated what type of art may be appropriate. He shared that there was a decorative arbor in the entryway, the fence could be an angled fabricated metal gate with mesh to provide visual interest and an enhancement.

Mr. Chacon noted for Vice Chair Lowe that mailboxes would have a locking mechanism, indicated that they could revisit moving the mailboxes to the community area towards the back of the development. He added that they would explore measures and other locations to provide more eyes on the mailboxes, and also evaluate lighting. In response to Vice Chair Lowe's request if the applicant would be open to a condition of approval related to moving the



mailboxes, and Mr. Chacon indicated that they would accept such a condition.

Vice Chair Lowe requested the architect elaborate on the community area. Mr. Chacon described this would include a picnic table and a barbecue area with some open seating.

Mr. Chacon clarified for Commissioner Franco-Clausen that a majority of the development would have a flat roof and that solar panels could be placed at an angle on the rooftops. Principal Planner Schmidt offered clarification that per the Building Code, every home was required to provide solar.

At the request of a member of the public who completed a speaker card, Vice Chair Lowe opened the public comment period at 7:37 p.m.

David Whatley asked what the pricing of the townhomes would be, expressed that he estimated the proposed units to be sold for \$1.5 million, and wondered who the target resident would be purchasing the condominiums. He asked how the proposed project aligned with the Council's priorities on equity, diversity and inclusion and commented that this had not been addressed in the staff report. He stated that it was his belief the project was not consistent with the code, character and the history of the City; that the community was a blue collar working class town and residents could not afford to buy condominiums priced at \$1.5 million. He indicated that he would be appealing the project and requested that staff provide the policies and procedures so his appeal can properly be registered.

Principal Planner Schmidt responded that staff supported housing developments that were consistent with the Municipal Code.

Commissioner Stevens expressed his support of the project, commenting that he loved the architecture and the articulation of the roofline, and made a motion to approve the staff recommendation. In reviewing the site plan, he favored the proposed location for the mailboxes as he presumed it was well lit, and was worried with the placement of the mailbox towards the rear of the development. He suggested that if a condition of approval is written, that there be some flexibility to allow the applicant to use their ingenuity to find the best possible area for placement of mailbox.

Vice Chair Lowe stated her concern was placing the mailboxes on D Street as this was a very busy location and there were already challenges experienced with mailbox theft for streets that weren't too busy.

A motion to approve the staff recommendation was made by Commissioner Stevens, seconded by Commissioner Franco-Clausen.



Vice Chair Lowe requested that the architect and applicant consider that the mailbox was placed in a safe location that is well lit, as she did not want there to be an issue with mail theft.

The motion passed with the following roll call votes:

AYES: Commissioners Franco-Clausen, Goodbody, Meyers, Stevens

Vice Chair Lowe

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Patterson

Chair Ali-Sullivan

ABSTAIN: None

2. Proposed Update to the Hayward Climate Action Plan, Amended Hazards Element, and Adoption of New Environmental Justice Element, Requiring an Amendment to the Hayward 2040 General Plan, and Adoption of Related Environmental Analysis Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. (PH 23-051)

Principal Planner Schmidt provided a synopsis of the Hazards & Environmental Justice Element updates, and introduced Environmental Services Manager Pearson and Sustainability and Climate Action Fellow Makenna Colucci who provided an update to the Climate Action Plan.

Vice Chair Lowe opened the public comment period at 8:00 p.m.

AmyBeth Willis with Save The Bay, a regional nonprofit organization that worked on pollution prevention and climate resilience in the Bay Area, indicated that one of their priorities with the Hayward General Plan Update was to promote equitable flood resilience. She shared her organization submitted a letter along with Greenbelt Alliance, proposed edits, and thanked staff for working with them to include many of their recommendations. She reenforced the following recommendations: create a sea level rise overlay district which had been accepted, next draft should include language requiring a buffer zone along the shoreline and creek banks, was glad that green infrastructure language was included in the proposed edits for complete green streets, and understood that while the Alameda Flood Control District was responsible for flood control emphasized the City to include an assessment of flood risk from extreme storms to avoid gaps especially as there were more frequent floods due to climate change. She appreciated the efforts made by the City to make Hayward climate resilient.

Marlina Rose Selva shared that as she was from an indigenous tribe, she remembered the original traditional ways and made the following comments about the negative impacts of



removal of the native habitat and installing infrastructure: that there were no sustainable developments as this resulted in destroying the natural world, the mining of earth for renewable energy, electromagnetic frequencies that were disruptive to wildlife, radiation resulting in health issues, and stated that it was impossible to harm earth and still be climate resilient.

Vice Chair Lowe closed the public comment period at 8:05 p.m.

Vice Chair Lowe noted for the record that Commissioner Patterson joined the Planning Commission meeting at 7:51 p.m.

Commissioner Goodbody recognized staff's efforts on the breadth of work, the meaningful engagement conducted with residents and affinity groups to help shape the City's roadmap toward an inaugural environmental justice element in every corner of the City, noted the proposed was a massive document and underscored that Hayward was a leader in a sustainable local government. She was excited about the following City initiatives: partnership with East Bay Community Energy (now called Ava Community Energy) that was experimenting with different programs to help residents build more sustainable homes and practices and encouraged the City to increase engagement on programs with Ava; electrification as much as possible through the City's grid would bring benefits to residents; suggested providing incentives to build out multifamily units, shopping centers, campuses and public transit infrastructure; to address costs of electrification she suggested exploring taxing largest and heaviest polluters of fossil fuels.

Commissioner Meyers thanked staff for a wonderful report. He stated that among the reasons why he decided to join the Planning Commission were community safety, crime, public art, but he also had a passion for renewable energy which included solar, EVs, climate change issues, emergency preparedness, and equality with these. He emphasized that he was honored to be reviewing the proposed item for his first meeting.

Commissioner Meyers stated that while vehicle miles traveled (VMT) was a good priority, he stated that as a longtime Hayward resident it was not always the miles, but the minutes traveled that his vehicle is driving. He hoped in the future to see vehicle minutes traveled and wondered if this was something that could later be addressed. Environmental Services Manager Pearson responded that staff had not yet discussed this as a metric, noted there were newer vehicles that automatically turned off when stopped at a red light, stated that the transition to EVs would help address the issue, and agreed that miles traveled should not be the only thing to be concerned about. Mr. Meyers commented that while the governor did have a certain transition period to EVs, he expressed that this could be expedited rather than to wait for the natural attrition of the vehicles, suggested working on the traffic management



system to help minimize time spent in traffic as this could improve the quality of life of residents.

Environmental Services Manager Pearson confirmed for Commissioner Franco-Clausen that most building types were required to offer solar panels per the California Building Code, noting the same provision was not included in the Reach Code. Commissioner Franco-Clausen expressed that in hearing her colleagues and in recognizing that while she was privileged to own an EV car. Hayward consisted of working-class families and electric vehicles were not common. She indicated that while non-electric vehicles were polluters, some Hayward residents did not drive EVs due to necessity rather than choice. She stated that while the Governor had progressive ideas for moving residents to meet environmental goals, the reality was that if opportunities were not matched for low-income families to have EV cars, then the goal may not be attainable. She underscored that most local families were still struggling for income equality. While she championed ideas that promoted being ecofriendly such as solar power, grey water system, and composting, she underscored that she was privileged to be able to do these things. She agreed with Commissioner Goodbody about having partnerships, urged promoting through social media how Hayward residents could have hybrid or electric vehicles, and to keep in mind that not everyone can afford to meet the demands thereby resulting in a huge part of the population that could not participate.

Environmental Services Manager Pearson indicated that the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) had a program called Clean Cars for All that was geared toward low-income households to be able to purchase EVs. He added that PG&E also had a program that promoted used electric vehicles. Commissioner Franco-Clausen stated that in looking at the demographics of the community, outreach was critical, stressing that if the community could be uplifted then the goals could be met by the desired timeline.

In response to Commissioner Stevens' question on comments received from Save the Bay and responses by staff to this, Environmental Services Manager Pearson indicated that staff and direction received from the City Council or the availability of funding would determine the feasibility of programs.

In response to Commissioner Stevens' question about programs that had a nature-based solution over grey infrastructure and who would assume liability if the nature-based solution failed, Mr. Pearson indicated that it was his belief this would lie with the owner or the designer of the project. Mr. Pearson added that in many cases, nature-based solutions would be feasible if there was space for it, and grey infrastructure may be required if space was not available.

Commissioner Stevens commented that it appeared there would be a lot of costs incurred in implementing the programs outlined. Mr. Pearson confirmed that there were many programs



listed that would require additional work from existing staff and require new staff to carry out the programs.

Commissioner Patterson apologized for being late but was thankful to be able to participate in the discussion on the present item. She thanked staff for their thoughtfulness and efforts in putting together the proposed recommendation. With regards to Community Outreach, she had concerns about the outreach done thus far, while she saw a long list capturing efforts made to engage individuals, she did not see any metrics of how many people were reached, what the targets were for the outreach, evidence was lacking demonstrating that all segments of the Hayward community had been outreached, and emphasized the importance of the community knowing of upcoming changes prior to them becoming requirements. She stated that in looking at the Climate Crisis Emergency passed by the Council, there is language that encourages including inclusive community engagement and diverse participation.

Principal Planner Schmidt responded that the proposed project commenced in 2021, she indicated that staff did not have metrics to support the outreach conducted over the two-year period including individuals staff spoke with at each of the various events or number of emails received, mainly due to three staff members having to do all of the outreach and to do the technical work of preparing the documents. She commented that ideally if staff had capacity to create, measure and conduct the outreach, then this would have been done. She shared the following were performed to connect with the community: reaching out to home owners associations, community based organizations, visiting commercial centers with flyers and iPads to gather information via surveys, tabling at street events, displaying flyers in English and Spanish where permitted explaining the projects, attending meetings of other organizations such as NAACP and Hayward Promise Neighborhood, running a social media campaign, partnering with Chabot College to interview 400 residents to find out their experience with housing and pollution in neighborhoods. Ms. Schmidt added that staff did visit multifamily developments and partner with management; however, attendance at these meetings was low, with as few as six attendees at one event.

Environmental Services Manager Pearson commented that staff was continuing to work with Chabot College and CSUEB students to survey the community, confirmed that staff would make extra efforts to ensure that demographic and neighborhood-level data is collected going forward. He indicated that while staff did have a lot of information on the number of respondents from the different outreach methods, the data was presently not organized in a dashboard.

Commissioner Patterson appreciated staff elaborating on the outreach conducted, understood the amount of work entailed, and asked how the Planning Commission could advocate for staff to receive the support needed to perform community outreach. She suggested that staff explore working with other community partners to assist with outreach work.



In response to Commissioner Patterson's concern that only sixteen individuals attended the CAP community workshop, Mr. Pearson stated that outreach included social media and email for this event.

Commissioner Patterson was generally in support of the work being done on electrification and while she did want the proposed plan to go through with achieving goals of the environmental justice element, she had concerns on behalf of the community and the potential burden that may be placed on individuals who were already struggling. While there were goals to achieve the City's Greenhouse Gas emissions target by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2045 and there were programs to assist with this, it was evident to her that the costs to the City and community to achieve this were high. In response to Commissioner Patterson's inquiry, Mr. Pearson stated staff was developing a building electrification roadmap to provide information on how to effectively electrify a home and provide assistance to those who need it. He shared a current project where staff was working with a group of students at CSUEB that will survey Spanish speaking members of the community to help inform the roadmap, with additional outreach also planned to be conducted.

Commissioner Patterson commented that 14 of the 68 actions in the Transportation sector were questionable and contradictory. For example, the closing of streets would result in idling and thereby an increase in traffic. She understood that the goal was to reduce driving and requested staff address these contradictions and provide information on how street closures are better for the environment than decreased idling. Mr. Pearson responded this would require further studying of traffic patterns and traffic levels on certain streets, noted that streets could only be closed to traffic if they already have low levels of traffic, the goal was to further promote walking and biking, and indicated that it would take a lot of work to find unique situations where this could be accomplished.

Commissioner Patterson requested that staff elaborate on congestion charges, as she was concerned about the impact this would have on especially lower income residents when the general congestion resulted from people outside the City. Mr. Pearson responded this had been done in much larger cities and would have to be studied further and carefully evaluated to see if applicable to a city of Hayward's size.

Commissioner Patterson referred to the charging of parking fees, highlighted that one of the great benefits of downtown Hayward was the abundance of parking making it easy for patrons to visit restaurants, stores or the library. If there were fees for parking lots, there is potential to impact businesses in the area because residents may choose to go elsewhere where there is still free parking. Mr. Pearson responded that staff would work closely with the business community, shared the topic had been previously addressed with business owners in the downtown and this was the reason parking was still free, and noted that if paid parking were implemented it would apply towards longer term parking.



Commissioner Patterson commented that she did not see much reference to seismic retrofitting and rather saw mention of energy efficiency and electrification retrofitting, and wondered if this would be addressed per the Hazard Plan. Mr. Pearson stated this may have already been included in the Hazards Element, shared that there were seismic retrofit programs in the past for unreinforced or apartment buildings. Principal Planner Schmidt added that the City had already implemented a Soft Story Ordinance to retrofit structures, noted that the Hazards Element included a seismic section and that this was a policy, shared a tremendous amount of outreach to apartment owners had been done, and stated that there was no specific program or action for specific homeowners. Commissioner Patterson suggested that staff look into including seismic retrofitting within the CAP as homeowners make improvements to their homes for energy efficiency retrofitting. Ms. Schmidt responded that staff could further evaluate this and the Hazards Element and perhaps it could be mentioned within retrofitting references within CAP. Mr. Pearson added that there were programs and resources that could be tied in and coordinated with efficiency upgrades.

Commissioner Patterson asked if the use of low carbon concrete was an extra expense that may discourage developers or if this was an industry standard. Mr. Pearson stated it was his understanding that it would be more expensive; however, the building code currently requires low carbon concrete only for large projects, noting that over time this cost may reduce to be on par with conventional concrete.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Lowe about when gas lines may be capped, Environmental Services Manager Pearson noted that there is no certain date but unlikely before 2045. However, if this is to be achieved the City would have to ensure that everyone had switched over to electrical appliances which would be a huge task. He shared that it was currently being evaluated if this could be accomplished on a street-by-street basis, for instance if there was a gas line due for replacement due to its age, conversations were being had with residents to gain support to switch over and, if residents agreed, then some funds could be put towards electrification efforts.

Vice Chair Lowe asked when the public would be notified in a very real way of deincentivizing single person vehicles on the road and turning off natural gas in the City, wondered if social media and other types of outreach were being relied upon to share this information, commenting that 2030 was drawing near and that many individuals within her circle were unaware of the upcoming changes. Mr. Pearson responded that a lot of the changes would occur on the regional level, noting that BAAQMD had adopted new rules to phase out gas appliances. He stated that starting in 2027, residents in the Bay Area will no longer be able to purchase a natural gas water heater, and noted that as equipment in buildings are replaced it would have to be replaced with electric products. He shared that BAAQMD was reviewing how to implement rules in an equitable way and provide incentives



for individuals, noting that information will be made available to the public as the rules become effective.

In response to a question about whether propane may be used for indoor appliances, Environmental Services Manager Pearson noted for Commissioner Stevens that while propane gas could be used for outdoor natural gas appliances, propane was not permitted for indoor use. Commissioner Stevens asked if any state or local agencies had done an analysis on the overall impact to the grid of converting gas appliances to electric facilities as there would be massive material change, upgrades and replacement required. Mr. Pearson responded that the California Public Utilities Commission and California Energy Commission were doing a lot of work to ensure that the grid will meet the needs once more electric appliances are added. Commissioner Stevens stated that if there was a product that had been maintained for one hundred years which ran on natural gas with less energy going into the maintenance of this product and was troubled by the environmental cost of having to replace such appliances that worked well but had to be replaced with an electric product.

Commissioner Franco-Clausen stated that given the number of questions raised by the Planning Commission, asked if the recommendation to approve the proposed be considered to move to a future date. Principal Planner Schmidt responded that staff would summarize the questions and comments received by the Planning Commission during the present meeting and would provide this to the City Council in an upcoming staff report.

Commissioner Franco-Clausen underscored the cost of electrification and how this would be distributed to the residents of Hayward in order to align with ambitious goals, she stressed that not everyone would be able to catch up with the deadlines and urged the importance of informing residents of programs available to them.

Commissioner Stevens appreciated the work done, understood the proposal was difficult, and expressed that part of the reason the City was in this position is because there were environmental advocates that did not think practically about implementing policies to help achieve desired goals. He referenced that the proposed documents contained language stating "as feasible" which was difficult to understand, emphasizing that it was difficult to spread liability. He expressed that during the storms last winter, many nature-based solutions had failed. He emphasized that the City should not be mandated by the State or BAAQMD and there needed to be more practicality with how the proposed recommendations moved forward. He raised the cost to implement these programs which was brought up by the Commission and whether the City would hire additional staff to implement the recommendations, the potential impacts to the development community, how individuals would pay for rising insurance costs, and reiterated that while he understood the aspirations, he did not understand the practicality of it.



Commissioner Patterson appreciated the comments and questions from her colleagues, was struggling as she supported the overall efforts of the goal, she agreed with the concerns raised by Commissioner Stevens, felt that the proposed recommendation included everything rather than being narrower, and worried that the proposed did not address environmental justice. She acknowledged how Hayward had been a leader in the State and Nation on Climate Action and emphasized that the community outreach could not be performative but had to be real as the proposed programs & requirements would be as impactful on residents as climate change. She suggested ad campaigns on television and town hall meetings for community outreach. Ms. Patterson stressed that the costs of electrification for individuals with solar panels on their homes was significantly lower and this tended to be individuals who had more money.

Vice Chair Lowe stated that conversations on the proposed topic started ten years ago and it was great to see how the City had advanced on this front and served as an example for other cities. She was proud of the work done by the City and staff, she shared similar concerns as expressed by her colleagues including impacts to the grid, the costs, staffing needed to perform outreach to ensure residents are fully informed and equipped to comply with recommendations. She stressed the importance of continuing on the path to lower greenhouse gas emissions and achieve carbon neutrality, conceded that it was a complex issue to resolve, applauded efforts to do as much as possible to prevent climate change while ensuring measures are equitable, encouraged staff to continue working hard and expressed that there was hope that the proposed would continue to be reviewed and improved upon. She added that when the proposed recommendations are revisited in the future, she was hopeful that there will be more knowledge and resources available in delivering the goals in the most equitable way possible; however, for now, she was content with what was presented.

Commissioner Meyers commented that when Covered California first came about, the policy and the website were not perfect, and it was his fear that it would be stopped altogether. Having said this, he supported the comments made by Vice Chair Lowe on being able to make alternations to the proposed in the future, underscoring the most important goal was to continue moving forward with the proposed but knowing that initially there may not be a perfect system, however this could be altered in the future.

A motion to approve the staff recommendation was made by Commissioner Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Meyers.



The motion passed with the following roll call votes:

AYES: Commissioners Franco-Clausen, Goodbody, Meyers, Patterson

Vice Chair Lowe

NOES: Commissioner Stevens ABSENT: Chair Ali-Sullivan

ABSTAIN: None

COMMISSION REPORTS

Vice Chair Lowe was thrilled to welcome Commissioner Meyers to the Planning Commission and looked forward to working with him.

Commissioner Meyers expressed that he was humbled to be serving on the Planning Commission and wished Commissioner Garg the best with her future endeavors.

Oral Report on Planning and Zoning Matters

There were none.

Commissioners' Announcements, Referrals

There were none.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Lowe adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

APPROVED:
Anika Patterson, Secretary Planning Commission
ЛТТЕСТ .

Avinta Madhukansh-Singh Planning Commission Secretary Office of the City Clerk