



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chair Goodbody. The Planning Commission held a hybrid meeting in the Council Chambers and virtually via Zoom.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Present: CHAIRPERSON: Goodbody
COMMISSIONERS: Haman, Hardy, Lowe, Meyers, Stevens, Yorgov
Absent: COMMISSIONER:

Staff Members Present: Allen, Ochinero, Pearson, Richard, Saebi, Schmidt, Spores, Tabari, Terentieff, Vigilia, Xie

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Proposed Demolition of an Existing Community Center to allow the Development of 83 Residential Condominium Units and Related Site Improvements on a 4.83 Net Acre Site at 1101 and 1103 Walpert Street (APNs: 445-0040-001-01 and 445-0040-003-034), Requiring Approval of a Vesting Tentative Tract Map, Site Plan Review and Finding that the Project is Exempt Pursuant to Section 15332 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Application No. TM-24-0007. Applicant: Caden Proctor, Waymark Development. Owners: Arc of the East Bay **PH 26-010**

Staff report submitted by Associate Planner Richard, dated March 12, 2026, was filed.

Associate Planner Richard introduced the item and provided a synopsis of the staff report.

Chair Goodbody opened the public hearing at 7:13p.m.

Deborah Souza, a longtime Hayward resident, expressed concern that the proposed development would place buildings too close to the creek along the Wally Wickander Trail, further reducing open space; and asked that the buildings closest to the creek be removed to create a larger setback and allow for a wider public trail and open community space.

Chair Goodbody closed the public hearing at 7:16 p.m.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioner Yorgov asked if SB 330 restrictions apply only to project denial or also to conditions imposed by the Commission. Associate Planner Richard stated that under SB 330 the Commission cannot deny the project without specific findings or impose conditions that would make it infeasible therefore, conditions are limited to standard conditions allowed by the Hayward Municipal Code and other regulations.

Commissioner Yorgov asked if the tree preservation zone and fencing requirement is mandated by City code or project-specific. Landscape Architect Spores clarified it is required under the City's updated Tree Preservation Ordinance for projects preserving trees.

Commissioner Yorgov asked whether the site is currently owned by ARC of the East Bay, to which Developer Proctor replied yes.

Commissioner Lowe asked whether affordable housing was ever part of the project. Associate Planner Richard stated that the project never included affordable housing and that the applicant will pay the in-lieu fee allowed under City code.

Commissioner Lowe asked if ARC of the East Bay still supports the project given the removal of the originally anticipated affordable housing component. Property Owner Representative Edin confirmed continued support, citing community housing benefits, property monetization, and funding for a new headquarters, calling it beneficial for the community, City, and ARC.

Commissioner Lowe asked whether additional trees could be preserved following the arborist report and recent revisions. Landscape Architect Spores said some trees were saved after the report, but no further efforts have been made, emphasizing ongoing focus on maximizing preservation and protecting trees during construction.

Commissioner Lowe asked about additional measures to protect Ward Creek despite no CEQA review or identified impacts. Associate Planner Richard said a required slope easement will provide ongoing protection by preventing future grading or alterations under HOA management.

Commissioner Stevens asked if meeting Condition 101 on runoff could require site plan changes. Senior Civil Engineer Saebi said a hydrology and hydraulic study is required to ensure post-development flows do not exceed pre-development levels, and that bioretention areas and Silva cells will manage and detain stormwater before discharge. He concluded no major site plan changes are needed.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioner Stevens asked for confirmation that the pre-development flow rates refer to the site's natural, undeveloped conditions. Senior Civil Engineer Saebi clarified that pre-development flows are based on the site's current conditions, including existing impervious areas, not purely natural terrain, and post-development flows are compared to these existing conditions.

Commissioner Stevens questioned whether "pre-development discharge rate" refers to natural site conditions with low runoff. Senior Civil Engineer Saebi clarified it reflects existing site conditions with current impervious surfaces, and mitigation applies only to new impervious area added by the project.

Commissioner Stevens stated that he still does not understand the term "pre-development discharge." Senior Civil Engineer Saebi clarified that "pre-development discharge" refers to the site's current existing conditions, not its original undeveloped state.

Commissioner Stevens asked whether the definition of "pre-development discharge" is specified in the Municipal Code, to which Senior Civil Engineer Saebi replied yes.

Commissioner Meyers asked if the project qualifies for an SB 330 denial given the lack of low-income units. Associate Planner Richard explained that SB 330 denial requires meeting RHNA targets across all income levels, and while projections show progress, credit is only granted upon permit issuance; many units remain unpermitted, so the City is not close to compliance.

Commissioner Meyers asked for more information on the City's efforts regarding hillside emergency egress and evacuation safety. Associate Planner Richard said she would follow up with the Fire Department and confirmed the project meets all California Fire Code standards, including the City-adopted Appendix D requirements for enhanced egress.

Commissioner Meyers asked whether providing more lower-income units would be preferable to paying the \$3 million in-lieu fee. Developer Proctor said building affordable units is not financially feasible due to significant revenue loss, and the fee option allows the project to remain viable for ARC and Waymark.

Commissioner Meyers asked whether the developer had coordinated with The Pines HOA and informally agreed to any requests. Associate Planner Richard said staff clarified that construction staging on private property is not allowed. Developer Proctor added he spoke with the HOA, assured them adjacent property would be off-limits, and noted City Code prohibits such use; the HOA was satisfied.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioner Meyers asked whether the site's steep rear slope would include any infill to raise the elevation or if the existing downward slope would remain. Associate Planner Richard responded that the site would continue to slope downward. She explained that the rear portion was previously graded in 2009 to create two flatter areas, and that this project does not include significant additional grading. She highlighted that some cut and fill will occur, however, the existing contours and elevations will largely be maintained.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the traffic study indicated there would be no impacts on Walpert, and whether the study considered emergency conditions such as fire and evacuation. Associate Planner Richard explained that both the Local Transportation Analysis (LTA) and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis found no significant impacts. She said the LTA confirmed the project would not require additional traffic improvements and would operate safely as designed, and the VMT analysis showed it stays within the City of Hayward's thresholds.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the traffic study considered conditions where congestion on Mission Boulevard could spill over and cause backups on Walpert. Associate Planner Richard responded that the traffic study evaluated specific nearby intersections, including those at Walpert and Mission and Walpert and Second Street, as part of the analysis.

Commissioner Haman stated that he has previously experienced congestion on Walpert due to issues on Mission Boulevard and expressed concern that in the event of a fire or other emergency, Walpert could quickly back up and make evacuation difficult. Associate Planner Richard replied that the report concluded there would not be any significant traffic impacts.

Commissioner Haman asked how it was determined that there are 10 available on-street parking spaces and whether those spaces would be dedicated for use by the property owners. Associate Planner Richard responded that there are 9 on-site visitor parking spaces, which are available for general use and not reserved for specific residents or owners.

Commissioner Haman clarified that his question was specifically about the on-street parking spaces, not the on-site parking. Associate Planner Richard responded that the on-street parking on Walpert Street is public and available to anyone, with no dedicated or reserved spaces tied to the project.

Commissioner Haman stated that the project plans appear to show about 10 on-street parking spaces. Associate Planner Richard clarified that the spaces shown on the plans are approximately nine visitor parking spaces, and they are not assigned to specific units but are intended for use by anyone within the project.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioner Haman asked for clarification on whether those visitor parking spaces are located on the project site rather than on the street. Associate Planner Richard clarified that the visitor parking spaces are off-street, located on the project site, and explained that in the City code, "on-street" refers specifically to public street parking.

Commissioner Haman stated that the plans appeared to show parking spaces designated along Walpert Street and asked whether that interpretation was correct. Associate Planner Richard responded that the parking spaces he referenced on the plans are existing public on-street parking spaces and are not designated or created by the project.

Commissioner Haman asked how RHNA goals are being met and where the money from the in-lieu fees goes. Principal Planner Schmidt explained that in-lieu fees are placed into the City's Housing Trust Fund and held until the City issues a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFA), where developers can apply for affordable housing funds. She noted that funds are accumulated over time and then periodically awarded, with the most recent cycle occurring in 2017 and funded projects only now coming online.

Commissioner Haman asked how long it would take for the \$3 million in-lieu fee to be used and reach affordable housing projects that serve those in need. Principal Planner Schmidt explained that in-lieu fees are collected at building permit issuance and deposited into the Housing Trust Fund. She noted it typically takes years to accumulate enough funds for a NOFA and for projects to be developed, though the current balance is about \$4.9 million and this project may help trigger another funding cycle.

Commissioner Haman asked what the incentive is for developers to build lower-income housing if RHNA targets have not been met. Associate Planner Richard explained that in-lieu fees from market-rate projects help fund very low- and extremely low-income housing, while tools like density bonuses incentivize on-site affordable units. She noted that without subsidies, such lower-income housing is often not feasible, and in this case the developer indicated additional affordability would have impacted project viability.

Commissioner Haman asked whether, under CEQA requirements, there have been instances where development projects were delayed or postponed due to bird nesting or other wildlife habitat protections. Associate Planner Richard responded that if construction occurs during nesting season, a required study must be conducted, and if active nests are found, construction would be delayed until the nesting activity is complete.

Commissioner Haman asked whether there have been any past development projects where nesting birds or wildlife habitat were actually found, resulting in delays or impacts to construction. Associate Planner Richard responded that most developers plan construction



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

schedules to avoid the nesting season, and that she has not personally seen projects delayed due to active nests.

Commissioner Haman asked whether staff are confident that no human remains from a cemetery will be encountered during excavation. Associate Planner Richard responded that she is confident no cemetery remains would be encountered. She explained that she conducted extensive research, including reviewing records with the All Saints Church, the Archdiocese of Oakland, and the Hayward Historical Society, and found no evidence indicating human remains on the project site.

Commissioner Haman asked whether there will be personnel on-site during excavation in case any unexpected findings, such as human remains, are discovered. Associate Planner Richard responded that standard conditions of approval, required under State Law, apply to the project. She explained that if any human remains are discovered during excavation, construction must immediately stop and the appropriate legal and procedural steps would be followed.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the project's proximity to a fault line, under the conditions of approval, is expected to increase construction costs. Developer Proctor responded that geotechnical and stabilization studies have been completed and incorporated into the project design, and that they are confident the proposed plan adequately addresses fault-related conditions without creating additional concerns.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the requirement for Building No. 34 to obtain separate permits for separate structures could be streamlined to reduce redundancy and simplify the application process for the applicant. Associate Planner Richard explained that the separate-permit process is standard and set by the Building Official. She noted he can pass along the suggestion to streamline it, but explained that building-by-building permits are used to simplify inspections and allow phased occupancy, whereas a single permit would require all buildings to be completed before any occupancy.

Commissioner Haman asked whether a temporary certificate of occupancy (TCO) could be issued for individual buildings under a single permit. Associate Planner Richard responded that a TCO (temporary certificate of occupancy) is possible, but it is an involved and phased process. She added that the City's Landscape Architect could speak further on the details and noted that Hayward has experienced challenges and issues with TCO processing in the past.

Commissioner Haman asked where the plans show the locations or list of the 111 new trees proposed for the project, noting he was unable to find where they would be planted. Landscape Architect Spores responded that the tree mitigation chart outlines which trees are being replaced on-site as part of mitigation requirements. He explained that the



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

calculations include required replacement trees and additional required trees such as street trees, and that any remaining balance that cannot be planted on-site is satisfied through an in-lieu mitigation fee.

Commissioner Haman asked how the project arrived at the \$3,520 amount versus the \$1,770 value for the 311 trees. Landscape Architect Spores explained that tree mitigation is based on valuing removed trees, then crediting on-site replacement planting. He highlighted that any shortfall is paid as an in-lieu fee. He noted that larger replacement trees receive higher credit due to higher installation costs, and required trees like street trees are included in the overall calculation.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the tree in-lieu fees are placed into a fund that would be used for future tree planting or related purposes. Landscape Architect Spores explained that tree in-lieu fees go into a fund for tree planting and replacement, noting past allocations to La Vista Park and that remaining funds will be distributed in the future to support citywide tree programs.

Commissioner Haman asked whether protected trees require approval before removal and if that approval is being granted as part of this meeting or handled separately. Landscape Architect Spores explained that protected trees are already defined in the Tree Preservation Ordinance, so their designation does not require separate approval. He clarified that only Heritage or Memorial Trees require additional review, and those decisions are made by the City Council, not during this meeting.

Commissioner Haman asked whether there are any Heritage or Memorial Trees on the project site that would require City Council review, to which Landscape Architect Spores replied no.

Commissioner Haman asked where the nine units that are designated as 80% accessible are located within the site plans. Developer Proctor responded that the accessible units are distributed throughout the project, both in the upper and lower portions of the site. He explained that ADA requirements prohibit clustering them in one area, so they are spread across multiple buildings rather than located in a single specific section.

Commissioner Haman asked whether some of the accessible units are located on the top floor. Developer Proctor clarified that he was referring to the site's two levels to the slope of the property.

Commissioner Haman asked what specific features or standards make the units ADA-accessible. Developer Proctor responded that ADA-accessible units include required design



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

features such as a bathroom on the main floor, wider entryways, and other Code-required accessibility elements.

Commissioner Haman asked whether kitchens are included on the bottom floor of the accessible units. Developer Proctor responded that kitchens on the bottom floor are not required for ADA compliance.

Commissioner Haman asked for clarification on accessibility, noting that if someone uses a wheelchair, they would not be able to access the second floor where the kitchen is located. Developer Proctor responded that ADA requirements do not mandate a kitchen on the ground floor, only certain accessible features such as a bathroom. He added that the project complies with those Code requirements.

Commissioner Haman asked what the space labeled “den” represents in the plans. Developer Proctor responded by asking what page of the plans he is referencing. Commissioner Haman clarified that on one of the floor plans on the lower level near the garage entry. Developer Proctor responded that the space labeled “den” is essentially a multi-purpose area, such as a family room or living space, and not a separately defined functional room beyond that.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the “den” space could still be used as a sleeping area. Associate Planner Richard responded that under the Building Code, a space can only be classified as a bedroom if it meets specific requirements such as proper egress, ingress, and a closet. She explained that the “den” does not appear to meet those standards, and therefore it would not be considered a sleeping room under Code.

Commissioner Haman asked whether it would effectively function as a sleeping space regardless of its Code classification. Associate Planner Richard responded that, under the Building Code, the “den” would not be classified or permitted as a sleeping room. She added that the City does not regulate how homeowners choose to use spaces within their homes, but from a Code perspective it does not meet the requirements of a bedroom.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the “den” would meet bedroom requirements under Code section 301.5.0.1 and be considered compliant for use as a sleeping space if remodeled. Associate Planner Richard responded that bedrooms must meet specific Building Code requirements, including egress and ingress standards. She explained that if a homeowner later wanted to convert the “den” into a sleeping room, they would need to undertake a permitted renovation and have an architect demonstrate compliance with all applicable Code requirements.

Commissioner Haman asked whether those modifications to convert the “den” into a Code-compliant sleeping room could be done during the current project phase. Associate Planner



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Richard responded that the applicant is not proposing to modify the “den” into a bedroom at this phase. She added that the project is designed as 3- and 4-bedroom units, which the applicant likely determined based on market analysis of community demand in Hayward. Developer Proctor explained that only one plan type includes a downstairs bedroom, while other layouts do not have sufficient space for one. In those cases, the design team opted for a bonus or flexible room on the ground floor as the best alternative.

Commissioner Haman stated that there may be a fine line between a “den” and a sleeping area, noting that such spaces are likely to be used as bedrooms in practice. Developer Proctor responded that any future changes to convert the space would require permits and City review. He noted that any such modification would go through the City’s permitting process and come back for approval under applicable regulations.

Commissioner Haman asked whether solar panels will be installed as part of construction or if installation will be left to individual homeowners after purchase. Developer Proctor explained that solar panels will be installed during construction as required by California Energy Code, with an estimated allocation of about eight panels per unit as part of the built-in system, not installed later by individual owners.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the project will include EV charger readiness and whether the City could streamline the permitting process to make it easier for homeowners to later install EV chargers. Developer Proctor responded that it is a good suggestion and confirmed that all units are currently designed to be EV-ready.

Commissioner Haman asked whether homeowners could be provided with clear informational materials outlining the steps needed to install or upgrade an EV charger, to which Developer Proctor replied they would look into it.

Commissioner Stevens asked for clarification on the difference between the “top of bank” shown on the architectural plans and the “surveyed top of bank” shown on the tentative map, and how those relate to the building setbacks depicted. Associate Planner Richard explained that the blue line shown on the architectural plans represents the 20-foot setback from the top of bank, which is required under the Alameda County Watercourse Protection Ordinance.

Commissioner Stevens asked how the red line was established, noting it does not appear to match the tentative map, and questioned whether the discrepancy means the tentative map is incorrect or not applicable. Associate Planner Richard explained that the lines match but are labeled differently. She said the “top of bank” is determined using a 2:1 slope projection from the creek toe under county standards, and the 20-foot setback is measured from that line. She highlighted that the tentative map uses different terminology, but reflects the same calculation.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioner Stevens asked whether the project, which is designed to maintain a neutral condition relative to existing creek conditions, could include additional measures to detain or further reduce stormwater runoff into Ward Creek to address concerns about creek health. Developer Proctor responded that, due to the site's steep slopes and constrained buildable areas, opportunities for additional stormwater detention are very limited. He stated that the Civil Engineer has already maximized the use of bioretention areas to the extent feasible while still maintaining safety and constructability.

Commissioner Stevens suggested improving stormwater management by modifying the system and noted that current City development standards are outdated. Civil Engineer Joseph explained that the project uses C-3 bioretention and Silva cells to reduce runoff to pre-development levels. He said upsizing pipes or adding more stormwater area is not feasible due to space and utility constraints, and noted the design already meets City Code requirements.

Commissioner Stevens stated that, based on sheet TM-05, he sees a 12-inch storm drain transitioning to an 18-inch pipe near an 8-inch sewer line, and asked whether the 18-inch pipe could be upsized and throttled at a manhole to further reduce peak flows into the creek. Civil Engineer Joseph responded that, due to existing utility separation requirements and limited court widths, upsizing the pipe is not feasible within the current design. He added that they are open to further discussion with staff, but the current configuration reflects the feasible engineering design.

Commissioner Hardy asked who is responsible for traffic controls like stop signs and speed limits on the private drive highlighting the City's focus on pedestrian and bicycle safety. Associate Planner Richard explained that traffic control measures are typically addressed through a striping and signage plan included in the conditions of approval. She highlighted that this plan is reviewed by the Transportation Department during the grading permit stage to ensure appropriate signage is installed, supporting safety and aligning with Vision Zero goals to reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflicts.

Chair Goodbody asked why the arborist had not reviewed or commented on the grading report, landscaping plan, and utility locations, and inquired whether she was present to explain the lack of input. Associate Planner Richard explained that the arborist report is typically focused on assessing existing tree conditions and health. Landscape Architect Spores confirmed that the arborist's role is to evaluate existing trees and their health prior to development, not to review development plans. He added that arborists are often involved during construction to ensure compliance with approved plans and to protect existing trees.

Chair Goodbody asked who determines the fate of the roughly ten trees—whether the arborist makes recommendations during development or staff makes the final decision. Landscape Architect Spores explained that the arborist will be required to be on site during construction



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

to evaluate the condition of the trees, including those with uncertain outcomes, and to assess their status and any impacts from development.

Commissioner Meyers asked whether in-lieu affordable housing fees could be used to offset costs in order to distribute lower-income housing more evenly instead of concentrating on one development. Associate Planner Richard said scattered affordable housing is harder to monitor and enforce across different HOAs, so the city prefers units to be included within developments but still distributed throughout Hayward to ensure easier compliance and oversight. Principal Planner Schmidt added that most current projects include affordable housing units by using Density Bonus Law, resulting in inclusionary housing being built on-site. She noted that in this case, the project is opting to pay the in-lieu fee instead, which is allowed under the Ordinance.

Commissioner Stevens criticized the project's design and lack of additional stormwater mitigation, expressing concern about impacts to Ward Creek and suggesting City standards may need updating. He argued the City is constrained by state housing laws and housing accountability requirements, referencing external pressure to approve projects.

Commissioner Yorgov supported the project, praising it as a strong addition and noting that the in-lieu fee would significantly boost the Housing Trust Fund to help fund future affordable housing projects. He emphasized the regional housing shortage, supported the parking approach as market-driven, and agreed with staff's findings.

Commissioner Hardy expressed support for the project, noting it was encouraging to see development move forward since the 2024 zoning change. She said the proposal is consistent with the surrounding area, appreciated the housing investment, and acknowledged ongoing concerns about affordable housing. She also supported the provided parking, noting it exceeds requirements.

Commissioner Haman expressed concerns about traffic and emergency access on Walpert, warning that congestion and lack of a second exit could create safety issues during emergencies. He also raised concerns about increased on-street parking demand and the removal of mature trees, noting the environmental loss.

Chair Goodbody supported the project but raised concern that ADA units do not include kitchens. She emphasized accessibility and independent living for people with disabilities and asked the developer to consider adding kitchens, potentially as a condition of approval.

Associate Planner Richard clarified that there is no requirement for ground-floor kitchens in ADA units, so it cannot be added as a condition of approval. She noted that the commission could include it as a recommendation for the developer to consider during the building permit and construction plan stage.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Chair Goodbody asked Commissioner Yorgov whether he would accept a friendly amendment to include kitchens in the ADA units as a condition of approval. Commissioner Yorgov clarified that kitchens in ADA units cannot be made a condition of approval, but can be included as a recommendation to the applicant, which he agreed to.

It was moved by Commissioner Yorgov, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, to approve the proposed Vesting Tentative Tract Map 8750 and Site Plan Review, subject to the attached Findings and Conditions of Approval and Finding that the Project is Exempt Pursuant to Section 15332 of the California Environmental Quality Act.

AYES:	COMMISSISONER	Haman, Hardy, Lowe, Meyers, Stevens, Yorgov
	CHAIR	Goodbody
NOES:	COMMISSIONER	
ABSENT:	COMMISSISONER	
ABSTAIN:	COMMISSIONER	

2. 2025 General Plan Annual Progress Report RPT 26-023

Staff report submitted by Principal Planner Schmidt, dated March 12, 2026, was filed.

Principal Planner Schmidt introduced the item and provided a synopsis of the staff report.

Chair Goodbody opened public comment at 8:31p.m.

Ahmed Shorab supported market-driven parking policies, but urged the City to fully implement its bike and pedestrian infrastructure. He expressed concern that safety projects have been delayed or canceled due to political pushback. He emphasized that active transportation is essential, not recreational, and called for stronger execution of the City’s mobility plans to improve safety and reduce car dependence.

Chair Goodbody closed public comment at 8:34p.m.

Commissioner Lowe asked why certain programs that are unlikely to be implemented are not simply removed from the plan. Principal Planner Schmidt said removing programs would require formal general plan amendment with public hearings. She noted the plan is a long-term 40-year document, so priorities and funding will change over time, and progress is tracked through updates rather than frequent revisions.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioner Meyers asked whether the City's budget deficit could affect General Plan implementation and which areas might be impacted. Principal Planner Schmidt said impacts are hard to predict across Departments but noted the expanded Climate Action Plan requires significant resources that may be difficult to sustain. Environmental Services Manager Pearson added that implementation is already challenging—particularly for the Reach Code due to State limits on gas bans—and that reliance on increasingly limited grant funding creates further uncertainty.

Commissioner Meyers asked whether the City's budget deficit would not create a major barrier to General Plan implementation. Principal Planner Schmidt replied that General Plan implementation is an incremental, long-term process. She explained that because it is a 40-year plan, progress naturally happens gradually over time, with steady, incremental advancement rather than rapid implementation.

Commissioner Meyers asked how completion percentages relate to statuses like “started” and “partially complete.” Principal Planner Schmidt said there are no fixed percentages, as progress varies by project, and noted that even items within the same status can take years, with the Housing Element most closely tracked by the State.

Commissioner Meyers asked whether the City should be roughly around 50% completion of its general plan goals by 2027 as a midpoint benchmark. Principal Planner Schmidt noted that the City is doing well, estimating about 78% of General Plan programs are complete, ongoing, or underway. She highlighted that progress varies widely and added that the general plan will likely be updated before 2040 through a multi-year public process.

Commissioner Meyers asked what proportion of general plan objectives are classified as “ongoing,” and whether they make up around 10% or a larger share of the total. Principal Planner Schmidt said that about 50% of the programs are ongoing and reported on regularly, but she could not specify how many of the remaining unstarted programs are ongoing without further detailed review.

Commissioner Meyers asked about backup options for priority sites if a BART station is lost. Principal Planner Schmidt said the City is still advancing redevelopment of the downtown BART site, and if key sites become unviable, alternative housing sites can be identified and reviewed by the state during the Housing Element cycle.

Commissioner Meyers asked for confirmation that, even if a BART site is lost, the city still has alternative sites available and would not be left without options for meeting its housing goals. Principal Planner Schmidt confirmed that the City does have backup options of alternative sites to rely on if a primary site like a BART station becomes unavailable.



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioner Meyers asked whether data exists on the effectiveness of the Tennyson traffic improvements. Principal Planner Schmidt said she was unsure but would follow up with the Public Works/Transportation team and share any available findings.

Commissioner Yorgov asked whether during any future General Plan Amendment, staff would consider removing programs that are no longer achievable. Principal Planner Schmidt said removing unachievable programs could be considered during a future General Plan Amendment, but it would require significant coordination. She noted that updates are typically handled in larger or targeted efforts, such as past multi-element amendments or future Housing Element cycles.

Commissioner Yorgov asked when the public can provide input on the downtown BART project. Principal Planner Schmidt said it is still in early discussions, with outreach expected in the coming months, led by BART with City support.

Commissioner Yorgov asked how the parking standard was established and its rationale. Principal Planner Schmidt said it was set through the 2019 Downtown Specific Plan following extensive outreach, aligns with state parking flexibility laws, and offered to share supporting documents.

Commissioner Haman asked about plans for the A Street–Redwood Road corridor and its role in future density and transportation. Principal Planner Schmidt said improvements are limited to a grant-funded segment so far, with further work dependent on funding and focused on Vision Zero safety upgrades, with possible future land use studies.

Commissioner Haman asked how the mobility plan prioritizes streets for improvements. Principal Planner Schmidt said the Safe Streets Downtown initiative is evaluating potential street closures to through traffic to support walking and biking. She noted the work is partially complete and encouraged the public to follow the project website or contact transportation staff for updates and outreach opportunities.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the “evacuation preparedness and coordination plan” listed under hazards refers to something like the emergency broadcast system. Principal Planner Schmidt said the evacuation plan includes both alert systems and coordinated emergency routing, such as reversing traffic flow if needed, with Fire and Police working together to quickly move people out of affected areas.

Commissioner Haman asked whether the evacuation preparedness and coordination plan has ever actually been implemented or used in practice. Principal Planner Schmidt said the evacuation plans were developed and published as part of the Hazards Element update and



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

are based on different citywide emergency scenarios, confirming that such plans do exist and are in place.

Commissioner Haman asked how the public is made aware of the evacuation preparedness and coordination plans. Principal Planner Schmidt said the evacuation plans are technical documents for police and fire use, not public-facing materials, though they are available online and may be supported by public communication during implementation.

Commissioner Stevens noted that the public-facing Zonehaven emergency evacuation platform is available on the City of Hayward website and includes evacuation mapping. He emphasized that more public awareness of these tools could have helped address past concerns about projects like Hayward Boulevard.

Commissioner Haman supported corridor beautification, transit improvements, EV infrastructure, and a cultural/arts commission. He emphasized sea level rise as a priority, encouraged involving the Clean and Green Commission, and urged faster rollout of environmental justice programs.

Commissioner Yorgov emphasized collaboration with regional transit agencies, raised safety concerns about the Hesperian–Foothill corridor, and urged clearer communication and community engagement on traffic calming projects. He also supported parking enforcement Downtown to better manage existing supply.

Commissioner Lowe praised staff for their engagement with residents at community events. She encouraged continued focus on resident needs and priorities.

Commissioner Hardy expressed relief that CAP Action T3.5 (congestion pricing/tolls) has not been implemented, citing concerns for residents and commuters. She supported T3.6's focus on engaging low-income communities, recommended strong impact metrics for any future T3.5 efforts, and favored maintaining free downtown parking to support businesses.

Chair Goodbody suggested combining overlapping programs in environmental justice, health, and quality of life. She also urged continued implementation of traffic calming measures citywide despite public resistance.

Commissioner Stevens supported traffic calming efforts but cautioned that engineering solutions alone are not enough to address traffic safety. He emphasized the need for stronger driver education, enforcement, and broader systemic changes, urging a more holistic approach to transportation safety.

It was moved by Commissioner Haman, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, to accept the City of



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Hayward 2040 General Plan Progress Report for the 2025 Calendar Year.

AYES: COMMISISONER Haman, Hardy, Lowe, Meyers, Stevens, Yorgov
 CHAIR Goodbody
NOES: COMMISSIONER
ABSENT: COMMISISONER
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3. Minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting on January 22, 2026 **MIN 26-029**

It was moved by Commissioner Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Stevens, and carried unanimously, to approve the Minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting on January 22, 2026.

AYES: COMMISISONER Haman, Hardy, Lowe, Meyers, Stevens, Yorgov
 CHAIR Goodbody
NOES: COMMISSIONER
ABSENT: COMMISISONER
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS, REFERRALS

Principal Planner Schmidt made two announcements: 1) the March 26, 2026, Planning Commission meeting will be canceled due to no agenda items; and 2) the April 9, 2026, meeting will include a public hearing on Business Friendly Hayward Zoning Amendments and the Capital Improvement Program, both of which will go to City Council with the Commission's recommendation.

Commissioner Lowe praised the Hayward 150th anniversary event, highlighting strong community turnout and appreciation for staff efforts to gather input on future street design.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Goodbody adjourned the meeting at 9:13p.m.

APPROVED:



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND VIRTUAL (ZOOM)
PARTICIPATION
Thursday, March 12, 2026, 7:00 p.m.**

Attachment I

Ron Meyers, Secretary
Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Briea Allen
Planning Commission Secretary
Office of the City Clerk