

**Zoning Hearing Officer Addendum
Minor Conditional Use Permit No. 7318
202 N. Euclid Avenue
August 29, 2025**

It is my understanding that members of the public have filed appeals of my decision to approve Minor Conditional Use Permit (MCUP) No. 7318. This permit authorizes a Safe Parking use for up to 25 vehicles in conjunction with the religious facility located at 202 North Euclid Avenue.

Prior to the public hearing held on June 18, 2025, I carefully reviewed the staff report and all related exhibits, conducted a site visit of the subject property, and considered all written testimony submitted by members of the public. The concerns expressed during the process primarily related to the following: safety of the proposed operation; unpermitted land use; loitering; adequacy of public notice; and compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

After a thorough review of the record, I concurred with staff's recommendation that the required findings for approval could be made. I found staff's analysis to be comprehensive and well-reasoned, providing a solid basis for approval. In addition, I was persuaded by the applicant's presentation that community concerns could be reasonably addressed through the conditions of approval and by ongoing coordination with neighboring stakeholders. The following considerations were most significant in informing my determination:

Compliance with Zoning Code

I agree with staff's assessment that the Safe Parking use is conditionally permitted in the PS zoning district subject to approval of a Minor Conditional Use Permit. I further concur that the proposed use complies with the specific requirements of Zoning Code Section 17.50.265 (Safe Parking), including submittal of a management plan and compliance with applicable performance standards. Based on the record, I also found sufficient evidence to support the determination that the site qualifies as a religious facility, thereby meeting eligibility requirements for operation of a Safe Parking program.

Safety Concerns

I determined that the Safe Parking program, as conditioned, would not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding neighborhood. The operation incorporates multiple safeguards specifically intended to minimize potential adverse impacts, including discouraging loitering, littering, late-night disturbances, use of the public right-of-way, and noise.

Conditions of approval require: (1) the presence of a security guard during all hours of operation; (2) establishment of a hotline for community concerns; and (3) designation of a program representative who is available at all times during operation to respond promptly to issues.

To further address sanitary needs in a manner consistent with neighborhood compatibility, I imposed a condition requiring use of the indoor restroom facilities in lieu of the initially proposed portable toilet. My concern with reliance on a portable toilet is that it could attract unwanted activity from unhoused individuals outside of the Safe Parking program. However, I recognize that the use of a portable toilet may be appropriate if access is strictly controlled. Therefore, I would support the

use of a portable toilet provided it is equipped with a key code mechanism available only to Safe Parking participants.

Collectively, these measures establish a robust framework of safeguards that adequately address neighborhood safety concerns while allowing the Safe Parking program to operate responsibly.

Public Noticing and CEQA Compliance

I found that all required noticing procedures were followed prior to scheduling the public hearing.

Proper notifications were mailed and posted in accordance with State and local requirements.

Regarding CEQA, I determined that the project is categorically exempt from environmental review and that no unusual circumstances distinguish it from other projects in the exempt class. The use of the religious facility site for Safe Parking constitutes a negligible expansion of the existing use.

Finally, I wish to clarify that my use of the term “mitigation measures” during the hearing was intended in a general sense to describe measures alleviating community concerns, and not in the technical CEQA context of environmental impact mitigation.

Conclusion

Based on these findings, and supported by the staff’s detailed evaluation, I determined that the proposed Safe Parking use is consistent with the intent and purpose of the City’s Zoning Code and is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. In my judgment, the project will not result in significant adverse impacts to adjoining properties or the broader community.

Accordingly, I reaffirm my decision to approve **Minor Conditional Use Permit No. 7318**.

Respectfully,



Alex Garcia
Zoning Hearing Officer