

**NEWPORT BEACH PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 100 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 2021
REGULAR MEETING – 6:30 P.M.**

I. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Commissioner Klaustermeier

III. **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Chair Erik Weigand, Vice Chair Lee Lowrey, Secretary Lauren Kleiman, Commissioner Curtis Ellmore, Commissioner Sarah Klaustermeier, Commissioner Peter Koetting, Commissioner Mark Rosene

ABSENT: None

Staff Present: Community Development Director Seimone Jurjis, Deputy Community Development Director Jim Campbell, Assistant City Attorney Yolanda Summerhill, City Traffic Engineer Tony Brine, Senior Planner Ben Zdeba, Assistant Planner Joselyn Perez, Administrative Support Specialist Clarivel Rodriguez

IV. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Jim Mosher complimented staff on updating the online log of planning applications to include links to documents. For the past year, he has not been able to download sections of meeting documents archived on the City website, but the hyperlinks in documents are active. Perhaps staff could update the archive so that portions of documents can be downloaded with the links remaining active. Two legislators have introduced a Constitutional amendment that would make local planning ordinances supreme over State law except for the Coastal Act, siting of power plants, and the location of water and transportation infrastructure. Hopefully, the City will support the proposed Constitutional amendment.

V. **REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCES**

None

VI. **CONSENT ITEMS**

ITEM NO. 1 MINUTES OF MARCH 18, 2021, Planning Commission meeting
Recommended Action: Approve and file

Chair Weigand noted Mr. Mosher's proposed edits to the minutes.

Motion made by Commissioner Ellmore and seconded by Commissioner Kleiman to approve the minutes of the March 18, 2021, meeting with Mr. Mosher's edits.

AYES: Ellmore, Klaustermeier, Kleiman, Koetting, Lowrey, Lowrey, and Rosene
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

VII. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

ITEM NO. 2 MIXED-USE DOVER/WESTCLIFF (MU-DW) ZONING DISTRICT CODE AMENDMENT (PA2020-316)

Site Location: The Mixed-Use Dover/Westcliff (MU-DW) Zoning District is comprised of six parcels located along the westerly side of Dover Drive between 16th Street and Westcliff Drive

Summary:

An amendment to Table 2-8 (Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements) of Section 20.22.020 (Mixed-Use Zoning District Land Uses and Permit Requirements) of Title 20 (Planning and Zoning) of the Newport Beach Municipal Code. The proposed amendment would allow eating and drinking establishments (i.e., restaurants) and larger health/fitness facilities in the MU-DW District, subject to meeting the parking requirements and obtaining a use permit.

Recommended Action:

1. Conduct a public hearing;
2. Find the action proposed herein not a project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with Section 21065 of the California Public Resources Code and Sections 15060(c)(2), 15060 (c)(3), and 15378 of the California Code of Regulations Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3 ("CEQA Guidelines"). Zoning Code Amendment CA2020-009 is also exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3), because it has no potential to have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. Adopt Resolution No. PC2021-009 recommending the City Council approve Zoning Code Amendment No. CA2020-009 to amend Table 2-8 of Section 20.22.020 (Mixed-Use Zoning Districts Land Uses and Permit Requirements) of Title 20 (Planning and Zoning) of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC) (Attachment No. PC 1)).

Vice Chair Lowrey recused himself due to business interest conflicts.

Assistant Planner Joselyn Perez reported the six properties located in the MU-DW Zoning District are developed primarily with multi-tenant office buildings and one religious institution. The surrounding properties are developed with primarily residential uses but also include a park, high school, and a strip of commercial uses. Prior to the most-recent General Plan Update, the six parcels comprising the MU-DW district were zoned Administrative, Professional, and Financial (APF), which conditionally allowed eating and drinking establishments and health and fitness facilities. In late 2020, property owners within the MU-DW district approached the City about their difficulties leasing vacant office space and suggested allowing restaurants and gyms would help them lease vacant spaces. In November 2020, the City Council adopted a resolution initiating the subject Code amendment.

Assistant Planner Perez further reported the proposed Code Amendment would allow restaurants and gyms with the approval of a use permit. An application for a use permit would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis with respect to compatibility with surrounding uses and available parking. The proposed Code Amendment does not decrease off-street parking ratios. Staff analyzed these uses and found them to be consistent with the General Plan. Staff provided notice of the hearing to property owners located within a 300-foot radius of the MU-DW district, published notice in the *Daily Pilot*, and also sent a letter requesting public comment to property owners. Staff has not received any responses.

In response to Commissioner Koetting's questions, Deputy Director Jim Campbell advised that the proposed Amendment does not reference specific hours of operation. Hours of operation will be evaluated as part of each individual use permit requests. A fast-food restaurant with a drive-through could be allowed with a conditional use permit. Onsite parking will be subject to existing Code requirements and will likely be greater based on the size of the restaurant or gym use. If onsite parking is not adequate, the applicant will have to seek a parking waiver or provide offsite parking.

In reply to Commissioner Klaustermeier's query, Assistant Planner Perez explained that each application would be analyzed for traffic impacts individually.

In answer to Commissioner Rosene's inquiry, Assistant Planner Perez indicated the Zoning Administrator would hear and potentially approve a minor use permit. A decision by the Zoning Administrator could be appealed to the Planning Commission.

In response to Chair Weigand's questions, Assistant Planner Perez related that the Zoning Administrator would hear an application for a minor use permit for a fast-foot restaurant. Community Development Director Seimone Jurjis added that he has the discretion to present items to the Planning Commission for review. Deputy Director Campbell explained that the existing General Plan and zoning allow up to 26.7 dwelling units per acre, and there are no residential uses located in the MU-DW district at present. Commercial uses and mixed uses are allowed in the MU-DW district. Assistant City Attorney Yolanda Summerhill advised that a Zoning Code amendment would be needed to change the underlying zoning so that residential uses are no longer allowed. Deputy Director Campbell stated the Housing Element Update has explored increased housing density on these sites but has not explored modifying the permitted uses. If Commissioners are concerned about restaurant and gym uses in a mixed-use building in the MU-DW district, they may not want to endorse the proposed amendment.

Chair Weigand believed the MU-DW District is not a candidate for fast-food uses. Commissioners have the right to appeal Zoning Administrator decisions. He expressed the belief that this item is premature in light of the Housing Element Update being finalized in the next several months.

Chair Weigand opened the public hearing.

Jim Mosher proposed Exhibit A, Table 2-8, state "Section 1: The rows entitled 'Eating and Drinking Establishments' and 'Health/Fitness Facilities' of Table 2-8"

Laura Acuna, DMP Properties and property manager for 1501 and 1515 Westcliff Drive, supported the expansion of uses in the MU-DW district. This would allow opportunities in use and leasing for property owners.

David Tanner opposed the proposed amendment at the current time because of the residential uses allowed. Because the zoning allows mixed-use development and housing laws are varied and there are many, the City could very easily lose control of the property. The use of density bonus incentives and concessions could result in a high-rise mixed-use building with a small commercial-use component. This item should be postponed until the Council gives direction on the Housing Element Update.

Chair Weigand closed the public hearing.

In answer to Commissioner Kleiman's query, Deputy Director Campbell reiterated that property owners could redevelop their properties with a commercial or a mixed-use building under the existing zoning.

Chair Weigand clarified his comments as the Housing Element Update is considering increased housing density for the MU-DW district. The new uses could impact existing uses. The church already has trouble with unauthorized parking on its property.

Commissioner Rosene noted a restaurant could be a viable use in the district. Perhaps, the concern is a fast-food restaurant, in which case the Planning Commission may want to eliminate a fast-food use from the proposed amendment.

In response to Chair Weigand's questions, Community Development Director Jurjis reported eliminating a fast-food use from the amendment is within the Planning Commission's discretion. The Planning Commission is making a recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Weigand noted Council Member Duffield's interest in expanding uses within the MU-DW district. He advised that he does not wish to restrict property owners. The City Council can make the final decision.

Commissioner Koetting explained that the Housing Element Update is considering an overlay for potential sites; therefore, the Planning Commission does need to be too concerned about increased housing. Fast-food restaurants and fast-food restaurants with a drive-through are different. A fast-food use needs to be carefully described.

Chair Weigand expressed concern about vehicles entering and exiting the properties. Infrastructure adjustments will be needed to slow traffic if there is a lot of vehicles obtaining take-out orders.

Commissioner Klaustermeier indicated the requirement for a use permit that could be presented to the Planning Commission should assure Commissioners that uses not compatible with the surrounding area would not be approved.

Commissioner Kleiman remarked that the Planning Commission needs to do what it can to assist property owners and businesses thrive.

Commissioner Ellmore concurred with Commissioners Kleiman and Klaustermeier. The use permit is a good safety net. He indicated his position that postponing items because of potential issues and uncertainties is not appropriate.

Motion made by Commissioner Ellmore and seconded by Commissioner Kleiman to approve the staff recommendation.

AYES: Ellmore, Klaustermeier, Kleiman, Koetting, and Rosene
NOES: Weigand
RECUSED: Lowrey
ABSENT: None

VIII. STUDY SESSION

ITEM NO. 3 INITIAL DRAFT OF THE GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE (PA2017-141)

Site Location: Citywide

Summary:

The Housing Element is a mandatory element of the City's General Plan that requires periodic review and updating. It is a comprehensive statement of housing goals and policies that are closely correlated with other elements of the General Plan. The next update to the Housing Element must be adopted by mid-October of 2021. The draft update provides for the City's 4,845-unit allocation of the 6th Cycle of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), a State mandate, as well as relevant supporting policies consistent with State Housing Element laws.

Recommended Action: Review, discuss and provide input and direction to staff.

Deputy Community Development Director Campbell reported staff seeks the Planning Commission's input and comments regarding the draft Housing Element. Input and comments from the public have informed the draft Housing Element. Staff will present it to the City Council later in the month.

Senior Planner Ben Zdeba related the history of the General Plan Update Steering Committee (GPUSC) and the Housing Element Update Advisory Committee (HEUAC) and reviewed Listen & Learn and Housing Element Update workshops and methods of advertising the Housing Element Update. Staff plans to present the draft Housing Element to the Council on April 27, 2021 and seeks authorization to submit it to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) on May 14, 2021. HCD has 60 days to review the draft Housing Element and provide their findings such that the HEUAC may review the findings and offer potential changes on August 4, 2021. Planning Commission review and recommendation are tentatively scheduled for September 9th and September 23rd respectively. Finally, Council certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and adoption of the Housing Element could occur on October 12, 2021, with staff submitting the adopted Housing Element to HCD on October 15, 2021.

David Barquist, Kimley-Horn & Associates, advised that the draft Housing Element is an initial draft. The first public review period closes at the end of the month. Additional revisions will be made to the draft Housing Element to comply with statutory requirements and to reflect community concerns. The Introduction section sets the stage for the policy, its relationship to the General Plan, and the overall organization of the document. The Community Profile section is a demographic, econometric analysis of the existing community and sets a framework of initial need. The Housing Constraints and Resources section relates to governmental and nongovernmental constraints, contains an analysis of

fair housing, and summarizes the resources available to address housing issues. The Housing Plan section contains the policies to accommodate and implement housing growth through 2029. The Appendices support the analysis. The Adequate Sites Analysis explores the feasibility of sites accommodating future housing. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) is an estimate of the housing growth need for 2021-2029. The City's RHNA is 4,845 units. The City must show the capacity to accommodate future growth within its policy program. The City is required to provide the capacity for growth, not to build housing units. After subtracting projections for accessory dwelling unit (ADU) growth, projects in the pipeline, and remaining available sites in the 5th Cycle from the RHNA number, the net remaining need is 2,645 units, which the draft Housing Element accommodates.

Mr. Barquist further reported the community identified focus areas for development, and the HEUAC evaluated candidate sites, analyzed the feasibility and potential feasibility of future housing sites, and identified an inventory of sites with the highest potential for redevelopment in the future. Only the sites identified in the inventory are needed to accommodate the City's RHNA allocation. Development potential is the capacity to accommodate growth, and the City is required by law to demonstrate its ability to accommodate growth. The sites are used as a basis to frame the City's future policy and regulatory amendments to accommodate growth. He reviewed the five steps of calculating development potential for sites in a focus area. Public comment from workshops and HEUAC meetings suggested reevaluation of the sites methodology to establish a more equitable distribution of units Citywide, reconsider the distribution of affordability in each focus area, and revise assumptions for development potential. The HEUAC generally supports revising the assumptions.

Mr. Barquist went on to say the Airport Area was a key strategy of the 4th and 5th RHNA cycles; the proposed average density is 50 dwelling units per acre (du/ac); and redevelopment of 25 percent of the area is needed to accommodate growth. The West Newport Mesa Area provides opportunities for reinvestment and redevelopment, partnerships between public and private organizations, and housing for local workers of various income levels; the proposed average density is 45 du/ac; and redevelopment of 30 percent of the area is needed to accommodate growth. The Dover/Westcliff Area can support increased density that is compatible with surrounding uses; the proposed average density is 30 du/ac; and redevelopment of 40 percent of the area is needed to accommodate growth.

In response to Chair Weigand's inquiry, Deputy Director Campbell indicated there are no changes proposed for Mariners' Mile. The focus area is along Dover Drive.

In reply to Commissioner Koetting's request, Mr. Barquist explained the 5th RHNA Cycle as the planning period from 2014 to 2021.

Mr. Barquist stated the Newport Center Area has seen recent residential developments; the City anticipates additional development opportunities for housing; the proposed density is 45 du/ac; and redevelopment of 25 percent of the area is needed to accommodate growth.

Deputy Director Campbell reported the Sight Plane View Ordinance was adopted in 1972 and carried forward in three existing Planned Communities in the Newport Center Area. The ordinance basically limits buildings to a height of 32 feet. Buildings may be taller as

long as they are below the sight plane. The increased densities have the potential to cross the sight plane.

In answer to Chair Weigand's query, Deputy Director Campbell indicated there are multiple points where the building height can be addressed. Staff hopes the Planning Commission will leave the sites in the draft Housing Element because there are opportunities for future developments not to exceed the sight plane ordinance. A future housing overlay can also identify development standards for buildings to remain below the sight plane. The sight plane ordinance is unique in Newport Beach, but all properties are subject to the Zoning Code protections for views.

In response to Vice Chair Lowrey's inquiries, Deputy Director Campbell advised that the sight plane was implemented through an ordinance rather than a private easement. He indicated he is not aware of the sight plane requirement appearing on real property titles.

Mr. Barquist related that the Coyote Canyon Area is a closed landfill, but a portion of it is an ideal opportunity for residential development; the proposed density is 40 du/ac; and redevelopment of 100 percent of the portion is needed to accommodate growth. A developer and the County of Orange have expressed interest in redeveloping the property.

In response to Chair Weigand's query, Mr. Barquist stated one entity owns and controls the Coyote Canyon property.

Mr. Barquist reported the Banning Ranch Area is considered unlikely for redevelopment under Scenario 1; the proposed density is 30 du/ac; and redevelopment of 100 percent of the area is needed to accommodate growth. The total development potential for all the focus areas is 9,937 units, which is greater than need in order to provide a buffer. The buffer protects the City from the no net loss provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 166.

Deputy Director Campbell reiterated that the HEUAC will review the comments from HCD in August and propose changes to the draft Housing Element, which will then undergo a public review process again. The EIR will be ready for review along with the revised draft Housing Element in the fall.

In answer to Commissioner Rosene's questions, Deputy Director Campbell advised that staff intends to allow property owners with ADUs to self-certify the uses of ADUs. If the self-certification complies with criteria for a particular income level, the City will take credit for the ADU. The proposed inclusionary housing policy obligates the City to adopt an inclusionary housing ordinance within 24 months and to implement an interim policy. In the 4th RHNA Cycle, the Housing Element included an inclusionary housing policy at 15 percent and provided an exception for smaller housing developments. Those types of details will be discussed with the interim and permanent regulations.

In reply to Commissioner Kleiman's inquiries, Deputy Director Campbell indicated the policy actions contained in the draft Housing Element establish the need to take future zoning actions. Development standards can be included in those zoning actions, which the Planning Commission will review as proposed ordinances. Once the Housing Element is adopted, the City has three years to create the zoning strategies. The City's responsibility is to create a plan that provides opportunities to accommodate future growth required by the RHNA allocation. The City does not control the destiny of the Banning Ranch Area, but it can provide the zoning that allows residential development in the

Banning Ranch Area. The HEUAC and staff reviewed each parcel in the focus areas and discussed the feasibility of redevelopment of each parcel. The proposed densities do not include density bonuses. In discussing proposed densities, staff and the HEUAC considered compatibility with the surrounding area and existing development. The financial feasibility of redeveloping sites was not considered. The EIR could be challenged, which could delay the process. Kimley-Horn & Associates, a reputable and credible firm, is preparing the EIR and traffic analysis.

In response to Commissioner Koetting's queries, Mr. Barquist explained that information in the Housing Element must conform to statutory requirements, which in many respects dictate the organization of the Housing Element. Most cities' Housing Elements will follow the same framework.

Commissioner Koetting felt the credits for projects in the pipeline, ADU growth, and remaining 5th RHNA Cycle sites need to be emphasized to the community. Deputy Director Campbell clarified that the Housing Element will not affect existing uses but add an opportunity for housing under certain rules. Staff has sent two letters and will be sending a third letter to owners of opportunity sites inquiring about their interest in redeveloping their properties. Some property owners have replied indicating interest in future housing opportunities. In addition, staff has met with some property owners. The percentages for redevelopment are necessary to meet RHNA, but whether those percentages will be realized over time is unknown. The redevelopment percentages are reasonable assumptions for the areas within a planning document. The County has an agreement with Tait and Associates to develop a golf course on the Coyote Canyon property. Staff in conjunction with Tait and Associates identified the 22-acre area as not impacted by the landfill. If Tait and Associates determines it can provide a project with 20 percent affordable housing rather than the assumed 35 percent, the Housing Element has to provide the difference in other focus areas or within 180 days the City will have to rezone property to account for the difference. This is where the buffer comes into play.

Vice Chair Lowrey preferred low- and very-low-income housing be distributed across focus areas instead of concentrated in the Airport Area. Because the EIR for the previous Banning Ranch project is invalid, a new development project in the Banning Ranch area may be able to provide more affordable housing than assumed. Deputy Director Campbell reported affordable housing has been reallocated slightly, but staff will look again at Banning Ranch.

In answer to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiries, Deputy Director Campbell explained that the Airport Area, Newport Center, and West Newport Mesa are ripe for densification because of the proximity to transit and jobs. The Dover/Westcliff Area is a lower-density community. The density for the Banning Ranch Area is low because of the limited amount of land. In the previous project, the Coastal Commission identified less than 15 acres of development that was free of any environmental constraint. The exact number of acres available for development today is unknown.

Commissioner Ellmore recommended staff consider lowering the density in the Airport Area and increasing density in the Banning Ranch Area.

Vice Chair Lowrey noted Fashion Island and the Airport Area are the City's business centers. The higher densities for those areas require some thought. The undeveloped Banning Ranch Area may be more appropriate for higher density.

In reply to Chair Weigand's questions, Deputy Director Campbell noted that market-rate housing in a mixed-income development is necessary to finance the affordable housing. While zoning for market-rate housing is not necessary for the 6th RHNA Cycle, it is a component of financing and constructing affordable housing. Typically, developers include the minimum number of affordable housing units required and the minimum number the development can afford. Developers may be able to construct more affordable housing in a development than required. Encouraging developers to provide more affordable housing is not part of the draft Housing Element. Projects with higher affordability are financed differently, and the amount of the subsidy is small. Mr. Barquist added that the draft Housing Element indirectly encourages the City to meet and confer with affordable housing developers.

Chair Weigand believed the projected number of ADUs could be more aggressive, and strategies need to be applied to that. Increasing senior housing and assisted living units would be good because seniors use fewer City services. The discussion needs to consider the impacts of increased housing and the omission of development impact fees for projects with less than 50 units on the City. He expressed concern about replacing recreation areas with housing. The process needs to slow down. He preferred to fight something like this because he does not want the character of the City to change to meet this arbitrary demand. Deputy Director Campbell indicated an increase in senior housing would coincide with the aging population of Newport Beach. Senior housing is usually more welcomed into the community.

In answer to Commissioner Koetting's query, Deputy Director Campbell indicated Sites 1-16 can be found on page B-37. The list of sites will be updated.

Commissioner Kleiman agreed with the concern about this changing the character of the City, particularly proceeding with no protections. The City should zone for a maximum number of units so that applications for unwanted developments are not submitted and future RHNA allocations do not increase exponentially. Deputy Director Campbell reported the Council directed staff and the HEUAC to develop a plan to comply with the City's RHNA allocation. Staff shares the concern about changes to the community over time. The Council is reviewing other ways to push back identified in its 2020 Housing Action Plan.

Jim Mosher remarked that zoning overlays provide development opportunities and protections for property owners. HCD expects the City to address its comments and not much else. Because of the grace period, there is no penalty if the Council adopts the Housing Element by February 15, 2022. Adoption in December may be more reasonable than in October. He inquired whether the draft Housing Element sent to HCD for review would be made available to the public.

Deputy Director Campbell explained that staff will revise the draft Housing Element to comply with HCD's comments. Chair Weigand questioned whether HCD could complete its review in 60 days.

Debra Allen, Harbor View Hills Community Association, commented that the sight plane ordinance is a constraint on development, and residents want the ordinance to continue. Property owners for five sites subject to the sight plane ordinance have expressed interest

in redeveloping their properties to provide residential uses. The proposed overlay may be difficult to remove in the future.

Chair Weigand wanted to protect the sight plane ordinance. The residents' concerns are legitimate. Community Development Director Jurjis advised that staff would ensure the Council is aware of the sight plane ordinance.

In response to Commissioner Kleiman's inquiry, Community Development Director Jurjis reported the Housing Element will not supersede the sight plane ordinance. The Council has notified him that it wants to preserve the sight plane ordinance.

Commissioner Kleiman also wanted to maintain the sight plane ordinance.

Nancy Scarbrough believed more things need to be done, such as learning whether affordable housing developers can provide projects with more than 10 percent affordable. The draft Housing Element has to be right before it is submitted to HCD.

John Loper requested an overlay zone for the Via Lido Plaza. The large amount of surface parking would be a good site for housing. During the 5th RHNA Cycle, mixed-use developments were allowed on surrounding properties.

In reply to Chair Weigand's query, Deputy Director Campbell reported the Via Lido Plaza site was not considered because it was not zoned for mixed use in the 5th RHNA Cycle. The Peninsula area was not considered for densification. Staff will talk with the property owner, and the Council may consider the request.

In answer to Commissioner Koetting's question, Deputy Director Campbell believed the Coastal Commission is more amenable to housing in the Coastal Zone than in the past and wants to see the preservation of existing density. The Environmental Justice Policy, which the Coastal Commission recently adopted, suggests principles for the Coastal Commission's review of applications. Weighing the housing crisis with environmental constraints on Banning Ranch is within the Coastal Commission's purview. Staff addressed identification of the Banning Ranch site for housing with Coastal Commission staff and received little definitive feedback.

In response to Vice Chair Lowrey's inquiries, Deputy Director Campbell related that mortgage revenue bonds from the County helped finance the Uptown Newport project and will probably be used in future projects. The draft Housing Element contains policies for homeless shelters. Most of the time, affordable housing is not feasible.

Commissioner Klaustermeier noted a low percentage of parcels is projected to redevelop. An overlay is proposed for a large number of parcels and should be approached cautiously. Deputy Director Campbell clarified that the overlay would be available until production achieves the targeted number of units and then would cease to exist. Staff does not want to create an overlay that exists in perpetuity.

In reply to Chair Weigand's query, Deputy Director Campbell advised that the HEUAC will be on hiatus until HCD provides its comments. To change the composition of the HEUAC would require Council action. Commissioners can voluntarily participate in HEUAC meetings. Staff could present HCD's comments to the Planning Commission as well as the HEUAC.

IX. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER ITEMS

ITEM NO. 4 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

None

ITEM NO. 5 REPORT BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR OR REQUEST FOR MATTERS WHICH A PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA.

Deputy Community Development Director Campbell reported on March 23, 2021, the Council adopted the wine tasting ordinance, authorized the Annual General Plan Update progress report, and approved a one-year waiver of business license fees for businesses that were forced to closed due to the pandemic. A virtual workshop regarding the Circulation Element Update was held April 5, 2021. The April 22, 2021, Planning Commission will be canceled. Currently, four applications are scheduled for the Planning Commission's May 6, 2021, meeting. Staff will present the draft Housing Element and the Mariners' Mile mixed-use project to the Council on April 27, 2021.

Jim Mosher believed paper copies of the draft Housing Element would assist the public's review of the document.

ITEM NO. 6 REQUESTS FOR EXCUSED ABSENCES

None

X. ADJOURNMENT – 8:58 p.m.

The agenda for the April 8, 2021, Planning Commission meeting was posted on Friday, April 02, 2021, at 2:20 p.m. in the Chambers binder, on the digital display board located inside the vestibule of the Council Chambers at 100 Civic Center Drive, and on the City's website on Friday, April 02, 2021, at 2:15 p.m.

Erik Weigand, Chairman

Lauren Kleiman, Secretary

May 6, 2021, Planning Commission Item 1 Comments

These comments on a Newport Beach Planning Commission [agenda](#) item are submitted by:
Jim Mosher (jimmosher@yahoo.com), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229).

Item No. 1. MINUTES OF APRIL 8, 2021

The passages in *italics* are from the [draft minutes](#). Corrections are suggested in **strikeout underline** format.

Page 1, last paragraph: “*Motion made by Commissioner Ellmore and seconded by ~~Commissioner Secretary~~ Kleiman to approve the minutes of the March 18, 2021, meeting with Mr. Mosher’s edits.*”

Note: **Secretary** Kleiman is referred to as “**Commissioner** Kleiman” in eight more places: on pages 4 (3 places), 5, 7, 9 and 10 (2 places). Those should be corrected, as well.

Page 11, Item 5, first sentence: “*Deputy Community Development Director Campbell reported on March 23, 2021, the Council adopted the wine tasting room ordinance, authorized the Annual General Plan Update progress report, and approved a one-year waiver of business license fees for businesses that were forced to closed due to the pandemic.*”