November 9, 2023, Planning Commission Item 1 Comments

These comments on a Newport Beach Planning Commission <u>agenda</u> item are submitted by: Jim Mosher (<u>iimmosher@vahoo.com</u>), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229).

Item No. 1. MINUTES OF OCTOBER 19, 2023

The passages in *italics* are from the <u>draft minutes</u>, with corrections suggested in <u>strikeout</u> <u>underline</u> format.

Page 2, paragraph 4 from end: "In response to Secretary Harris' questions, Senior Planner Lee clarified that the lease for parcel two expired in March 2022, an existing gate to access the courts at the **Champion Champions** Club, there are no required Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) upgrades, and the enforcement process and options for use violations." [note: from the summary, "Champion" (singular) is the lessee/operator of a club it plans to call "Champions" (plural)]

Page 3, full paragraph 2, sentence 2: "He noted little effort by Palisades to secure a lease and no outreach by the appellant's attorney, and thought the matter is a property rights issue and Palisades is leveraging the City's land use process to undermine **Champions' Champion's** lease."

Page 3, paragraph 5 from end, sentence 1: "*Micheal Michael* Shonafelt, legal counsel for the appellant, provided a presentation to show the project plans for 24 pickleball courts and noted multiplying impacts occluded from the record, deprived full public disclosure of the project impact, and CEQA mandates."

Page 5, full paragraph 3: "Eric Longabardi Longabardi noted handicap parking availability, challenges, and disputes and asked for the matter to be considered."

Page 5, full paragraph 5: "In response to Commissioner Barto's request, Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that the lot split should have been incorporated in the use permit application instead of having two different applications." [note: The minutes are correct that the existence of two parcels was referred to as a "lot split." The <u>resubdivision</u> creating the two parcels comprising the original tennis club was not actually a lot split. The parcels were carved out of two adjacent pexisting lots, preserving the pre-existing property line between them. For reasons known only to the Irvine Company, they were not merged.]

Page 8, paragraph 2: "Except for Commissioner Lowrey, the Commissioners disclosed ex parte communications with landowners in the multi-zones mixed-use zones."

Page 10, paragraph 2: "Jim Mosher suggested making the origins known of deleted rules known to access potential improve usefulness and expressed concern for eliminating bluff overlay districts from Title 20, specifically Irvine Terrace."