

Attachment No. 1

Draft Minutes of December 3, 2025

**CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE/GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY
COMMITTEE JOINT MEETING AGENDA
CIVIC CENTER COMMUNITY ROOM – 100 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE**

**December 3, 2025
SPECIAL MEETING – 4:00 P.M. OR SOON THEREAFTER**

I. CALL THE JOINT MEETING TO ORDER

General Plan Update Steering Committee (GPUSC) Chair Gardner called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE

GPUSC Chair Gardener conducted roll call:

Present: Philip Brown, Kimberly Carter, Nancy Gardner

Staff: Planning Manager Ben Zdeba

Absent: None

III. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

GPUSC Chair Gardner conducted roll call:

Present: Virginia Anders-Ellmore, Dennis Baker, James Carlson, Susan DeSantis (joined meeting in progress), Chuck Ebner, Jeremy Evans, Lynn Hackman, Laird Hayes, Ruth Kobayashi, Katie Love (joined meeting in progress), Thomas Meng, Jim Mosher, Amber Snider, Debbie Stevens, Christy Walker, and Paul Watkins

Staff: Planning Manager Ben Zdeba

Excused Absent: Nicholas Acevedo, Curtis Black, Annie Clougherty, Rita Goldberg, Arlene Greer, David Guder, Scott Laidlaw, and Anthony Maniscalchi

Absent: None

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

(This item includes written correspondence received that is not related to items on the agenda.)

Planning Manager Ben Zdeba reported that the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) and GPUSC discussed the concept of providing an overarching purpose statement to eliminate many of the uses of “reasonable” that GPAC Member Watkins recommended adding to policies. He presented a draft purpose statement to integrate into the introduction, adding that it has been shared with the City Attorney’s office.

GPAC Member DeSantis joined the meeting during Planning Manager Zdeba's comments.

The GPAC members nodded in agreement with the general direction of the statement.

V. CURRENT BUSINESS

a. **GPAC Meeting Minutes of November 5, 2025 (Attachment 1 – Draft Minutes)**

Recommended GPAC Action:

Review and approve the minutes of November 5, 2025.

Motion made by GPAC Co-Chair Evans and seconded by GPAC Member Meng to approve the meeting minutes of November 5, 2025, with GPAC Member Mosher's edits.

The motion carried unanimously. GPAC Member Ebner abstained as he did not attend the November 5, 2025, meeting.

b. **Input from the Community Members and from City Boards, Commissions, and Committees on the Draft General Plan Elements (Attachment 2a – Table of Community Member Input; Attachment 2b – Table of City Boards, Commissions, and Committees Feedback; and Attachment 2c – Additional Input Addressed to Planning Commission and City Council)**

City staff has compiled and reviewed all the input received from community members (Attachment 2a) and City Boards, Commissions, and Committees (Attachment 2b) on the draft General Plan Elements. Each Subcommittee has received its respective comments for consideration and will bring up any comments as appropriate for GPAC and GPUSC discussion. City staff has provided recommended responses to each comment received for consideration.

Recommended GPAC/GPUSC Actions:

- (1) Receive input from the various GPAC Subcommittees; and
- (2) Provide guidance to City staff and Dudek on any changes to the draft Elements.

GPUSC Chair Gardner called for comments on the feedback received by City boards, committees, and commissions, starting with the City Arts Commission's feedback.

In response to GPAC Member Hackman's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba noted that there is a proposed policy encouraging art at larger developments, both public and private. He added that the GPAC could encourage the Council to incorporate a development fee to directly benefit the City's arts and libraries.

GPAC Member Hackman reported that a one-percent development fee going directly to the City's arts used to be mandatory and endorsed bringing it back.

GPUSC Chair Gardner stated that the direction from the GPAC has been to mandate as little as possible.

GPAC Member Mosher clarified that GPAC Member Hackman is referring to a since-repealed City Council policy.

In response to GPAC Member Mosher's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that there is a typographical mistake on the Agenda Packet, and staff recommends incorporating the City Arts Commission's suggested edit to Draft Policy No. HR-4.3.

GPAC Member Love joined the meeting.

GPAC Member Mosher stated that the map of view corridors in the current General Plan is out of date and called for it to be revised prior to adoption.

In response to GPUSC Chair Gardner's inquiries, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that the Newport Coast area is not within the City's certified Local Coastal Program (LCP). He noted that there has been a directive through the General Plan updating process for the City to coordinate with Orange County and the California Coastal Commission to add the area into the City's LCP. He added that it would be more appropriate to update the view corridor map as part of an LCP update. He confirmed that the City still must request permits from the County for work on some Newport Coast tracts.

GPAC Member Anders-Ellmore stated that a notation about this nuance should be included in the General Plan.

Planning Manager Zdeba confirmed that there are references to the LCP in this section.

GPAC Member Mosher recommended adding a notation to the Implementation Plan, noting that the view corridor map is out of date and needs correction.

Adam Leverenz stated that, if "lower-cost" is removed from Draft Policy No. HBB-8.2, the policy would become inconsistent with the LCP's Coastal Land Use Plan Section 3.3.2-3. He added that the City's moorings contribute \$1.9 million to the Tidelands Fund while piers only contribute \$238,000.

In response to GPAC Member Hackman's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that Draft Policy No. HBB-8.2 is intended to apply to both public and private marinas. Mr. Leverenz clarified that the "lower cost" refers to the fees that go into the Tidelands Fund and not the ones the marina charges the lessee.

GPUSC Chair Gardner stated that they wish to support recreational boating but noted that there are higher and lower cost ends to recreational boating, adding that a kayak is also a recreational boat.

GPAC Member Mosher noted that California Coastal Act Section 30213 calls for the encouragement and protection of lower-cost facilities, obligating the LCP to provide a lower-cost option. He encouraged keeping "lower cost" in the General Plan for consistency with the LCP's State mandate.

Planning Manager Zdeba confirmed that "lower cost" can stay in the General Plan.

Mr. Leverenz cautioned against changing "reasonable" rates to "market" rates in Draft Policy No. HBB-9.1 because "reasonable" allows the City more latitude in determining what is reasonable for Newport Beach as opposed to neighboring cities. He cited the

higher rates in the City of Huntington Beach as an example of risk exposure the City would incur by using market rates.

GPAC Member Mosher agreed with Mr. Leverenz, adding that some harbor uses provide educational and other public benefits.

By a show of hands, the GPAC members agreed to keep “reasonable.”

GPAC Member Mosher noted that the recommended edit for Draft Policy No. HBB-11.5 omits improvements to physical wayfinding signage.

Planning Manager Zdeba stated that the proposed edit can be rewritten to include physical signage.

By a show of hands, the GPAC members agreed to include physical signage.

In response to GPAC Member Mosher’s inquiry, Consultant Elizabeth Dickson (Dudek) clarified that, in Draft Policy No. HBB-11.3, the specific location of a potential marine terminal is not identified in the General Plan, with the policy stating only to coordinate an ideal location or locations with other interested parties.

In response to GPUSC Chair Gardner’s inquiry, GPAC Member Mosher reported that the Harbor Commission was left pondering why the City would want a marine terminal in the harbor. Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that comments were added after the Harbor Commission heard the Draft Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element. He agreed with Consultant Dickson’s interpretation of the Draft Policy’s intent of encouraging coordination and not site specificity.

In response to GPAC Member Mosher’s inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that phrasing can be added clarifying that the Draft Policy applies if there is a desire in the future to construct a marine terminal.

GPAC Member DeSantis stated that a marine terminal would be inappropriate for Newport Beach and would never happen, so the policy is unnecessary.

By a show of hands, the GPAC members agreed to delete Draft Policy No. HBB-11.3.

In response to GPAC Member Baker’s inquiry, Consultant Dickson reported that the defining language about the Harbor Department came largely from the City’s website.

In response to GPAC Member Mosher’s inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba agreed that staff can include direction in the General Plan to update data reflecting the economic value of the harbor at a regular interval.

By a show of hands, the GPAC members agreed to add direction for staff to update the harbor’s economic value data on a regular interval to be determined.

In response to GPAC Member Walker’s inquiry, GPUSC Chair Gardner stated that policies like this usually have an updating timeframe of every five or 10 years.

GPAC Members DeSantis and Walker called to set the interval at five years.

In response to GPAC Member DeSantis' inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba stated that he is unsure how the Implementation Plan currently handles updating the economic value data for the harbor, but added that it can be included.

In response to GPUSC Chair Gardner's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba estimated that an economic value study would cost between \$20,000 and \$30,000.

By a show of hands, the GPAC members agreed to set a five-year timeline for updating the harbor's economic value figures.

Mr. Leverenz stated that Harbormaster Paul Blank reported that every Harbor Department employee will be trained on the rules of arrest, leading to a discussion by the City Council with assurances from Mayor Joe Stapleton that the Harbor Department will not serve as law enforcement but rather remain as code enforcement. He expressed concerns about Suggested Policy No. HBB-5.4 stating that the Harbor Department will serve a law enforcement role as opposed to the Orange County Sheriff's Harbor Patrol.

GPUSC Chair Gardner stated that Suggested Policy No. HBB-5.4 does not mention the Harbor Department.

GPAC Member Baker clarified that the Draft Policy's meaning depends on how you interpret the phrase "well-coordinated law enforcement." He stated that his interpretation is that the Harbor Department will coordinate with law enforcement agencies and not become a law enforcement agency.

In response to GPUSC Chair Gardner's inquiry, the GPAC members nodded in agreement with GPAC Member Baker's interpretation.

Consultant Dickson noted that Suggested Policy No. HBB-8.9 calls for a reassessment of the harbor's economic value at least every five years.

GPAC Member Mosher stated, regarding Suggested Policy No. HBB-5.4, that the beach management role described is already under the purview of the Parks, Beaches, and Recreation (PB&R) Commission. He added that this policy would require a City Charter amendment to change the PB&R Commission's role.

GPUSC Chair Gardner clarified that the PB&R Commission typically only looks at the recreational aspects of the beaches, and the Suggested Policy would create a committee also looking at beach aspects like coastal resilience.

GPAC Member Baker expressed concerns about creating another committee. He pondered whether too much is being put on the PB&R Commission if they also had to consider matters like tidepools.

GPAC Member Walker decried having too many committees, leading to confusion over who is responsible for certain things. She stated that beaches should be considered the same as a park without grass, adding that the Recreation and Senior Services Department should also consider matters like sand erosion.

Planning Manager Zdeba reported that the call for a singular beach-driven committee came from the Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands (WQ/CT) Committee's feedback. He stated that the concept can be rephrased.

Mr. Leverenz reported that the WQ/CT Committee recently approved cameras to track sand flow and is actively looking into beach sand replenishment.

GPAC Member Hayes reported that he served on the PB&R Commission for nine years and that they were never consulted about beaches.

GPAC Member Mosher stated that the City's beach-related roles need to be clarified, but questioned whether the General Plan is the correct place to achieve it. He agreed with GPAC Members Baker and Walker that another committee is not needed when the City Charter already identifies the PB&R Commission for the role.

GPAC Member Baker stated that the WQ/CT Committee has aggressively added areas of purview over the years, whereas the PB&R Commission tends to wait until items are assigned to it before acting. He clarified that he would like to use the General Plan to give the PB&R Commission permission to take on additional beach-related matters currently tending to fall to the WQ/CT Committee.

In response to GPUSC Chair Gardner's inquiry, the GPAC members verbally agreed not to endorse creating a new committee, but rather to include language encouraging the PB&R Commission to handle the beaches more actively.

GPUSC Chair Gardner noted that Pages 60-61 of the Agenda Packet features details of potential roles for beach management and directed Planning Manager Zdeba to clarify those details based upon the discussion.

In response to GPAC Member Hayes' inquiries, GPUSC Chair Gardner clarified that there will not be a new committee, and staff will rework the language on pages 60-61. Consultant Dickson added that those two pages provide a potential scope of work for a new beach-centric committee.

In response to GPAC Member Hayes' inquiry, GPUSC Chair Gardner reported that residents have fought in the past against public restrooms at the wedge. She stated that the General Plan can recommend adding them. Consultant Dickson added that policies in the Draft Recreation Element addressing facilities include restrooms.

In response to GPUSC Member Carter's inquiry, GPUSC Chair Gardner reported that the references to the Bicycle Master Plan in the Draft Recreation Element cover possible future regulations about eBikes. Planning Manager Zdeba added that eBikes are also covered under the Draft General Plan's policies for emerging technology.

GPAC Member Mosher lamented the lack of comments from the Planning Commission on the Draft Safety Element and the Draft Land Use Element.

GPUSC Chair Gardner stated that it is not within their purview to tell the Planning Commission how much thought it should give to the General Plan update.

GPAC Member Carlson commended Draft Policy No. LU-14, lamenting that the City's policy is diametrically opposed to the General Plan regarding Mariners' Mile.

GPUSC Chair Gardner clarified that they can only present the City Council with what they feel is important, and the Council gets to determine how to act.

GPAC Member Hackman theorized that the lack of Planning Commission commentary on their work is because updating the Housing Element and Circulation Element is not part of the GPAC's mission.

In response to GPAC Member DeSantis' inquiry, GPUSC Chair Gardner stated that they are past the initial window for Planning Commission comments on the elements under the GPAC's purview, regardless of whether the Housing Element already being certified impacted the Commission's decision.

In response to GPAC Member Hackman's inquiry, GPAC Member Walker clarified that the GPAC had to work within the parameters of the Housing Element, and their work is based on needing to implement the existing Housing Element.

Planning Manager Zdeba noted that Draft Policy Nos. LU-20-23 are all new policies derived directly from the focus areas of the Housing Element. He added that there were community comments about land use policies in Coyote Canyon.

In response to GPAC Member DeSantis' inquiry, Consultant Dickson confirmed that the Existing Conditions Background Analysis Reports are based on future population growth projections drawn from the Housing Element. She cited the Housing Element impacting traffic studies conducted for the Draft Noise Element as another place where it is being considered as part of the GPAC's work. She stated that the Housing Element will always be on a different track than the rest of the General Plan because the State mandates extensive updates to it every eight years.

In response to GPAC Member Hackman's inquiry, GPUSC Chair Gardner clarified that the Housing Element is included in the General Plan but is not included in what the GPAC can discuss because it has been State-certified. She noted that the GPAC has discussed and made changes to the existing Land Use Element. She added that they depend on staff and consultants to ensure that the GPAC drafts is consistent with the Housing Element. Consultant Dickson reported that many of the changes made to the Land Use Element are based on future population projections from the Housing Element.

GPAC Member Kobayashi endorsed adding an opening statement to the Draft Land Use Element, denoting that it is based on the Housing Element's population projections.

GPAC Member Stevens stated that the General Plan includes already approved elements and separating them out from the GPAC's mission does not make sense.

Mr. Leverenz stated that the Housing Element is evolving, including potential litigation, and the GPAC would be wasting its time going through a document that could still change in ways beyond its control.

GPAC Member Walker reported that if the City must abide by the State-certified Housing Element, then the GPAC's place is to ensure that it fits with the remaining elements.

In response to GPAC Member Walker's inquiries, GPUSC Chair Gardner confirmed that any forthcoming challenges to the State's housing mandates do not impact anything the GPAC is doing tonight. She agreed that changes to the State's policies could change what the City's General Plan needs to include, but that it is a future discussion. She noted that this is not the GPAC's last meeting.

In response to GPAC Member Anders-Ellmore's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that the Planning Commission's comment on Draft Policy No. LU-29 was to remove the reference to a linear park and not to explore removing Randall Preserve from the City's sphere of influence.

Planning Manager Zdeba reported that the City received 69 unique public comments on the draft elements. He noted that several comments were too specific to be included in the broader General Plan. He added that all comments were responded to by City staff. He reported that consultants from Kearns & West will be working on an outreach summary that will include all comments, and it will be presented to the City Council when it hears the General Plan.

GPUSC Chair Gardner called for comments on the public feedback. None were made.

Planning Manager Zdeba presented two public comment emails sent to the Planning Commission when the draft elements were presented. He noted that staff feels that one was too specific to Lido Isle to be incorporated into the General Plan, while the other asks several questions covered in either the General Plan or Implementation Plan.

In response to GPUSC Chair Gardner's inquiry, GPAC Member Stevens stated that, if they include Lido Isle as a specific area, they would also have to give the same treatment to Harbor Island and Shark (Linda) Island.

Planning Manager Zdeba agreed that Lido Isle could be too specific and prompt multiple similar requests for portions of neighborhoods Citywide.

GPAC Member Stevens noted that many of the General Plan's focus areas are places where development is planned, so Lido Isle does not merit specific inclusion.

GPAC Member Mosher reported that Dudek included maps in the drafts reviewed by the public that were not seen by either the GPAC's subcommittees or the City's boards, committees, and commissions. He questioned the accuracy of several templated maps with locations mislabeled and using names for locations not commonly found in Newport Beach residents' vernacular.

Planning Manager Zdeba confirmed that staff can work with Dudek to ensure that the maps include accurate and commonly used local naming conventions.

In response to GPAC Member Baker's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba reported that the maps are posted online with the draft elements. He clarified that the subcommittees saw many maps.

In response to GPAC Member Ebner's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that the General Plan, including the maps, is a draft until adopted by the City Council and can be viewed on the City's website as part of the public access to their process.

GPUSC Chair Gardner noted that at the first City Council meeting of February, new members can be appointed. She added that, if the members thought they would feel comfortable approving a General Plan in January, then the Committee could be sunset, and they would not have to go through an annual renewal process in February. She added that the Council could also act so that the current membership does not expire.

Planning Manager Zdeba offered to directly assist GPAC Member Hackman with Housing Element questions and GPAC Member Ebner with map questions. He clarified how the GPAC members could still engage beyond the GPAC's actions as members of the public. He noted that the draft elements still need formal approval from their relevant boards, commissions, and committees.

GPUSC Chair Gardner clarified that they would have to be able to approve the General Plan in January to avoid their potential sunset by the City Council in February.

In response to GPUSC Member Carter's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that, because they have already gone to the boards, commissions, and committees with an introduction to the draft elements in search of feedback, he does not anticipate receiving much feedback when those groups see more finalized drafts in the coming months.

GPUSC Chair Gardner stated that what is ultimately presented to the City Council should be what the GPAC recommended, but if there are additional comments, then those could be heard by the Council if the GPAC sunsets. She added that, while there may be additional comments, it is the GPAC's final plan that should move forward.

In response to GPAC Member DeSantis' inquiries, Planning Manager Zdeba stated that the City Council will receive all the GPAC's work, including the eight elements under their purview, the Implementation Plan, and the Crosswalk Tool. He added that the plan for the next item is to introduce the Implementation for initial feedback and direction, cautioning that staff is reviewing it concurrently, so some portions are still rough.

c. Draft Implementation Programs and Crosswalk Tool (Attachment 3a – Redline-Strikeout Draft Implementation Programs; and Attachment 3b – Draft Crosswalk Tool)

Implementation Programs in the General Plan are an important component. City staff mostly uses them to understand how goals and their policies may be implemented. As has been previously shared, the currently adopted Implementation Programs chapter provides a sound baseline to work from and has been updated in tracked changes for the GPAC's and GPUSC's review (Attachment 3a). However, one major missing piece from the current format is a document that helps provide clearer guidance to City staff on timing expectations and supporting departments. The proposed draft "crosswalk" provides a useful tool for City Council, City staff, and the community to ensure enhanced implementation accountability (Attachment 3b).

Recommended GPAC/GPUSC Actions:

- (1) Receive a presentation from City staff and the consultant team; and

(2) Provide any feedback on the draft documents.

Consultant Dickson reported on how the Implementation Program presents a tool, a responsible department, and a timeline for each General Plan policy, connecting every policy with actions for City staff to track progress while exercising professional judgement. She cited examples of how corresponding Zoning Code changes, the development of Specific Plans, and interagency coordination can impact implementation.

Consultant Dickson stated that the Crosswalk Tool is important in tracking and monitoring how the implementation of the General Plan is performed through progress reports connected to individual policies with needed actions by accountable City departments.

In response to Planning Manager Zdeba's inquiry, Consultant Dickson reported that the implementation work of other agencies can vary greatly, but the best practices are tied to the Crosswalk Tool and connected with a timeline to the department responsible. She noted that some policies will always be considered ongoing, such as some land use-based policies, while others, such as a specific economic analysis, have a firm deadline. She clarified that it is considered a best practice to connect actions to the specific intent of each policy.

In response to GPUSC Chair Gardner's inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba stated that the current Implementation Plan has a great foundation but needs refreshing. He stated that staff is looking for feedback on whether the Crosswalk Tool is a good approach. He added that the Crosswalk Tool will be a significant improvement, aiding annual reports focused on each policy on a micro level. He added that staff is looking for feedback on the concept of doing a more extensive review of three elements on a rolling basis.

GPUSC Chair Gardner lauded the Crosswalk Tool for being a big improvement from the City's current methods.

GPAC Member Baker noted that the General Plan is meant to be dynamic with an amendment process allowing for adaptation to unknown future conditions.

In response to GPAC Member Baker's inquiry, Consultant Dickson confirmed that the Crosswalk Tool would be amended alongside any future General Plan amendments.

In response to GPUSC Member Brown's inquiries, Consultant Dickson confirmed that the Crosswalk Tool is proactive and can help the City better track both positive accomplishments and policies where implementation is lagging.

GPUSC Chair Gardner agreed that the Implementation Plan is still rough and pondered if it is concrete enough for the GPAC members to fully assess it before their next meeting.

In response to GPAC Member DeSantis' inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba stated that staff will continue to adhere to the current General Plan until the new one is adopted.

In response to GPAC Member DeSantis' inquiry, Consultant Dickson stated that she has only seen a Draft General Plan's proposed policies applied before adoption as it relates to proposed land use maps.

GPUSC Member Carter stated that it is likely illegal to follow an unadopted policy.

GPAC Member DeSantis expressed concerns that a Development Agreement could be approved over the coming months that is inconsistent with the Draft General Plan.

Planning Manager Zdeba noted that the Draft Land Use Element does not make land use changes. He offered to speak offline about the City's planning approval process.

GPAC Member Mosher stated that most General Plans in California have an Implementation Plan like the one being discussed, but decried that Newport Beach's proposed format is vaguer than its peers. He lamented that the Implementation Plan lacks specifics provided by the subcommittees and expressed doubts that they could have a completed plan by January. He called for more subcommittee meetings to create lists of expected short-term and long-term implementation actions.

GPUSC Chair Gardner lauded the improvements that the Crosswalk Tool will bring over the City's current implementation methods by including specific actions to be taken.

GPAC Member Anders-Ellmore expressed concerns that the Implementation Plan, as currently drafted, only directs staff back to vaguely written General Plan policies.

GPUSC Chair Gardner cautioned that if the GPAC collectively feels like it is taking an incorrect approach through a lack of specificity, then this process will take even more time, and the City Council could conceivably not allow the GPAC to approve the Implementation Plan, instead letting staff coordinate it.

GPAC Member Watkins encouraged the GPAC to let staff do its work in finalizing the Implementation Plan with enough time for the GPAC to be prepared to discuss a more detailed version in January.

GPAC Member DeSantis recommended using a spreadsheet to track implementation progress.

Consultant Dickson confirmed that the Crosswalk Tool is currently in a spreadsheet format, separated by tabs with filtering ability.

Planning Manager Zdeba confirmed that he has sent the Implementation Plan to the GPAC and GPUSC in a Microsoft Excel format.

By a show of hands, the GPAC members agreed that staff is taking a good approach in creating the Implementation Plan.

GPAC Member Mosher reported that other jurisdictions using a Crosswalk Tool also identify the funding source for the implementation and encouraged this addition. He noted that several draft policies will feature multiple Implementation Programs spanning both short-term, long-term, and ongoing timelines, requiring additional breakdown.

Consultant Dickson agreed that it is worth including language about funding sources, cautioning that funding sources cannot always be projected 30 years into the future. She confirmed that some policies will have multiple timeframes. She agreed that she can consult with Planning Manager Zdeba about whether some policies are too vague, potentially impacting implementation.

d. 2025 Recap and Next Steps

City staff will provide a brief lookback on the General Plan Update efforts from 2025, as well as next steps.

Recommended GPAC/GPUSC Actions:

- (1) Receive a presentation from City staff and the consultant team; and
- (2) Determine the January 2026 meeting date.

Planning Manager Zdeba reported on the GPAC and GPUSC's 2025 highlights, commending the group's collective productivity. He noted that there have been 3,700 unique visitors to the City's General Plan update website, with 35,000 residents reached about their work through advertisements, social media, and email.

Planning Manager Zdeba reported on the next steps leading up to a goal of City Council adoption in April or May of 2026. He stated that there is a goal to hold another GPAC and GPUSC joint meeting in mid-January to review a final draft of the General Plan, noting that they all need to be reappointed in February if the process needs to continue.

GPAC Member Mosher stated that the Circulation Element depends on the rest of the General Plan's Implementation Program, so it must be included in the Crosswalk Tool.

GPAC Member Kobayashi expressed her hopes that the GPAC can approve a final draft in January and encouraged her peers to resolve any lingering concerns in the interim by meeting with Planning Manager Zdeba.

In response to GPAC Member Kobayashi's inquiries, GPUSC Chair Gardner clarified the month-long process that would have to occur for the City Council to extend the committees if they do not approve of a final draft in January. She theorized that the Council would not make new appointments at this stage of their progress.

In response to GPAC Member Hackman's inquiries, Planning Manager Zdeba clarified that the Back Bay area is mostly covered in the Natural Resources Element and the Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element when each discusses Upper Newport Bay. He cited the earlier discussion about Lido Isle as being an area where there is scant opportunity for change. He added that broad policies in the Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element address the potential for marina expansion in the Back Bay.

GPAC Member Hackman expressed concerns about the lack of specific attention being paid to the Back Bay in the General Plan and indicated that she will discuss it offline with Planning Manager Zdeba.

By a show of hands, the GPAC members indicated that they will likely be able to vote in mid-January to move the Draft General Plan forward for City Council consideration.

GPUSC Chair Gardner stated that if the Implementation Plan cannot be approved by the GPAC in mid-January, her inclination is to have a more robust discussion about it, providing comments for Planning Manager Zdeba to incorporate into the final draft.

GPAC Co-Chair Evans agreed.

Planning Manager Zdeba stated that he would conduct a poll to see when an ideal January meeting date would be.

VI. COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS OR MATTERS WHICH MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)

None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, GPUSC Chair Gardner adjourned the meeting at 5:56 p.m.

Next Meeting: TBD

DRAFT

**CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES
CIVIC CENTER COMMUNITY ROOM – 100 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE**

**December 3, 2025
SPECIAL MEETING – 3:45 P.M.**

I. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

General Plan Update Steering Committee (GPUSC) Chair Gardner called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

II. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

Present: Philip Brown, Nancy Gardner

Staff: Planning Manager Ben Zdeba

Absent: Kimberly Carter (arrived while the meeting was in progress)

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

(This item includes written correspondence received that is not related to items on the agenda.)

None.

IV. CURRENT BUSINESS

a. Meeting Minutes of September 24, 2025 (Attachment 1 – Draft Minutes)

Recommended Action:

Review and approve the minutes of September 24, 2025.

Chair Gardner opened public comment, and there was none.

Motion made by GPUSC Member Brown and seconded by GPUSC Chair Gardner to approve the minutes of September 24, 2025.

The motion carried unanimously.

b. Review of GPAC's Meeting on November 5, 2025 (Attachment 2 – Draft Noise Element)

Despite delayed consultant support, GPAC Noise Subcommittee Chair Jim Mosher and the Subcommittee Members have been working hard alongside Dudek and City staff to refresh and modernize the Noise Element. The Subcommittee met on October 21, 2025, to review and provide guidance on a draft of the refreshed Element. At the conclusion of the Subcommittee meeting, those in attendance agreed to allow City staff to work with Dudek to make responsive revisions and to share the Element with the full GPAC for consideration and continued discussion. The draft Noise Element was shared with the GPAC at its meeting on November 5, 2025, alongside some additional policy considerations. By a unanimous vote of the GPAC members in attendance, the draft was

supported with inclusion of the additional policy considerations and some additional revisions to move on for the GPUSC's review and concurrence with the GPAC's work. Attachment 3 includes responsive revisions to the GPAC's input.

Recommended Actions:

1. *Provide any feedback on the GPAC's efforts; and*
2. *Receive and file Attachment 2 to express concurrence with the GPAC's actions, finalizing the draft Noise Element.*

Chair Gardner opened public comment, and there was none.

Motion made by GPUSC Member Brown and seconded by GPUSC Chair Gardner to move the Draft Noise Element forward.

The motion carried unanimously.

c. Potential General Plan Review Committee

Over the course of the General Plan Update, one of the important components discussed by both the GPUSC and the GPAC is the implementation and annual progress report. A consideration to help with this effort is the potential creation of a General Plan Review Committee, which would assist in a more thorough review of Element implementation on a rolling basis.

Recommended Actions:

1. *Discuss the potential for such a committee; and*
2. *Consider placing on the January GPUSC/GPAC agenda for discussion and formal recommendation to the City Council.*

GPUSC Member Carter joined the meeting.

GPUSC Chair Gardner noted that there is an annual review of the Housing Element, but not a regular review of the General Plan in totality, with elements regularly needing a periodic review and update. She reported on a suggestion that a small committee be proposed to the City Council to review one or two elements annually to assess how closely the General Plan is being followed, ensuring that every element is reviewed at least every five years.

GPUSC Chair Gardner opened public comment, and there was none.

In response to GPUSC Member Brown's inquiry, GPUSC Chair Gardner reported that this concept has not been discussed at the City Council level since it was first proposed, but she noted that she has spoken to several City staff members, all of whom were supportive. She recommended having one annual meeting of the Committee to not utilize much staff time, with the Committee writing the annual report to the Council. She stated that Acting Community Development Director Jaime Murillo expressed his support.

Motion made by GPUSC Member Brown and seconded by GPUSC Member Carter to add a discussion of a potential General Plan Review Committee to the next General Plan Advisory Committee meeting's Agenda.

The motion carried unanimously.

V. **COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS OR MATTERS WHICH MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)**

None.

VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, Chair Gardner adjourned the meeting at 3:49 p.m.

Next Meeting: December 3, 2025, at 4 p.m., or soon thereafter, as a joint meeting with the GPAC

DRAFT