

November 5, 2025, GPAC Agenda Item IV.a Comments

The following comments on an item on the Newport Beach [General Plan Advisory Committee agenda](#) are submitted by: Jim Mosher (jimmosher@yahoo.com), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

Item IV.a. Meeting Minutes of September 16, 2025

The passages shown in *italics* below are from the [draft minutes](#), with suggested corrections shown in ***strikeout underline*** format. In addition to the numbers appearing at the bottom of the draft minutes pages, the passages are identified by the handwritten page numbers in the separate agenda packet that was emailed to GPAC members but does not seem to have been posted for the general public.

Page 5 (handwritten page 11 of the agenda packet), paragraph 2: “*In response to GPAC Member Curtis Black’s inquiry, GPAC Member ~~David Guder asserted he Laidlaw~~ thought that Balboa Island is included ***in with*** Balboa Village.*”

[The [video](#) shows the response was from GPAC member Laidlaw rather than Guder. While his off-mike comment is only marginally audible, it appears to have been an observation about where he thought Balboa Island was mentioned in the proposed Land Use Element text – not an assertion that Balboa Island is a geographic subdivision inside Balboa Village. Ironically, the observation of where Balboa Island was mentioned may have been incorrect, for as GPAC member Black suspected, it appears Balboa Island was, in fact, not mentioned at all in the [draft Land Use Element](#) being reviewed at this meeting.]

Page 5 (handwritten page 11 of the agenda packet), paragraph 3 from end, sentence 1: “*In response to GPAC Member ~~Waker’s Walker’s~~ inquiry, Planning Manager Zdeba confirmed that there are minimum parking requirements for new residential and commercial development, adding that they can be adjusted through discretionary action.*”

Page 6 (handwritten page 12 of the agenda packet), paragraph 2, last sentence: “*He recommended that the City’s planning staff introduce a new Land Use category due to lettered lots in Newport Coast, where ***the map makes it appear*** homes ~~have been could be~~ built on lots originally designated as reserved buffer space.*”

[This was a reference to “lettered” buffer space lots which are (incorrectly?) depicted on the present [Land Use map](#) as “RS-D” (single-unit residential detached), implying homes could be built on land having no road access.]

Page 6 (handwritten page 12 of the agenda packet), paragraph 3: “*In response to GPAC Member Maniscalchi’s inquiry, GPAC Member Mosher showed maps with lots ***marked intended*** as private open space that were ~~developed marked~~ as residential lots.*”

Page 9 (handwritten page 15 of the agenda packet), Item “c”, long paragraph, sentence 2 from end: “*He lamented that only a small number of roadway segments were analyzed, adding that the selection of roads was based on the Housing Element’s Environmental Impact ***Review Report*** (EIR).*”