

**NEWPORT BEACH PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 100 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE  
THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2026  
REGULAR MEETING – 6:00 P.M.**

I. **CALL TO ORDER** - 6:00 p.m.

II. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Secretary Langford

III. **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Chair Tristan Harris, Vice Chair David Salene, Secretary Jonathan Langford, Commissioner Curtis Ellmore, Commissioner Michael Gazzano, Commissioner Mark Rosene

ABSENT: Commissioner Greg Reed

Staff Present: Community Development Director Jaime Murillo, Acting Community Development Director Ben Zdeba, Assistant City Attorney Yolanda Summerhill, Deputy City Attorney Jose Montoya, Traffic Engineer Kevin Riley, Civilian Investigator Wendy Joe, Principal Planner Liz Westmoreland, Assistant Planner Laura Rodriguez, Assistant Planner Melinda Whelan, Administrative Assistant Clarivel Rodriguez, and Department Assistant Beatriz Avila

IV. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** – None

V. **REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCES** – None

VI. **CONSENT ITEMS**

**ITEM NO. 1 MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 5, 2026**

**Recommended Action:** Approve and file

Chair Harris opened public comment, and there was none.

**Motion** made by Chair Harris and seconded by Commissioner Ellmore to approve the meeting minutes of February 5, 2026, with Jim Mosher's edits.

AYES: Ellmore, Gazzano, Harris, Langford, Rosene, and Salene

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Reed

VII. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**ITEM NO. 2 300 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE CONDOMINIUMS (PA2025-0102)**

**Site Location: 210 and 300 Newport Center Drive and Unaddressed Parcels Identified as Accessor Parcel Numbers 442-091-12 and 442-161-16**

**Summary:**

A request to demolish all improvements on a 4.17-acre site, including an existing movie theater (Regal Edwards Big Newport) and a health/fitness facility (Body Design), to allow for the construction of two, 22-story residential buildings (approximately 270 feet high) consisting of a total of 150 condominium units, on-site amenities, for-sale home offices, retail/café

space, and 343 parking spaces. Each residential building is nearly identical and is connected through a podium that contains the home offices, retail/café, amenities, parking, and building support facilities. The project includes private residential amenities such as pools, exercise facilities, and entertainment spaces. Vehicular access to the Property is through a driveway on Newport Center Drive, which leads to a guardhouse and motorized gate restricting access to the motor court and valet drop off. The requested project requires the following approvals:

- Major Site Development Review to allow a new residential development with five or more units and a tentative tract map, and to waive 5 of the 52 Multi-Unit Objective Design Standards;
- Conditional Use Permit to waive 58 required off-street parking spaces for the proposed home offices and retail/café component; and
- Vesting Tentative Tract Map to consolidate four lots into one parcel and to allow for an airspace subdivision of the individual residential units and nonresidential units for condominium purposes.

**Recommended Actions:**

1. Conduct a public hearing;
2. Find that this project is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to Section 21083.3 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC) and Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines because the project is consistent with the previously certified Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2023060699); and
3. Adopt Resolution No. PC2026-004 approving the Major Site Development Review, Conditional Use Permit, and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 19407, collectively filed as PA2025-0102.

Principal Planner Liz Westmoreland reported that the project is located at the corner of San Miguel Dr. and Newport Center Dr. within the City's Housing Opportunity Overlay Zoning District. She stated that the project will demolish the existing theater, health and fitness business, and surface parking to construct two residential towers with up to 150 residential condominium units on top of a podium structure containing 343 parking spaces, retail space, a café, and home offices. She added that the two nearly identical towers will be 22 stories each, reaching a height of 270 feet, featuring 2-4-bedroom units and penthouses with the units ranging from 2,127 square feet to 6,419 square feet, plus residential amenities.

Principal Planner Westmoreland added that the retail space and/or café space would be at the corner of Newport Center Dr. and San Miguel Dr., but the applicant may change the use in the future. She clarified that the home offices could only be sold to residents of the development, with Conditions of Approval including a prohibition of subleasing and staff to serve the offices, and a restriction on the spaces being exclusively for professional office use.

Principal Planner Westmoreland reported that the project requires a Major Site Development Review (SDR), a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and a Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM). She reported that the project is consistent with the City's development standards, clarifying that the setbacks exceed the standards and are measured to the podium as opposed to the towers, which are farther setback. She presented a site map, noting that the central driveway is on Newport Center Dr. She reported that there is a wide variety of architectural designs in Newport Center, noting that the podium will help scale the transition for pedestrians, along with the significant setback of the towers. She reported that public scenic views will not be impacted more than they already are by the existing development and vegetation, adding that the site is not subject to the

Sight Plane View Ordinance. She added that the project would be consistent with the design intent of Newport Center as it relates to high-rise structures.

Principal Planner Westmoreland reported that the project includes requests for five Objective Design Standard waivers, noting that this section of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC) was not written with high-rise towers in mind. She added that the project still meets the intent of a high-quality design. She stated that three of the waiver requests relate to the transparency of the first and second floors on the podium level, adding that the applicant intends to use landscaping to soften the area and is not far from meeting the transparency standards. She noted that there is a minor deviation in horizontal modulation as the balconies are only 14 feet wide instead of 20. She clarified that the main entry abuts a motor court instead of a public realm, adding that the project would still support the public realm, and this form of entry layout is common for the style of development proposed.

Principal Planner Westmoreland reported that a Trip Generation Assessment was prepared, finding an estimated decrease of 396 average daily trips from the current use and a Traffic Study was not required. She reported that the project was reviewed by the Federal Aviation Administration and Airport Land Use Commission due to the height and received approval or acceptance from both entities. She added that a finalized Construction Management Plan and completion of the Draft Fire Master Plan will be required prior to permit issuance.

Principal Planner Westmoreland reported that the CUP is needed to waive parking for the non-residential uses. She noted that the project requires 331 parking spaces for residential use and provides 343, allocating the 12 additional spaces for building staff, but providing no spaces for commercial use. She stated that a Condition of Approval would allow the retail/cafe staff to use the 12 spaces to be designated for staff. She added that the site is adjacent to the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) hub and is both easily accessible by bicycle and on foot. She stated that the commercial parking space deficit is also counterbalanced by the home office space being limited to residents who have designated parking spaces as part of their residential units. She noted that 45 visitor spaces will be provided.

Principal Planner Westmoreland reported that the public courtyards abutting the entrances and home office entrances serve as the Publicly Accessible Open Space (PAOS) required. She reported that the In-Lieu Park Dedication Fee will be \$59,575 per unit, amounting to a total of \$8.9 million if built to the planned capacity. She added that the current plans would generate about \$4.9 million in Development Impact Fees.

Principal Planner Westmoreland reported that the Housing Overlay sites were included in the Housing Element Implementation Program's Environmental Impact Report (EIR), so the site is not subject to further environmental review under Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). She added that the project is consistent with the density range and zoning, and a Condition of Approval requires the applicant to comply with the City's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Principal Planner Westmoreland reported receiving public comments both in support of the project and in opposition. She added that areas of public concern include traffic and affordable housing, noting that the City does not have an inclusionary housing ordinance. She stated that there have been several public concerns about losing the Regal Edwards Big Newport movie theater, adding that it is not designated as a historical resource and is not eligible to be listed as a historical resource under CEQA. She added that a Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared for the theater. She stated that the project is consistent with the Housing Element. She reported that one comment included CEQA concerns over the possibility of bird strikes.

In response to Commissioner Gazzano's inquiries, Principal Planner Westmoreland clarified how the Objective Design Standards were focused on townhomes and apartment buildings when they were drafted. She added that, while they do not perfectly translate to a high-rise development, the application is consistent with most of the standards. She added that staff is seeking to add high-rise-specific standards in the future but confirmed that the Commission can rely on the standards in place. She confirmed that the applicant was close to meeting the standards for transparency on the first two floors but deferred to the applicant on just how close.

In response to Commissioner Rosene's inquiry, Principal Planner Westmoreland confirmed that the applicant will be obligated to maintain the PAOS as a Condition of Approval. She stated that, should the designs significantly change, staff would review the plans for conformance.

Commissioner Rosene expressed uncertainty over what the Commission is being asked to approve regarding the retail component, as the applicant has not committed to including retail and/or a cafe despite reserving space for them. He stated that this is a hypothetical situation.

In response to Commissioner Rosene's inquiries, Principal Planner Westmoreland clarified that the Draft Resolution is crafted to provide the applicant some flexibility. She stated that the café would reflect a higher intensity use, while retail or office space would be lower intensity and substantially conforming to the approval.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, Principal Planner Westmoreland confirmed that there is a mathematical mistake on the parking slide in the presentation for stating that the retail would require 8 parking spaces instead of 20. She agreed that the correct figure reduces the number of spaces in the waiver request by 12.

Chair Harris clarified Commissioner Rosene's retail intensity concerns by noting that the applicant would have to go through a formal application process to increase the intensity of use for the space, but reducing the intensity in the future would conform to the higher intensity that the Commission is being asked to approve tonight.

Principal Planner Westmoreland noted that certain commercial uses require a permit. She added that a Condition of Approval states that, if the space was going to be used for a restaurant with late hours or needed more parking, the applicant must apply for a CUP.

Principal Planner Westmoreland clarified that the earlier discussed mistake in the parking slide is because the rate of one space for every 100 square feet is erroneously listed as one space for every 250 square feet, meaning that the original count of 20 required spaces is correct. She clarified that staff assessed the parking needs based on a restaurant's higher intensity and not a retail store's lower one to create a more conservative estimate.

In response to Chair Harris' inquiry, Principal Planner Westmoreland confirmed that the slide she showed of Newport Center reflects the original design intent for Fashion Island as it was being developed.

In response to Chair Harris' inquiry, all commissioners reported having ex parte communications with the applicant.

Chair Harris opened the public hearing.

Related California LLC President and Chief Executive Officer Gino Canori spoke of his personal history with Newport Beach, reported that the company is moving its offices to Newport Center, and discussed the company's history of creating award-winning major mixed-income

developments around California. He reported that the property owners of the site agree that it is time to sell and reimagine the land they have owned for almost 60 years.

Jim Edwards reported on the site's history since his father opened what is now Regal Edwards Big Newport in 1969, including the increasing number of competing entertainment mediums that have hurt movie theaters nationwide, adding that the movie theater business has yet to recover from the pandemic. He stated that this theater has also felt the brunt of these shifting national conditions, adding that the family has decided not to extend Regal Cinema's operating agreement beyond its June 2027 expiration, with the theater permanently closing. He reported that Regal Cinemas has indicated that they would like to exit the agreement prior to the end of 2026. He stated that the Edwards family wishes to honor his father by creating something powerful, iconic, and high-quality on the property, leading them to Related California and this project that Newport Beach can be proud of for generations to come. He encouraged the Commission to approve the project.

Mr. Canori thanked Mr. Edwards and his family for trusting Related California to create a new use for the site that will enhance Newport Center. He reported on hiring acclaimed architects to reimagine the site, noting that they have previously worked successfully in Newport Beach and around Orange County.

Robert A.M. Stern Architects Principal Dan Lobitz stated that he feels a responsibility to build something that grows out of the original Newport Center concept while also making its own statement. He noted other upcoming developments that will help turn Newport Center into a mixed-use neighborhood, adding that 300 Newport Center Dr. will be iconic but also tie into the area's feel and scale. He stated that splitting the project into two towers with 200 feet of space between them creates an open and airy feel, while the height correlates to its neighboring towers. He added that the architecture ties into Newport Beach's coastal feel, with the podium base relating in height to the Fashion Island structure.

Mr. Canori stated that his team took care to ensure that the project aligns with the vision for Newport Center and enhances the area. He requested approval of the project and thanked City staff for its work on the project.

In response to Chair Harris' inquiry, Mr. Canori agreed to the Conditions of Approval.

Chris Fletcher expressed his support for the project, stating that it is a property residents will be proud of through Related California's reputation for high-quality products and experience. He added that the City has a need for housing, such as what is being proposed, surrounded by amenities for aging long-term residents like himself who are looking to stay in the community while downsizing their residence.

Jim Mosher noted that, historically, the transition from a shorter commercial property to a vastly taller residential one would involve the City Council's approval. He expressed the opinion that the property was quietly slipped into the Housing Element as a Housing Opportunity site at the last minute, with no incentive for affordable housing on the site. He stated that the height limit was increased after the EIR was completed for the Housing Element and may not have been assessed. He stated that 81 affordable housing units should be going on this site and that it would instead be an ideal site for a new Newport Beach Police Department (NBPD) headquarters.

Steve Swerdlow stated that the project is a perfect solution for the site, adding that it is tastefully done and provides an opportunity for people of his generation to remain in Newport Beach, echoing Mr. Fletcher's comments. He expressed his support for the project.

Chase Preciado, speaking on behalf of the non-profit Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility (SAFER) requested that the project not be approved at this time because it is being exempted from CEQA despite impacts not being analyzed in the EIR. He stated that the height of the towers and their predominance of glass will result in avian mortality at a rate of 1,270 birds annually from striking the building, including birds from protected species. He stated that CEQA Section 15183 compels the City to study this matter further and adopt mitigation measures for bird strikes.

Kevin Barrel stated that he is a Newport Beach resident who would like to live in the proposed towers. He noted that the law firm working on behalf of SAFER is in the City of Oakland, which is dissimilar from Newport Beach. He stated that it is a shakedown letter, and the same boilerplate letter is regularly sent Statewide, to cause delays and pressure developers into a deal. He referred the Commission to the website "PhonyUnionTreeHuggers.com" for additional information on the scheme and how it operates around California. He encouraged the Commission not to allow SAFER to create a costly delay for the City and the developer.

Pam Howard decried the height of the towers for their impact on the community, and inquired where the on-site parking would be located.

Francis Cray commended the developer and architect on the project, stating that it will enhance Newport Center and property values for other homeowners. He encouraged the Commission to support the project to add more housing to Newport Beach.

Larry Tucker reported that he served on the Commission for 11 years and supports this project for its quality and the standard it will set for future growth prescribed in the Housing Element if those projects want to be competitive in a burgeoning market. He noted that the State's legislative framework gives the City very little ability to disapprove. He added that the objective design standards provided the applicant a framework for a project that is less dense than what would be permitted. He added that no environmental impacts were identified and agreed with Mr. Barrel's assessment of Mr. Preciado's comments as being a veiled union shakedown.

Gregg Schwenk, Co-Founder and Chief Executive Officer of the Newport Beach Film Festival, shared fond memories of the Regal Edwards Big Newport theater, including conversations with Mr. Edwards' father, who built the theater. He lamented that the Edwards family did not reach out to the Festival's organizers about the decision, adding that Newport Beach has the largest film festival in coastal Southern California, with the theater serving as its anchor. He lamented that the Cultural Resources Assessment was performed by a consultant in the City of Riverside and not one in Newport Beach, who may have better understood the theater's place in the community. He called for collaboration to figure out a solution to the loss of the Festival's home.

Susan Tobias, owner of Body Design, located within the Regal Edwards Big Newport theater, thanked the Edwards family for her 40 years as a tenant.

Assistant City Attorney Yolanda Summerhill reported that the applicant's attorney analyzed the letter from SAFER, determining that there will be no significant impacts in an urban area over 600 feet from any open space. She added that the average bird migration area is at 1,600 feet of elevation, far above the 270-foot towers.

Chair Harris closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Rosene stated that change is difficult but inevitable. He noted that the Edwards family is looking for an exit from the business, and a developer is looking to provide an excellent project. He commended how well the project considers the pedestrian component in its

landscaping, adding that the footprint of this project is smaller than the existing building. He noted that there is a Draft Fire Master Plan and requested that the applicant honor the landscaped spaces at the pedestrian level without eliminating them as the draft is finalized. He expressed his support for the project.

Vice Chair Salene stated that, like with drive-in theaters, it is a tragedy to lose the Regal Edwards Big Newport theater, lamenting that things evolve. He stated that creating a residential development on the site, as opposed to a commercial development, creates a unique housing opportunity for Newport Beach. He commended the look of the project and Related California's reputation. He expressed his support for the project.

Secretary Langford commended the Edwards family for choosing such a beautiful project for the site. He stated that the development could start a trend of making Newport Center more of a residential village, leading to increased investment and development in the area. He expressed his support of the project.

Chair Harris acknowledged that losing the Regal Edwards Big Newport theater is a big deal to those like himself who grew up in Newport Beach for the memories and sentiment around the theater. He echoed his peers' comments about the entertainment world changing, adding that the Edwards family has gone through all the proper processes. He stated that the design waivers are minor, and the parking plan makes sense due to the residential ownership requirements for the commercial space. He stated that there is no reason to hold up a beautiful project that will drive a new era that fits within the City's initial growth plan from the creation of Newport Center.

**Motion** made by Chair Harris and seconded by Vice Chair Salene to approve the item as presented.

AYES: Ellmore, Gazzano, Harris, Langford, Rosene, and Salene  
 NOES: None  
 ABSTAIN: None  
 ABSENT: Reed

Chair Harris called for a recess at 7:13 p.m. The meeting resumed at 7:19 p.m.

**ITEM NO. 3 THE NICE GUY RESTAURANT (PA2025-0252)**  
**Site Location: 2607 West Coast Highway**

**Summary:**

A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to renovate an existing 5,260-square-foot restaurant space on the waterfront, formerly occupied by GuacAmigos, and operate a restaurant known as The Nice Guy with a Type 47 (On-Sale General – Eating Place) Alcoholic Beverage Control license, late hour operations, and live entertainment. Proposed hours of operation are 11 a.m. to 12 a.m., Monday through Saturday, and 9:30 a.m. to 12 a.m. on Sunday. A CUP is required to authorize a restaurant with alcohol service and late hour operations (defined by the Newport Beach Municipal Code as service provided after 11 p.m.). If this CUP is approved, the restaurant operator will be required to obtain an operator license from the Newport Beach Police Department, as they intend to offer alcoholic beverages for on-site consumption in conjunction with late hour operations and live entertainment. No dancing is proposed. Approval of the project will also supersede the Minor Use Permit filed as PA2023-0119 and Staff Approval No. SA2018-010.

**Recommended Actions:**

1. Conduct a public hearing;
2. Find this project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301 under Class 1 (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines, because it has no potential to have a significant effect on the environment and the exceptions to this Exemption do not apply; and
3. Adopt Resolution No. PC2026-005 approving the Conditional Use Permit filed as PA2025-0252.

Chair Harris recused from the item due to a financial interest near the site. Vice Chair Salene ran the meeting in his absence.

Assistant Planner Laura Rodriguez reported that the project is within the Mariners' Mile Corridor on West Coast Highway. She reported that the property was developed in 1968 with a 5,260-square-foot restaurant. She added that relevant entitlements since then include Use Permit 3627, approved in 1998, allowing for late hour operations and live entertainment, and Minor Use Permit PA2023-0119, approved in 2023, which eliminated the late operating hours but added disc jockeys as an additional form of live entertainment. She added that the property has been vacant since late 2024 when it housed the GuacAmigos restaurant.

Assistant Planner Rodriguez reported that the applicant plans to operate until midnight daily whereas the previous restaurant closed at 10:30 p.m. from Sunday through Thursday and at 11 p.m. on Fridays, Saturdays, and holidays. She added that another significant change is a prohibition on dancing, while continuing live entertainment. She noted that the project will comply with parking requirements.

Assistant Planner Rodriguez stated that a CUP is required due to the request for late-hour operations, but a Coastal Development Permit is not required because there is no intensification of use. She presented the proposed floor plan and noted that the project is required to provide a minimum of a 48-square-foot trash enclosure, which is much smaller than the existing trash enclosure. She added that exterior changes are also being proposed and will be presented by the applicant.

Assistant Planner Rodriguez noted that NBPD Reporting District 25 has had a 20% higher number of reported crimes than the Citywide average, which results in undue concentration. She added that, because the property has historically operated as a restaurant with alcohol service, live entertainment, and late operating hours, the NBPD does not object to the request.

Assistant Planner Rodriguez reported that the applicant provided a Noise Study, specifically considering the residences on Lido Isle. She reported that it is recommended that doors and windows facing the bay be closed after 10 p.m., but that the project will ultimately comply with the City's Exterior Noise Standards. She added that the building is sufficiently noise-buffered from residences to the north. She added that several other restaurants within the Mariners' Mile Corridor operate past 11 p.m., making the request consistent.

Assistant Planner Rodriguez reported that the CUP request finds consistency with the General Plan and zoning, while being compatible with surrounding uses. She noted that the site has historically operated in a similar manner, with a lack of noise complaints to the City. She confirmed that the NBPD has approved the proposal with its recommended Conditions of Approval.

Assistant Planner Rodriguez reported on changes to the Conditions of Approval that need to be included in the Resolution. She stated that Condition of Approval No. 10 needs to be bifurcated into Conditions of Approval Nos. 10-11, Condition of Approval No. 38 needs to be deleted as it

duplicates Condition of Approval No. 4, and an additional Condition of Approval must be created clarifying that all signs must conform with the NBMC Chapter 20.42.

In response to Secretary Langford's inquiry, Assistant Planner Rodriguez clarified that GuacAmigos was only authorized to operate until 11 p.m. as of 2023 but could operate later before 2023.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, all commissioners reported having ex parte communications with the applicant and/or a representative of the applicant.

Vice Chair Salene opened the public hearing.

Nima Fazeli, Senior Vice President of Development of the h.wood Group, reported that his organization is a hospitality and lifestyle company with a focus on fine dining, adding that a restaurant in Newport Beach has been in their strategic vision for many years. He stated that The Nice Guy would be a fine-dining Italian restaurant with an intimate feel reminiscent of the Rat Pack era. He added that there would be live background music playing on a small stage and that the additional hour of operations is an intrinsic piece of The Nice Guy's business. He stated that assimilating to their local community is critical to their strategy at the company's 14-15 locations nationwide.

Mr. Fazeli reported that the applicants are intending to invest several million dollars into repositioning the interior of the site and the structure's façade while remaining in line with the Mariners' Mile design standards to help revitalize the corridor. He noted that the occupancy and bar seating count will be reduced from the previous interior layout to create a more intimate feel for their higher-end clientele. He presented exterior renderings of the restaurant, emphasizing its coastal look to align with Mariners' Mile. He displayed a proposed floor plan and interior images of The Nice Guy's location in the City of Los Angeles, along with multiple positive reviews by restaurant critics.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, Mr. Fazeli agreed to the recommended Conditions of Approval, including the amendments mentioned previously by Assistant Planner Rodriguez.

Mr. Mosher noted that a portion of the NBPD report on the site's history was missing from the Agenda packet, adding that it could merely be accidental. He added that a 2023 version of the missing attachment was available from a hearing before the Zoning Administrator. He stated that the experience of prior operators will speak louder than the Noise Study which he found to be done sloppily, citing a table with duplicated column headers as an example. He added that the Noise Analysis only considered standards in NBMC Title 10 and not either Title 20 or the General Plan's standards. He noted that the underlying assumption of 105 decibels in the dining room is closer to a rock band than the softer dinner music that the applicant is proposing. He encouraged the Commission to ignore the Noise Study.

Mike Tunney, a Lido Island resident, expressed his support for the project, adding that the City needs more quality waterfront projects. He added that this operator will be an upgrade from previous operators. He endorsed having dinner music specifically played on a piano.

Bryan Estrada, Principal at RK Engineering Group, reported that his firm created the Noise Study, adding that he has been working on acoustical studies for 18 years. He stated that the Study was prepared in accordance with the City's noise standards and following standard engineering methods for noise projections. He added that the higher noise volumes were used to ensure conservative sound-prevention measures, agreeing with Mr. Mosher that the restaurant will be unlikely to generate such loud internal noise.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill clarified where the information Mr. Mosher is seeking can be found in the Resolution, acknowledging that the data is not presented in the same colorful format that he was specifically searching for.

Vice Chair Salene closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Gazzano lauded The Nice Guy's Los Angeles location's dining experience from past experiences there, noting that it does not create a wild late-night atmosphere. He stated that the site has been an eyesore, adding that significant investment in it should be encouraged as a benefit to the City. He thanked Assistant Planner Rodriguez for her convenient map of Mariners' Mile Corridor restaurants with late operating hours, adding that this is the portion of Newport Beach where later hours are more appropriate, and noting that each of the site's immediate neighbors would be operating later than The Nice Guy intends.

Commissioner Ellmore commended the project and theorized that it will prove popular.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiry, Community Development Director Jaime Murillo clarified that, typically, there is a standard Condition of Approval requiring that the quarterly gross sales of alcoholic beverages do not exceed the gross food sales during the same period. He stated that the NBPD has determined that this is too difficult to enforce so they have dropped it from their standard Conditions of Approval request.

Commissioner Ellmore stated that The Nice Guy has been successful in other markets. He recommended that operators who are large in community partnership should be associated with Conditions of Approvals that are with other restaurants.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiries, Community Development Director Jaime Murillo clarified that enforcement of a closing time allows for the serving of food and beverages until that time only. He added that the customers would have to reasonably finish their meals and vacate the premises after closing time.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiries, Assistant Planner Rodriguez confirmed that the neighboring restaurant to the east is The House Newport Beach and that it can operate past 11 p.m. She confirmed that the immediate neighbor to the west is The Shamrock Bar & Grill, and the next neighbor to the west with permitted operating hours past 11 p.m. is Billy's at the Beach. She confirmed that the western-most neighbor with optional operating hours after 11 p.m. is The Winery Restaurant & Wine Bar, and that the two diagonally across West Coast Highway with later operating hours are the Newport Whaler and the recently approved Arc Carne & Cantina restaurant.

Commissioner Ellmore noted that most of these restaurants do not actually operate after 11 p.m., although it is permissible.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiries, Community Development Director Murillo confirmed that Arc Carne & Cantina has language in its Resolution relative to being fully closed at midnight. He confirmed that this is due to the more sensitive nature of the rooftop dining planned for Arc Carne & Cantina.

Commissioner Ellmore recommended including a Condition of Approval specifying that the last call is made at 11:30 p.m., with hopes of the restaurant being empty by midnight.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiries, Community Development Director Murillo confirmed that there is no Condition of Approval in this item relative to queuing waiting diners,

adding that those are more common for Balboa Peninsula bars.

Commissioner Ellmore recommended including a Condition of Approval restricting queue lines for waiting patrons.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that these proposed Conditions of Approval are significant and recommended giving the applicant an opportunity to speak.

Commissioner Ellmore stated that he would support this application with his three proposed additional Conditions of Approval.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that the public hearing should be reopened to the applicant if the Commission wishes to incorporate the Conditions of Approval proposed by Commissioner Ellmore. She added that reopening the public hearing would be unnecessary if including the additional Conditions of Approval is not the will of the Commission.

Commissioner Rosene noted that the applicant will be investing in the community, decreasing the occupant load, and thus meeting the parking requirements.

In response to Commissioner Rosene's inquiry, Commissioner Ellmore clarified that there is a traffic queue, and he is referring more to the restaurant's likely popularity, leading to groups waiting outside.

Commissioner Rosene noted that the drive aisle is one-way in-and-out. He expressed his understanding that the applicant will have valet service even though it is not required. He noted that, while not a Condition of Approval, valet service may be necessary to make the restaurant operate effectively. He stated that it is reasonable to him that the Condition of Approval requiring windows facing the water to be closed at 10 p.m. when there is live entertainment occurring regardless of whether there is live entertainment. He stated that he is interested from an operational perspective in what the applicant thinks about the gray area regarding last call and closing times. He stated that this may not be an issue, but is curious about how it occurs logistically, adding that he would like to be consistent if those standards are applied to all.

Vice Chair Salene stated that the operator should dictate how and when they decide to have last call for a set closing time. He stated that the comparison of alcohol to food sales has gone away, according to Community Development Director Murillo, and is no longer being requested so it should not be forced on an applicant who has demonstrated to be a good operator elsewhere. He added that he does not have an issue with queuing, noting that, if they have valet parking, there will be an inherent goal to get people in-and-out quickly and efficiently.

Commissioner Ellmore reported that an individual was struck and killed recently by a drunk driver and that one NBPD officer has issued over 100 tickets for driving under the influence in the past 12 months. He stated that his proposed Conditions of Approval are not onerous and can help eliminate late-night drinking and driving issues, adding that he has grown more sensitive to these issues due to maturation and fatherhood. He added that the Conditions of Approval would better manage the closing and are not a concern about this specific operator.

Secretary Langford stated that he shares some of Commissioner Ellmore's sentiments about late hours but is not as concerned about operational matters. He stated that he is inclined to support the late hours in this application, but agreed that it would be helpful to better define the closing time based around last call, so patrons are not hanging out until 2 a.m. finishing off a bottle of wine ordered at 11:59 p.m. He questioned what the proper balance is between the permitted

closing time and the actual closing time as dictated by restaurant operations.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, the commissioners agreed to reopen the public hearing to discuss these concerns with the applicant.

Vice Chair Salene reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Fazeli stated that there is nothing for them to gain from a business operations model by staying open later and continuing to pay staff while they can no longer generate revenue. He clarified that they are not trying to assimilate into Newport Beach's very late-night scene, as that group is neither their demographic nor their business model. He stated that he would be amenable to discussing methods that more clearly establish a midnight closing time without substantively impacting their operational procedures.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, Mr. Fazeli stated that he would agree to modified Conditions of Approval around the closing logistics so long as they are not operationally restrictive. He agreed with Commissioner Rosene's comment and stated that they can agree to a closing time but not agree to operational mandates about how to get there.

Commissioner Ellmore stated that they agree on the sentiment of not having guidelines.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiries, Mr. Fazeli agreed with the sentiment but could not agree to a last call mandate of 11:30 p.m. for a midnight closing. He stated that his company's restaurants operate very well, but, as part of community assimilation, he does not intend to come into a new market and disrupt the standard course of operations for its restaurants. He added that what The Nice Guy offers after 9 p.m. is not common. He stated that, while he likes the concept, tying a last call to their CUP is too restrictive and ties their hands operationally. He stated that turning the lights on at midnight and asking patrons to leave would be acceptable. He added that if they wanted to be open until 1 a.m., they would be asking for it, but this group is not the demographic they seek.

Commissioner Ellmore stated that turning the lights on and asking patrons to leave at midnight is not the same as closing at midnight.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, Mr. Fazeli clarified that his definition of closing at midnight means that they are no longer open to the public or operational. He stated that it is very difficult to cut off the business at a set moment, citing the example of food being late coming out of the kitchen. He expressed concerns about such firm timelines being applied to their CUP because it gives them an inability to account for a hectic kitchen night.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiry, Mr. Fazeli noted that their restaurant sells several bottles of wine for hundreds of dollars apiece so comparing the ratio of gross revenue between alcohol and food sales may not reflect how they operate and provide what the City is truly looking for. He stated that analyzing the sales ratio would be more relevant if they were a bar focused on cheap beers and tequila shots. He added that, if a standard Condition of Approval has gone away, he would not feel comfortable being the first one to bring it back, considering that it was removed for being difficult to enforce.

Vice Chair Salene closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Rosene stated that this is a new and interesting conversation. He agreed that restaurants operate in a gray area around their closing times, adding that they may be splitting hairs. He recommended giving the operator an ability to perform and then have a future discussion

if needs be about any issues. He added that this is how they have handled matters historically, and the precedent should apply here.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that one option would be to maintain the Conditions of Approval as they currently stand and require a one-year follow-up report to the Commission on the operational status.

Vice Chair Salene agreed with Commissioner Rosene, adding that he does not want to put an onus on this applicant that has not been put on others. He added that other Mariners' Mile establishments closing earlier than they must is the restaurant's voluntary decision. He stated that midnight is a reasonable closing time request, as opposed to 2 a.m. He stated that provisions calling for lights on at midnight or all checks being closed by midnight would be inconsistent with the City's other restaurants. He added that setting an arbitrary deadline and not an operationally based deadline is inappropriate.

Commissioner Ellmore agreed with the sentiment of being consistent. He clarified that they granted the Arc Carne & Cantina an additional hour of operation due to the investment they are making in the City but with the certainty that everyone will be out of the restaurant by that time. He stated that this applicant should be consistent with the nearby Arc Carne & Cantina. He added that conditions such as having the lights on and checks paid by midnight would give the applicant the ability to assimilate in the community without hurting their business.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, Commissioner Ellmore agreed that the 11:30 p.m. last call at Arc Carne & Cantina is self-imposed and is not a Condition of Approval but noted that Arc Carne & Cantina owner (and former Mayor) Noah Blom is a proven restaurant operator in Newport Beach. He stated that a lights-on mechanism would be appropriate for a Condition of Approval in this application, adding that the Condition of Approval could be eliminated after a one-year follow-up if the Commission is satisfied with the applicant's operations.

Commissioner Gazzano agreed that consistency is important, and it would be inconsistent to treat this application differently when both of the immediately adjacent neighbors have later hours. He stated that the Arc Carne & Cantina has a different set of circumstances because the hard closing time is self-imposed, the restaurant features an open rooftop deck and is closer to residences. He stated he would support the item as presented, acknowledging that having the lights on at midnight would be a good idea.

Secretary Langford stated that the later hours are a big request, but one he would be willing to grant, given operational constraints to encourage closure close to midnight. He agreed with Commissioner Ellmore on trying to improve the Conditions of Approval as currently drafted, suggesting including that checks must be closed out by midnight with the lights coming on. He added that these provisions would not drag out operations into late-night hours, clarifying that he wishes to prevent a situation like what is seen on Balboa Peninsula where patrons go from one establishment to the next following their varied closing times.

Community Development Director Murillo recommended adding "the applicant shall be responsible for encouraging patrons to vacate the premise by midnight" to Condition of Approval No. 4, stating that this would be in line with the spirit of their discussion. He added that the NBPD Chief issues an Operator's License for a restaurant to be open after 11 p.m., noting that it can be used as a regulatory tool in addition to a CUP. He reported that the Operator's License allows for quicker additions and modifications to the Conditions of Approval, including the closing hours.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiry, Community Development Director Murillo confirmed that every operator open past 11 p.m. needs an NBPD-issued Operator's License.

Vice Chair Salene reopened the public hearing.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiries, Mr. Fazeli agreed with the lights on, and checks closed out at midnight concepts, in addition to encouraging patrons to leave at that time. He noted that the checks are essentially closed out at last call, whether they have been physically signed or not, because there is an inability to add to them. He confirmed that he would be comfortable with a modified Condition of Approval stipulating these efforts be made.

Secretary Langford stated that this makes a true closing time more objective than subjective and would be considered satisfactory.

Vice Chair Salene stated that resurrecting the burden of reporting the ratio of gross alcohol sales to food sales should not be imposed on this applicant.

Commissioner Ellmore acquiesced on ratio reporting. He agreed with recommendations to have the applicant report back after a year and have these provisions removed if operating in a clean manner.

In response to Mr. Fazeli's inquiry, Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that a one-year review could be structured with staff bringing the Commission a report on any issues. She added that it could be a simple receive and file report as opposed to a public hearing.

Mr. Fazeli agreed to this arrangement.

Secretary Langford stated that New Year's Eve should be exempted from the midnight closing time to be consistent with the Arc Carne & Cantina's identical exemption.

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, Mr. Fazeli confirmed that the applicant would like to have a later closing time on New Year's Eve.

Vice Chair Salene closed the public hearing.

In response to Commissioner Ellmore's inquiry, Community Development Director Murillo clarified that the amended Condition of Approval No. 4 would read that "the hours of operation shall be limited to between 11 a.m. and 12 a.m. Monday through Saturday, and between 9:30 a.m. and 12 a.m. on Sundays, except for New Year's Eve. The Applicant shall be responsible for encouraging patrons to vacate the premises by 12 a.m., including but not limited to a "lights-on" policy and ensuring that all checks are closed."

In response to Vice Chair Salene's inquiry, Community Development Director Murillo confirmed that a Condition of Approval would be included that calls for a one-year review.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Salene and seconded by Commissioner Gazzano to approve the item with the amended Conditions of Approval.

AYES: Ellmore, Gazzano, Langford, Rosene, and Salene  
NOES: None  
RECUSED: Harris  
ABSENT: Reed

Chair Harris returned to the meeting.

**ITEM NO. 4 WIRELESS SERVICE FACILITIES CODE AMENDMENTS (PA2021-103)**  
**Site Location: Citywide**

**Summary:**

Consistent with the City Council's initiation on May 25, 2021, and the more recent guidance provided at the City Council Study Session on January 13, 2026, the proposed amendments to Title 13 (Streets, Sidewalks and Public Property), Title 20 (Planning and Zoning), and Title 21 (Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan) of the Newport Beach Municipal Code serve to simplify and modernize some of the City of Newport Beach's (City) regulations related to the permitting, installation, modification, operation, and maintenance of wireless service facilities on both private and public property, including within the public right-of-way. Although Title 13 does not fall within the purview of the Planning Commission, it is included for reference.

**Recommended Actions:**

1. Conduct a public hearing;
2. Find this action is not a project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with Section 20165 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). Further find this action is also exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3), the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects, which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.
3. Adopt Resolution No. PC2026-006 recommending the City Council approve the Zoning Code Amendment modifying regulations pertaining to wireless service facilities on private and public property; and
4. Adopt Resolution No. PC2026-007 recommending the City Council authorize staff to submit the Local Coastal Program Amendment to the California Coastal Commission.

Acting Deputy Community Development Director Ben Zdeba reported that the City's purview over wireless facilities is very heavily limited by federal and state law, with windows for local review, or "shot clocks," ranging from 60-90 days. He reported on the evolution of wireless service since the City's Wireless Ordinance was passed in 2014, adding that the technology continues to evolve. He added that Newport Beach has challenges for wireless service providers primarily because 47% of the City's land area is in the Coastal Zone making it subject to additional California Coastal Commission regulations, and there are limited private structures for collocation.

Acting Deputy Community Development Director Zdeba reported that in May 2021, the City Council initiated a review and possible amendment to the City's ordinances; however, staff subsequently determined that the current framework for small cell technology was appropriate. In more recent years it had become apparent that there may be barriers to investment and infrastructure for wireless services. He noted the City Council's study session on January 13, 2026, where the City Council unanimously supported updating the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC). He reported that NBMC Titles 20 and 21 regulate the time, manner, and place of wireless facilities. He noted that one of the largest challenges the City presents to wireless carriers is the need for a minor use permit (MUP) for installations on streetlights in the public right-of-way (PROW), requiring a public hearing. He reported on the many classes for facilities, adding that Class 3 Public Right-of-Way (PROW) installations is the focus of the proposed NBMC updates, as they are reasonably unobtrusive and the City has better control due to having ownership of the sites.

Acting Deputy Community Development Director Zdeba reported that he and Deputy City Attorney Jose Montoya compared practices and codes from other jurisdictions and compiled a proposed new Chapter 13.22 for the NBMC, moving PROW installations to Title 13. He added that the

proposed Chapter 13.22 would follow the City of Santa Monica's lead in making the installations primarily processed by the Public Works Department, noting that this move can also enable the City to be more flexible in adapting to new technologies. He noted that there are limited exceptions requiring discretionary approval for deviations from the City's design standards, new streetlight pole locations, and the location or facility type requiring either a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) or a de minimis waiver.

Acting Deputy Community Development Director Zdeba clarified that the Commission's purview is to revise Chapter 20.49 and Chapter 21.49 so that wireless installations live more appropriately in Title 13 under the purview of Public Works and the Utilities Department. He stated that staff would like to consider exempting City-owned property from Title 20, while there are also updates for legislative consistency and compliance. He reported on how the language of the NBMC is being revamped to align with the current nomenclature while streamlining the City's policies. He reported that changes include formalizing the ongoing process of Class 1 (Stealth) facilities requiring only administrative clearance, Class 3 facilities moving to Title 13 and shifting from discretionary to mostly administrative approvals, City-owned properties being exempt from Chapter 20.49 and Chapter 21.49, adjusting the design and process guidelines, and updating for legislative compliance. He confirmed that height limits are not changing, but clarity is being added. He stated that staff received one letter of support and a second letter identifying possible discrepancies with suggested improvements. He added that the documents are considered drafts until they are taken to the City Council for approval in about a month.

In response to Commissioner Rosene's inquiries, Acting Deputy Community Development Director Zdeba confirmed that these changes are expected to incentivize Class 3 PROW installations, adding that carriers provided input on models from other jurisdictions to consider. He stated that the City's MUP requirement is a substantial barrier being removed in this update. He confirmed that the revisions call to eliminate the need for a MUP on City-owned property if the wireless facility is visible, essentially exempting the City from Title 20. He clarified that the item heard by the Commission recently was for a larger freestanding facility requiring a CUP and not a smaller Class installation that could be administratively approved moving forward.

Commissioner Rosene stated that this is a great idea, especially if it will increase wireless coverage.

Chair Harris expressed concerns about completely exempting City property, adding that his is unsure how to condition it or if conditions are necessary.

In response to Chair Harris' inquiry, all commissions reported having no ex parte communications about this item.

Chair Harris opened the public hearing.

Mr. Mosher echoed comments made by Chair Harris and Commissioner Rosene that the redlined drafts were difficult to follow. He expressed that relative state and federal laws have not changed over the past four years. He expressed concerns about the logistics of PROW changes with the shift to Public Works and utilities, acknowledging that they are not in the Commission's purview. He expressed concerns about the growing number of exemptions from CDPs, stating that these proposed changes will have to be certified by the California Coastal Commission, and expressed concerns about passage due to the City self-granting blanket decision-making rights.

Acting Deputy Community Development Director Zdeba clarified that Public Works issues encroachment permits to allow PROW construction, so it is appropriate to have the review under that department.

Chair Harris closed the public hearing.

**Motion** made by Chair Harris and seconded by Commissioner Rosene to approve the item as presented.

AYES: Ellmore, Gazzano, Harris, Langford, Rosene, and Salene  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Reed

## VIII. DISCUSSION ITEMS

### ITEM NO. 5 ANNUAL GENERAL PLAN AND HOUSING PROGRESS REPORTS (PA2026-0004)

**Site Location: Citywide**

#### **Summary:**

The General Plan and Housing Element Annual Progress Reports (Reports) are prepared by City of Newport Beach staff each year and reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council. The Reports summarize the City's progress with implementing the goals, policies, and programs of the General Plan and specifically, the Housing Element. The current Reports are presented for the Planning Commissions' review and expansively cover the City's activities in calendar year 2025.

#### **Recommended Actions:**

1. Find the review of the 2025 General Plan and Housing Element Annual Progress Report is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15060(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, because it has no potential for resulting in physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly;
2. Review and comment on the 2025 General Plan and Housing Element Annual Progress Reports; and
3. Recommend the City Council review and authorize the submittal of the 2025 General Plan and Housing Element Annual Progress Reports to the California Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) and the submittal of the Housing Element portion to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

In response to Chair Harris' inquiry, Community Development Director Murillo clarified that this is not a discussion item as staff is seeking a formal recommendation to the City Council.

Assistant Planner Melinda Whelan reported that the State mandates an Annual Progress Report on implementation of the General Plan and more specifically Housing Element implementation. She noted that the General Plan is being comprehensively updated so many implementation programs have been completed. She reported on the General Plan updating process over the past year, noting that it is close to completion.

Assistant Planner Whelan reported that the development at 1401 Quail St. generated 14 deed-restricted affordable housing units towards the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) quota. She reported that new housing developments have been approved and entitled under the new Housing Overlay Zones, implementing the City's Objective Design Standards. She noted the data driven required excel tables required as part of the Housing Element report for HCD. Staff was fine-tuning Table C for final submission and would be ready for City Council. She noted the

most significant Table is B, which directly feeds into counting towards the City’s RHNA. She noted how Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) production has contributed to the RHNA efforts with the City already permitting 204 of the 240 ADU prescribed in Policy Action 1H for the Planning Period ending in 2029. She reported on the City’s efforts to assist the unhoused, including 66 shelter intakes.

Chair Harris opened public comment.

Mr. Mosher expressed concerns about the State’s no-net-loss provision, with the Commission recently approving developments such as 300 Newport Center Dr., the Dover Townhomes, and the Monrovia Townhomes, in addition to a recent Development Agreement with The Irvine Company approved by the City Council, all with an insufficient amount of affordable housing units. He stated that the City is rapidly approaching a point where its remaining housing opportunity sites will be insufficient to generate enough affordable units to reasonably achieve its RHNA requirements due to an infeasible Housing Element.

Community Development Director Murillo clarified that the Housing Element does not promise affordability levels, but rather it is a plan created by the City to show that it can accommodate the number of affordable units mandated by RHNA. He added that no-net-loss creates a buffer to address the reality of how difficult it is to create affordable housing units. He added that staff is tracking its no-net-loss progress, and it is included in this Report.

Chair Harris closed public comment.

**Motion** made by Commissioner Ellmore and seconded by Chair Harris to approve the item as presented.

AYES: Ellmore, Gazzano, Harris, Langford, Rosene, and Salene  
 NOES: None  
 ABSTAIN: None  
 ABSENT: Reed

**IX. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER ITEMS**

**ITEM NO. 6 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION - None**

**ITEM NO. 7 REPORT BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR OR REQUEST FOR MATTERS WHICH A PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA**

Community Development Director Murillo reported that among other items on a full March 19<sup>th</sup> Agenda is a Study Session on the General Plan update ahead of requesting the Commission’s formal approval in April. He stated that the Commission’s meeting schedule will be adjusted to have a Special Meeting on April 2<sup>nd</sup> in place of the April 9<sup>th</sup> regular meeting to discuss a residential development and a restaurant.

Secretary Langford noted that their last few housing development approvals included requirements of Homeowners Associations (HOA) to enforce Conditions of Approval. He requested an informational presentation from staff at a future meeting about HOA enforcement limitations which could impact the Commission’s future actions and decisions.

Chair Harris agreed, noting that there are new State restrictions on HOAs.

Mr. Mosher noted that, when approving the last comprehensive update of the General Plan in 2006, there was a four-month review after the General Plan Advisory Committee completed its work with a vastly more active meeting schedule and more interaction between the Commission and City Council. He lamented that having fewer meetings to discuss the General Plan updates in detail will lead to a thinner public review than in 2006.

**ITEM NO. 8 REQUESTS FOR EXCUSED ABSENCES - None**

- X. **ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, Chair Harris adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m.

**The agenda for the March 5, 2026, Planning Commission meeting was posted on Friday, February 27, 2026, at 3:05 p.m. 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, February 27, 2026, at 2:56 p.m.**

---

Tristan Harris, Chair

---

Jonathan Langford, Secretary

DRAFT