

**NEWPORT BEACH PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 100 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2023  
REGULAR MEETING – 6:00 P.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER – 6:00 p.m.**

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

**III. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:** Secretary Tristan Harris, Commissioner Brady Barto, Commissioner Jonathan Langford, Commissioner Lee Lowrey, and Commissioner David Salene

**ABSENT:** Chair Curtis Ellmore and Vice Chair Mark Rosene

**Staff Present:** Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director Seimone Jurjis, Deputy Community Development Director Jim Campbell, Assistant City Attorney Yolanda Summerhill, City Traffic Engineer Brad Sommers, Senior Planner David Lee, Planning Manager Jaime Murillo, and Administrative Assistant Clarivel Rodriguez

**IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

**V. REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCES**

None

**VI. CONSENT ITEMS**

**ITEM NO. 1 MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2023**

**Recommended Action:** Approve and file

**Motion** made by Commissioner Langford and seconded by Commissioner Salene to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2023, meeting with Mr. Mosher's edits.

**AYES:** Barto, Lowrey, Langford, Harris, and Salene

**NOES:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** Ellmore and Rosene

**VII. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**ITEM NO. 2 THE CHAMPIONS CLUB STAFF APPROVAL APPEAL (PA2023-0138)**

**Site Location:** 1107 AND 1171 Jamboree Road

**Summary:**

An appeal of the Community Development Director's August 3, 2023, Staff Approval, finding substantial conformance to the previously approved Use Permit No. UP1697 and authorizing a new operator, Champion Management Group, Inc., to operate six existing tennis courts located on Parcel 2 of Resubdivision No. 413 under the name "The Champions Club." These six courts were previously part of the Palisades Tennis Club. There are no physical improvements proposed for the continued tennis operations, and pickleball activities of any kind are prohibited within the operation. The Palisades Tennis

Club will continue to operate ten existing courts and clubhouse located on Parcel 1 of Resubdivision No. 413.

This item was continued from the September 21, 2023, Planning Commission meeting, at the request of the appellant due to scheduling conflicts.

**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
3. Adopt Resolution No. PC2023-034 upholding the Community Development Director's approval authorizing a new operator for six existing tennis courts and finding substantial conformance with Use Permit No. UP1697 (PA2023-0138).

Senior Planner Lee used a presentation to review the project location, background, staff approval, substantial conformance, staff approval findings, notable conditions, staff responses to the appeal and a recent appeal letter submitted by the appellant, and recommendation.

In response to Commissioner Lowrey's questions relative to condition of approval #3, Senior Planner Lee confirmed that the lease agreement is to be determined and no parking allocation is specified in the conditions of approval.

In response to Commissioner Barto's questions relative to condition of approval #3, Senior Planner Lee stated that a parking lease agreement will be required as per the approved plans, staff will need to analyze an alternate parking plan from the Palisades Club in the absence of a lease agreement, and parking can be on parcel two and the Hyatt lot as well. Deputy Community Development Director Campbell stated that the application before the Commission is for tennis only, has no bearing on an interest to propose pickleball in the future, and the CEQA review for tennis is acceptable. Assistant City Attorney Summerhill explained the analysis process for CEQA piecemealing and indicated that this project is not considered piecemealing because it can move forward without being dependent on pickleball. Deputy Community Development Director Campbell noted that the application does not request any changes to the condition of approval related to the number of special events per year (i.e., tournaments), so the conditions of approval in the current permit apply and how the two tennis clubs share tournament privileges will not be addressed by staff.

Commissioner Salene expressed concern for the condition to provide parking subject to a lease with no reasonableness required and inquired if there is a way to tie the approval to an agreement for parking at the Palisades Club. In response, Assistant City Attorney Summerhill recommended hearing the public comment before coming up with a solution.

In response to Secretary Harris' questions, Senior Planner Lee clarified that the lease for parcel two expired in March 2022, an existing gate to access the courts at the Champion Club, there are no required Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) upgrades, and the enforcement process and options for use violations.

In response to Commissioner Langford's question, Deputy Community Development Director Campbell stated that both operators need to comply with all the conditions on the use permit and the conditions on the staff approval are applicable to the Champions portion of the club and reviewed the procedure for violations.

Commissioner Salene thought it was lacking to not have a development plan that addresses poor access conditions by court 3.

The following ex parte communications were disclosed: Commissioner Barto communicated with representatives from Palisades before the previous meeting, Commissioner Salene visited the site and is a

past Palisades member, Secretary Harris had communication with the representative before the previous meeting, Commissioner Lowrey spoke with the Champions operator and attorney for the appellant, and Commissioner Langford spoke with the applicant and an associate of the appellant and toured the property.

Secretary Harris opened the public hearing.

Sean Matsler, applicant representative from Cox, Castle, & Nicholson, reviewed the proposal and clarified that pickleball is not in the proposal, Champion holds the lease on the six tennis courts, and Palisades lost the right to park in the lot closest to the clubhouse but can use the parking area if the staff approval is upheld. He noted little effort by Palisades to secure a lease and no outreach by the appellant's attorney, and thought the matter is a property rights issue and Palisades is leveraging the City's land use process to undermine Champions' lease. He asked the Planning Commission to uphold the staff approval and honor staff's recommendation and agreed to the recommended conditions.

Gary Stougaard, owner representative, indicated that he is the only one present in the room that was involved in every conversation between the Palisades Tennis Club and Hyatt Hotel, outlined facts and chronology of lease discussions with the management groups for Champions and Palisades, and Palisades is trying to use the City's Land Use appeal process to secure a private property right for which Palisades was unwilling to pay.

In response to Commissioner Salene's question, Mr. Stougaard was unaware of the applicant's plan to address court access conditions. Assistant City Manager Jurjis explained that building official enforcement is triggered by development, this discussion is from a land use perspective, and ADA access cannot be mandated without development proposed.

In response to Secretary Harris' question, Mr. Stougaard clarified the pickleball court proposal details from Palisades and Champions' current intended court use for tennis.

In response to Commissioner Salene's inquiry, Mr. Stougaard indicated that he is not willing to enter into any long-term parking lease agreement with Palisades unless and until his interests are protected but will continue to provide parking spaces in the overflow lot. He relayed how he encouraged teamwork and believes he has gone above and beyond as a landowner to ensure the use of the courts and property.

In response to Commissioner Barto's question, Mr. Stougaard clarified overflow parking on the west side of the hotel and access from Back Bay Drive or the hotel side gate and staff deemed this acceptable.

Micheal Shonafelt, legal counsel for the appellant, provided a presentation to show the project plans for 24 pickleball courts and noted multiplying impacts occluded from the record, deprived full public disclosure of the project impact, and CEQA mandates. He referenced a letter he sent dated October 17, 2023, that addressed CEQA piecemealing and a change of ownership fallacy of division case and reviewed the requirement for single integrated management for the two parcels outlined in Use Permit (UP) 1697 and implications when UP 1697 is fractured. In closing, he summarized two problems with the action: CEQA disclosure requirements and rupturing UP 1697. He proposed the project come back for a comprehensive review and a disclosure of all the project impacts.

In response to Commissioner Barto's query, Mr. Shonafelt relayed that Palisades was not in violation of UP 1697 when it did not renew the lease.

Cyndie Borcoman-Martin, 2217 Private Road, advocated for the Palisades quality of life without the noise of pickleball and showed a video clip from the October 25, 2022, City Council meeting public hearing that addressed the reconsideration of the Tennis Club at Newport Beach project amendment (PA2021-260).

Jennifer Rabbitt, 4240 Park Newport, supported the Palisades Club.

Liz McNabb, Costa Mesa resident, hoped for a compromise between the Hyatt and the Palisades Club owner.

Melissa Lu, Huntington Beach resident, suspected CEQA piecemealing, noted plans for pickleball, and expressed concern for area residents.

Jim Mosher noted the conditions of approval are on packet page 22 and thought the application is not eligible for staff approval as stated on page 18. He reviewed the Planning Commission meeting minutes of October 4, 1973, and original parcel division, single development use, and parking conditions approved.

Danielle, Palisades member, expressed concern for safety at the courts.

Debbie McCormick expressed concern for the future of the club and walking distance from the parking area to the Palisades Club.

Alex Shakiss encouraged the City to keep tennis courts at the Hyatt and Palisades Club.

Carl Mazzi, The Tennis Club (TTC) member, supported change and addressing the application for tennis.

Jennifer Hunter, Huntington Beach resident, expressed concern for logistics, safety, electricity, handicap restrooms, parking rates, and maintenance.

Julie Sherwin, Corona del Mar resident, expressed concern for CEQA piecemealing, pickleball development, and the lease rate increase.

Mary Helen Beatificato, Newport Beach resident, reviewed the legal argument of CEQA piecemealing, referenced Orinda Associations versus Board of Supervisors (182 Cal.App.3d 1145), and asked the Planning Commission to consult legal counsel on this matter.

Robert Struthers supported the proposal for tennis.

Kevin Preeb supported TTC and the proposal for tennis.

Kevin Craig, UTR Vice President, reviewed the tennis agreement at the facility.

Abraham Mohssin expressed excitement for holding tennis tournaments at the Palisades Club.

Ken Montgomery, Irvine resident, suggested the Planning Commission require a plan be prepared and submitted.

Lauren Sherwin, Palisades member, concurred with requiring a plan for review.

An unidentified speaker, 1612 Santiago Drive, challenged event logistics and use permit limits.

Sean Bollettieri-Abdali thanked Mr. Duddy for his club membership, noted numerous efforts to work through concerns and clarified a twenty-eight-cent mistake on his rent percentage reporting and willingness to pay it, increasing operating costs, meetings with staff to discuss pickleball requirements, event logistics, an operating agreement offer, and no intention to destroy Palisades. He offered to answer any questions from the Planning Commission.

Denys Oberman, Newport Beach resident, agreed with the economic premise needed for the applicant's proposal to be viable, noted two incomplete uses that do not fulfill conditions for parking, club access, and electric and water, and urged the Planning Commission to consider a construction component.

Rita Zurcher, Newport Beach resident, expressed concerns for the impact to match times, charity events, employees, junior tennis program, parking, and traffic.

Thomas Duddy, 1701 Port Westbourne Place, indicated that his reason for filing the appeal was to provide an opportunity to discuss confusion and concerns and ensure transparency, compliance, and accountability of the

process, a desire for a good partnership and neighborly relationship, and appreciation for the time provided at this meeting.

Valentina Bollettieri-Abdali reviewed the history of tennis and pickleball at TTC and expressed her passion for tennis and charity at the Palisades Club.

Mauricio Bertolli, Costa Mesa resident, noted the matter is about a resolution granted under certain principles and circumstances to ensure safety and successful operations, moral aspects in business transactions, and worsened problems and stress.

Eric Lonagbardi noted handicap parking availability, challenges, and disputes and asked for the matter to be considered.

Mr. Matsler opposed the CEQA piecemealing accusation.

Mr. Shonafelt stated that the testimony revealed that pickleball is going to be included and findings of fact cannot be made for A3 and condition of approval 3 and suggested the applicant to come back with the proper bundle of entitlements.

Secretary Harris closed the public hearing.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill legally justified why this matter is not considered CEQA piecemealing and parking is not a CEQA impact and should not be considered part of the analysis. She disagreed that the established use permit requires a single operator.

In response to Commissioner Barto's request, Assistant City Attorney Summerhill stated that the lot split should have been incorporated in the use permit application instead of having two different applications. Deputy Community Development Director Campbell read the conditions of the approval as stated in the October 4, 1973, Planning Commission meeting minutes and reviewed the single development and parking provisions in condition eight. He did not think the City could be held to the condition because the lease expired, and circumstances have changed. Commissioner Barto stated he was trying to process the implications of the use permit.

In response to Secretary Harris' question, Deputy Community Development Director Campbell relayed that staff did not see any violations to the conditions of approval that would require an amendment to the use permit and proceeded with the staff approval path.

Secretary Harris re-opened the public hearing.

In response to Commissioner Barto's question, Mr. Matsler stated that the lease to Champion does not create an obligation to convert to pickleball use.

Secretary Harris closed the public hearing.

In response to Secretary Harris' question, Deputy Community Development Director Campbell indicated that both parcels use the same use permit, with 78 parking spaces for tennis use by the entire tennis facility, and that it is mandated by the staff approval. Additionally, he noted that the use permit contemplates overflow parking onto the broader Hyatt parcel and staff believes is sufficiently consistent with the use permit to warrant the recommendation. The October 4, 1973, Planning Commission meeting minutes were presented for the Resubdivision of the tennis club lot and condition 8 was reviewed. Mr. Campbell stated that the easement held by parcel two provides for vehicular access through parcel one to parcel two and not being aware of any access rights from parcel two to parcel one.

Secretary Harris recognized private property rights and wondered if this project were to be proposed today if it would be viable and approved and expressed being "torn" by the matter.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill asked if the Commission would like a proposed modification to condition of approval #3 associated with parking that provides more assurance that Palisades would have parking available.

Commissioner Langford expressed concern for a successful set up and suggested reviewing all the conditions and preparing a new use permit.

Commissioner Barto recognized staff is trying to maintain a broken situation and a half-baked solution and expressed frustration for the situation.

Commissioner Langford thought the timing of the staff approval was justified, but now seems different to him and a "referee" is needed for the parking matter.

Commissioner Salene agreed with Commissioner Langford that it would be difficult for the Planning Commission to piecemeal conditions and not miss something, noted the key issues are parking, access, and key events, and expressed uncertainty of the best next step.

Commissioner Lowrey suggested delaying a decision tonight so staff can review the concerns, agreed with his colleagues, noted the Planning Commission purview for land use and related questions, stated he usually sides with the property owner, and wished there was a meeting of the minds between the parties.

Commissioner Salene noted that the conditions as written are inadequate and a choice to either patch them up tonight or let staff work it out and bring it back when the conditions are more complete.

Commissioner Barto thought that the 1973 use permit does not fit the current situation and the parking issues need to be figured out and looked to staff for recommended next steps.

Assistant City Manager Jurjis suggested the item be returned at a future Planning Commission meeting so staff can work on the matter.

Commissioner Salene proposed staff work on a parking agreement, adequate access, and tournament limits. He thought references to pickleball should be ceased.

Commissioner Lowrey agreed that the focus is on tennis and for land use and thought if staff could address the key issues, then the Planning Commission can come up with a better land use decision.

After Deputy Community Development Director Campbell inquired about the Planning Commission's parking location expectations, Commissioner Barto asked how to address that the use permit contemplates parking in the front. Deputy Community Development Director Campbell indicated that staff would like to have parking in front as originally contemplated by the use permit, and a desire to avoid shutting down any party.

Commissioner Salene hoped wording could be arranged in the conditions that would allow parking to be granted to the Palisades Club by the applicant.

Commissioner Langford suggested language that reflects two operators instead of a single operator, the parties work out the parking, and clear direction from the Planning Commission on the matter.

Commissioner Barto expressed concern that neither club is satisfying the permit and noted the importance and best interest for everyone to work together.

Assistant City Attorney Summerhill recommended the matter be continued to a date certain of December 7, 2023.

**Motion** made by Secretary Lowrey and seconded by Commissioner Salene to continue the matter to December 7, 2023.

AYES: Barto, Lowrey, Langford, Harris, and Salene  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Ellmore and Rosene

**ITEM NO. 3 MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SHORT TERM LODGING (PA2023-0116)**

**Site Location: Citywide**

**Summary:**

Amendments to Chapter 5.95 (Short Term Lodging Permit), Title 20 (Planning and Zoning) and Title 21 (Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan) of the Newport Beach Municipal Code that include the following:

- Establishing regulations permitting short term lodging within the MU-W2 (Mixed-Use Water) and MU-CV/15<sup>th</sup> Street (Mixed-Use Cannery Village and 15<sup>th</sup> Street) zoning districts;
- Changing the maximum cap of short term lodging permits from 1,550 permits Citywide to: 1) 1,475 permits in residential districts; and 2) 75 permits within the MU-W2 and MU-CV/15<sup>th</sup> Street zoning districts;
- Correcting an inconsistency in the definition and use of short term lodging and bed and breakfast inn to mean a rental of 30 days or less; and
- Revisions related to violations, suspensions, revocations, and permit closures.

**Recommended Actions:**

1. Conduct a public hearing;
2. Find the recommended actions and the attached resolution exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15060(c)(2) (the activity will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment) and 15060(c)(3) (the activity is not a project as defined in Section 15378) of the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, because it has no potential for resulting in physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly;
3. Adopt Resolution No. PC2023-037 recommending the City Council adoption of a Code Amendment to Chapter 5.95 (Short Term Lodging Permit) and Title 20 (Planning and Zoning) of the Newport Beach Municipal Code related to short term lodging (PA2023-0116) (Attachment No. PC 1); and
4. Adopt Resolution No. PC2023-038 recommending the City Council authorize submittal of Local Coastal Plan Amendment to the California Coastal Commission requesting to amend Title 21 (Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan) of the Newport Beach Municipal Code related to short term lodging (PA2023-0116) (Attachment No. PC 2).

Commissioner Langford recused himself due to parcels owned by his employer in the zoning districts at hand.

Planning Manager Murillo used a presentation to review the code and local coastal program (LCP) amendments related to short term lodging (STL), background, proposed amendments, a mixed-used district graphic, proposed changes for STL in mixed-use zones, and a recommendation. He noted that amendments would also need to be submitted to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) for approval.

Commissioner Salene expressed concern for a high minimum unit count requirement in the same statistical area per owner, and in response, Planning Manager Murillo noted that the proposed unit count was based

upon the initial direction from the City Council. Assistant City Manager Jurjis also noted that the two-year STL permit inactivity requirement came from an Ad Hoc Subcommittee recommendation.

Except for Commissioner Lowrey, the Commissioners disclosed ex parte communications with landowners in the multi-zones.

Secretary Harris opened the public hearing.

Jim Mosher reviewed the direction by City Council and suspected that the Council wants to reduce the time share unit requirements from 100 units to 20 units and then questioned why the unit count would be limited to two specific districts and separate permit caps.

Denys Oberman agreed with the concept, questioned limiting it to specific districts, suggested extending into other mixed-use areas, expressed concern for the transition process from residential areas to mixed-use zones, asked for a more specific plan from staff and a quantitative target and timing of how many units can be reallocated, and noted no opportunities for close proximity parking to accommodate the code requirement.

Planning Manager Murillo noted that there will be two separate caps with associated waiting lists. He further explained that permits would be immediately available for mixed use properties and there may be an interim period where permits exceed 1550 until the residential cap and total number of permits reduce through attrition. He relayed that staff does not expect the 75 permits in the mixed-use districts to be secured right away.

Secretary Harris closed the public hearing.

In response to Commissioner Lowrey's questions, Planning Manager Murillo confirmed that owners of one unit cannot participate, and an eligible permit holder is required to own 20 units under common ownership. Commissioner Lowrey stated he will not support this recommendation because it excludes a lot of people.

In response to Secretary Harris' question, Assistant City Manager Jurjis relayed that the direction to staff came from the City Council as an A-1 item and the Planning Commission can disagree and make a recommendation.

Commissioner Salene concurred with Commissioner Lowrey.

In response to Commissioner Barto's comment, Planning Manager Murillo concurred that the 20-unit requirement relates to the professional manager and amenity requirements.

In response to Commissioner Salene's question, Planning Manager Murillo stated that the code allows for flexible amenities and provided examples.

In response to Secretary Harris' question, Planning Manager Murillo indicated that the 75 units will be available immediately after adoption by the City Council and the California Coastal Commission.

**Motion** was made by Commissioner Lowrey with no second motion to approve the item with an amendment to the unit count from 20 units to one unit.

Commissioner Barto expressed concern for enabling a transient community by allowing a STL for a single unit owner. He opposed the motion. In response, Commissioner Lowrey counter argued that the net number is not increasing.

**Motion** was made by Commissioner Barto and seconded by Secretary Harris to approve the item as recommended.

AYES: Harris and Barto



NOES: Lowrey and Salene  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Ellmore and Rosene

**Motion** made by Secretary Harris and seconded by Commissioner Lowrey to approve the item with an amendment to the unit count to a minimum of one unit.

AYES: Harris, Lowrey, and Salene  
NOES: Barto  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Ellmore and Rosene

**ITEM NO. 4 MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDMENTS (PA2022-0219)**  
**Site Location: Citywide**

**Summary:**

The City Council established the Ad Hoc Municipal Code and Council Policy Review Committee to comprehensively review and amend the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC) to reduce regulations, streamline processes, and generally eliminate outdated information and directed boards and commissions, including the Planning Commission, to establish an ad hoc committee to review the NBMC and City Council Policies within that particular body's area of expertise with recommended revisions. At its August 3, 2023, meeting, the Planning Commission made recommended revisions to Title 19 (Subdivisions), Title 20 (Planning and Zoning) and Title 21 (Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan) of the NBMC in accordance with the Council's direction. The recommendations include:

- Tentative Parcel Map Review – Eliminate the public hearing requirement for parcel maps for condominium purposes.
- Bluff Overlay District – Eliminate conflicting code provisions by deleting the bluff overlay areas in Title 20 that are included in Title 21.
- Take-Out Service—Fast-Casual – Change threshold for when a fast-casual take-out restaurant with no late hours requires a minor use permit (discretionary review).
- Conversion or Demolition of Affordable Housing – Eliminate Chapters 20.34 and 21.34 as they are inapplicable to the City.

**Recommended Actions:**

1. Conduct a public hearing;
2. Find the recommended action not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 1506(c)(2) and 15060(c)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3; and
3. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. PC2023-039, recommending City Council adoption of a Code Amendment to Title 19 (Subdivisions), Title 20 (Planning and Zoning) and Title 21 (Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan) of the Newport Beach Municipal Code incorporating the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations and other related revisions (PA2022-0219) (Attachment No. PC 1).

Planning Manager Murillo used a presentation to review the municipal code changes to reduce regulations, support of City Council efforts, recommended areas affecting Titles 19, 20, and 21, additional amendments, and recommendation.

In response to Commissioner Lowrey's question, Planning Manager Murillo relayed that the parcel map provision would be applicable to four condos or less.

Commissioners reported no ex parte communications.

Jim Mosher suggested making the origins known of deleted rules to assess potential usefulness and expressed concern for eliminating bluff overlay districts from Title 20, specifically Irvine Terrace.

Deputy Community Development Director Campbell noted that there are two different bluff overlays in two different titles and the recommendation is to eliminate the less restrictive overlay in Title 20 to avoid confusion and errors. He expressed no concern for staff overlooking the regulations in Title 21 during a development permit review.

Secretary Harris closed the public hearing.

**Motion** made by Secretary Barto and seconded by Commissioner Harris to approve the item as recommended.

AYES: Barto, Harris, Langford, Lowrey, and Salene  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Ellmore and Rosene

**VIII. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER ITEMS**

**ITEM NO. 5 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

None

**ITEM NO. 6 REPORT BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR OR REQUEST FOR MATTERS WHICH A PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA**

Deputy Community Development Director Campbell stated that the next Planning Commission meeting scheduled for November 9 has one appeal item planned, second meeting in November is canceled, December 7 meeting has two items planned, and December 21 meeting has two items planned.

**ITEM NO. 7 REQUESTS FOR EXCUSED ABSENCES**

None

**IX. ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Secretary Harris at 9:32 p.m.

**The agenda for the October 19, 2023, Planning Commission meeting was posted on Friday, October 13, 2023, at 10:00 a.m. in the Chambers binder, on the digital display board located inside the vestibule of the Council Chambers at 100 Civic Center Drive, and on the City's website on Friday, October 13, 2023, at 10:15 a.m.**

---

Tristan Harris, Secretary

---

Seimone Jurjis, Ex-Officio Secretary

DRAFT