



4040 MacArthur Blvd., Suite 300
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Tel: (949) 251-0444

John Saunders
President

December 1, 2023

City of Newport Beach
Planning Commission and City Council
100 Civic Center Drive
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Re: 1400 Bristol Steet, Newport Beach

Dear Member of the Commission and Council:

I am writing to express my support for The Picerne Group's proposed luxury apartment development at 1400 Bristol Street in Newport Beach. As a long-time property owner and member of the business community, I have seen the positive impact that thoughtful development has on the area. This project will bring new life to the community, expand the customer base for local retail businesses, and provide needed housing for the City.

The Picerne Group is a committed local development group with a strong interest in the continued success of the City. They plan to own and operate the project for the long term, and their proven track record at One Uptown Newport has assured me they are the right people for this project. 1400 Bristol will help alleviate a severe housing shortage while creating a thriving neighborhood in the Airport Area, where I also own property. I encourage you to approve this development, which I believe is a positive step towards evolution of a community where people will live, work, and shop.

Sincerely,

John Saunders

December 7, 2023, Planning Commission Item 4 Comments

These comments on a Newport Beach Planning Commission agenda item are submitted by:

Jim Mosher (jimmosher@yahoo.com), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229).

Item No. 4. RESIDENCES AT 1400 BRISTOL STREET (PA2022-0296)

Skimming portions of the proposed resolution, I have these preliminary comments:

1. In the “General Plan Amendment” section starting on handwritten page 34, the description in fact or finding 1 that “*The request is to amend the General Plan Land Use designation from General Commercial Office (CO-G) to Mixed-Use Horizontal 2 (MU-H2)*” seems incomplete. First, the request is to do that *only* at 1400 Bristol Street. And second, per Section 1.2 (page 31), it is to do that *and* to add 64 dwelling units not currently in the General Plan or allotted to the MU-H2 designation.
2. On handwritten page 45, the “Traffic Study” portion of Section 3 of the proposed resolution begins with a lettered finding “A”, then skips to a finding “D” and follows that by a finding “B”. As it serves no obvious purpose, I suspect this non-sequential lettering is a typo.
3. Fact D.1.c on page 50 says the 64 non-replacement dwellings are expected to add 624 average daily vehicle trips. In light of that, it is interesting to me that in Tables 3.12-2, 3.12-3 and 3.12-4 of Section 3.12 (Noise) of the [Addendum](#) (No. 6) to the 2006 EIR, the only neighboring streets on which those vehicles consistently produce increased trips (300 ADT) is Bristol, although in Table 3.12-4 (but strangely, not in the others – likely due to rounding the numbers to 100), they also add 100 ADT on Jamboree.
4. Considering the effort the City has gone to to move this site outside the airport’s 65 dB CNEL contour, it is interesting to note that in the tables of the Addendum just referenced, traffic on Bristol Street itself, without counting airport noise, is expected to produce 64.8 dB CNEL at the project site on opening day, increasing to 65.5 dB at buildout of the current General Plan, without all the additional housing the City hopes to add. Although the purpose of those tables is to predict if the project traffic will increase noise on selected streets, it is also interesting that the adjacent 73 freeway is not listed in them. But I see now that is consistent with the Noise Element of our General Plan, which does not identify freeways as sources of traffic noise (see [Figure N5](#)).
5. On handwritten page 51, under “Development Agreement,” finding or fact 2 refers to a “public safety fee” implying it is part of the Development Agreement. Yet Condition of Approval 19 on handwritten page 167 suggests it is an obligation separate from the DA.
6. On handwritten page 58, the proposed amendment to Anomaly 16 does not appear clearly written to me. It suggests two office buildings of 38,764 sf *each* were demolished. But from the last paragraph on page 37 it is a *total* of 38,764 sf. It is also unclear where in Anomaly 16¹ the 89 units referred to are. I would suggest something like: “*At 1400 Bristol Street, 89 dwelling units were converted from two existing office buildings totaling 38,764 square feet and 64 units were added through a GPA (PA2022-0296).*”

¹ Anomaly 16 is the entire area bounded by Birch, Quail, Spruce and N. Bristol.