

From: Matt <mattsup62@gmail.com>
Sent: October 10, 2025 12:54 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: Bayview Hts traffic hearing

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

To whom it may concern . In regards to possible solutions for the traffic situation in Bayview hts I would like to see a full road closure at Spruce and Bristol or Spruce and Zenith. If that is not possible I would like to see speed bumps on Bayview, Spruce, Zenith and Orchid in combination with both speed limit signs and lines that separate the road from the parking in front of homes. I do not feel that a monument sign on a center island will be helpful as that is not where the speeding issue is taking place.

I would like to reiterate that in my opinion the best option is to close Spruce at either Zenith or Bristol.

Thank you for your time.

Matt Clark

20111 Bayview ave NB

Sent from my iPhone

From: Brett Mullinax <brettmullinax3@gmail.com>
Sent: October 12, 2025 9:33 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comments to Study Session Item 2: Traffic Calming and Public Safety Measures in the Bayview Heights Neighborhood
Attachments: IMG_2672.JPEG; IMG_2673.JPEG; IMG_2674.JPEG; IMG_2671.JPEG

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

Good Evening City Councilmembers:

While I am looking forward to hearing the actual discussion take place at the 10/14/25 City Council meeting, I have reviewed the slides posted to the Agenda and below are my comments and questions that I would like considered and discussed:

Slide 2: "Residents informed Spruce Avenue closure not supported by Traffic Engineering and presents concerns for emergency services." Why is the closure not supported? Is it due to the physics of the road? What are the concerns by emergency services personnel, because we have residents in our neighborhood who work for Fire and Police Departments who do not believe this is an issue.

Slide 9: City should exclude "no response" households because this skews the data. Should only read "yes to Spruce closure" = $187/260 = 72\%$. And "no to Spruce closure" (math is not provided. Please include # of "no to Spruce closure" households). Exclude "no response" households.

Slide 10 (Edgelines): I think the edgelines are a moot point. Can the traffic engineer explain the psychology of how this slows traffic? The edgelines differentiate parking locations, but may give drivers the false impression that they can move faster when in the driving lane (almost protected by the parking lane delineated by the edgelines).

Slide 12 (Speed Cushions): The main goal is to close Spruce for the reasons noted. Speed cushions in addition to closing Spruce may compliment the closure. But speed cushions by themselves are not the goal nor the solution without the Spruce closure.

Slide 13 (Spruce Closure): Great slide, this proposal works.

Slide 14 (Spruce Closure): This solution or similar works too.

Slide 15: **When evaluating % "yes" to Spruce Closure against all petition participants, 70% + was achieved. $187/260 = 72\%$**

Slide 16 Public Safety Review:

1. Where are the Flock cameras? How did our neighborhood get skipped over when we were one of the first to install them due to the crime in our neighborhood and we had to take measures into our own hands? NBPD has appreciated our installation of the cameras because it helped solve crimes in our community. We got our wrists slapped for installing them, then it was discovered we were one of the *only* cities without them, and then Santa Ana Heights got passed over when the City installed them? Our neighborhood is one of the **most needed for Flock cameras due to our proximity to the 73 and provides an easy escape from the City.**
2. Please explain how a closure at Spruce would slow emergency response time?

Slide 17: I like and agree with the raised median at Spruce Avenue with the neighborhood greeting sign. I think this would serve as a nice buffer to slow traffic and make drivers aware that this is a residential neighborhood.

Slide 18: Traffic circle is okay but may prove difficult to navigate with multi-axle vehicles that are prominent in our neighborhood such as horse trailers, other trailered items, RV's. etc.

Generally Speaking: Although data might not hit certain numbers, recall **on May 15, 2025, we had a truck slam through someone's house** in the middle of the day due to speed, reckless driving, and evading law enforcement – see photos. Why isn't this being considered above any numbers/data/metrics/thresholds? We are lucky it wasn't in the evening while kids were occupying the back bedrooms the driver hit, or playing out front of our homes.

Sincerely,

Brett Mullinax

Spruce Avenue Resident









From: Brittany Chapman <brittanyktchapman@gmail.com>
Sent: October 12, 2025 2:58 PM
To: City Clerk's Office
Subject: 10/14/25 agenda, item III. SS2

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

Dear Council,

Thank you for considering traffic improvements in our Bayview Heights neighborhood.

From the proposal we are in favor of

- raised center median at spruce/zenith
- speed limit pavement markings
- edgelines
- speed cushions

We are not in favor of

- closing spruce
- raised traffic circle at spruce/zenith

If the council considers speed cushions in the proposed areas on page 12, then I would like you to consider adding them to Cypress as well. I noticed that a traffic study was not done on Cypress, specifically between Orchard and Mesa.

I urge you to not put in a traffic circle. Traffic coming to a full stop allows kids to bike the neighborhood safely as well as our family to walk our dog knowing cars will be fully stopping. A traffic circle continues momentum we are trying to prevent coming into the neighborhood.

Thank you.

Best,
Brittany (20292 SW Cypress St)

Brittany Chapman

8184568195
brittanyktchapman@gmail.com

From: [Chris Wright](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bayview Heights Traffic Calming and Public Safety Meeting 10/14/25
Date: October 13, 2025 10:03:52 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

Dear City Clerk,

I am reaching out to submit my opposition to the street improvements requested in tomorrow's, October 14, 2025 meeting due to my inability to make the meeting due to prior engagements. I have lived on Spruce Avenue since 2018 and have two young children and have not been concerned regarding the traffic that ventures in our neighborhood. The majority of the traffic that takes place in our neighborhood is caused by our neighbors and their family and friends. I may have one or two issues over the last 6+ years that may have been concerning but not to cause a shut down of our street or add any additional improvements.

Please use this email as my wife and my opposition to this request.

Sincerely,

Chris and Kimberly Wright
20211 Spruce Avenue
Newport Beach, CA 92660

From: [Denys Oberman](#)
To: [Barto, Michelle](#); [Stapleton, Joe](#); [city](#)
Cc: [City Clerk's Office](#); [Fred Levine](#); sheri.morgan@gmail.com
Subject: City Council Session of October 14 2025--Comments for the Public Record re Item XI
Date: October 13, 2025 2:46:21 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

Councilmember Barto,

As residents of the Balboa Peninsula ,we would like to express appreciation and support for your proposal to bring forward,
“Amendments to the Newport Beach Municipal Code to enhance enforcement of bicycle safety ...”
to include restrictions re ebikes).

We are aware that you have been leading a Council committee charged with evaluation and recommendations to the City to improve regulation and safety of ebikes.

The City has been aware of this issue as a growing concern, not only to the Balboa Peninsula, but the City-at-large.

The City and the Community have experienced several years of leaning into “Education” with little if any material improvement,
The time is ripe to take this as a major Public Safety issue and exercise Enforcement ---for the benefit of all.

We look forward to learning more about the Council committee’s direction on its recommendations, and stand by to provide insights and support.

Denys H Oberman
Resident and Community Stakeholder

.....
(Please disregard the signature and notice,below.)

Regards,

Denys H. Oberman, CEO



OBERMAN Strategy and Financial Advisors

19200 Von Karman Avenue, 6th Floor

Irvine, CA 92612

Tel [\(949\) 476-0790](tel:(949)476-0790)

Cell [\(949\) 230-5868](tel:(949)230-5868)

Fax [\(949\) 752-8935](tel:(949)752-8935)

Email: dho@obermanassociates.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The documents accompanying this transmission contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this telecopied information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately at [949/476-0790](tel:949/476-0790) or the electronic address above, to arrange for the return of the document(s) to us.

From: [Ryan Schleiger](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bayview Heights Traffic Calming Correspondence
Date: October 13, 2025 2:47:43 PM
Attachments: [Spruce Closure Planning Comments.pdf](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

Hello,

Attached please find a document addressing the ideas regarding traffic calming in Bayview Heights. Please post these to the Correspondence. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Ryan Schleiger
20162 Spruce Ave.

To whom it may concern:

My name is Ryan Schleiger and I live on Spruce Ave. I am writing today in support of the Spruce Closure to increase safety for the children, pedestrians, bicyclists, equestrians, and residents of the Bayview Heights Community. Bayview Heights is a unique community that maintains some “old school” charm including no sidewalks and no streetlights. Unfortunately, Spruce Ave. has become a thoroughfare for business and non-business traffic cutting through the community to return to Birch St. This is particularly dangerous in a neighborhood without sidewalks & streetlights. People using short cuts are typically interested in time savings with little thought or regard for safety in a residential neighborhood.

In Bayview Heights, we have a significant population of young families with kids learning to ride bikes/scooters/skateboards, throw and kick balls, play hockey and other activities that occur in the street not to mention the horses, dog walkers, and cyclists that share the road. With the continued development, the potential for over 11,000 new residential units in the city, and the increased reliance on smart phones for short cuts the current problem only stands to intensify in the coming years. Please act now to protect our children before this problem gets worse.

The closure of Spruce will increase safety in several ways.

1. Decreased vehicle traffic/traffic conflicts with children, bikes, pedestrians, horses, & dog walkers
2. Elimination of easy freeway access for crimes of opportunity. (ie mail theft, package theft, vehicle/parts theft & vehicle burglary)
3. Closure may decrease unwanted foot traffic(Transient Assault on an elderly man at 2431 Azure Ave, Package theft)

Addressing the primary concern regarding the closure:

1. “The closure of Spruce will shift traffic.” It is true that access and egress will now occur on Orchard or Mesa. However, if we eliminate the significant cut through traffic, I believe the increased traffic on Orchard, Orchard, and Mesa will be minimal since its solely traffic related to the residences. Per the traffic studies, Orchard and Orchard have almost twice as much traffic as the remaining streets. Furthermore, if after the closure we are dealing with primarily local traffic, not those looking for a short cut, I suspect we will see a change in driving habits and speed.

Context to items presented in the slideshow from city staff:

1. Petition Response Spruce Closure (Subsection Study Area) Excluded from Staff Report – I am not sure why this metric was excluded. This was the initial requested petition area. The 70% threshold for closure was met & exceeded in this area. If you remove the non-respondents (vacant/under construction) from the tally the approval exceeds 80%.
2. Emergency Response - After attending the Bayview Heights Traffic Calming meeting on August 5, 2025, with Council member Weigand, city staff, and with Chief Officers from both the police and fire departments the following was indicated: while this is a change to traffic, due to the one way nature of Bristol, the location of the responding resources, and the exit from the 73 freeway, the closure doesn't materially impact the routes that would be taken to access Bayview Heights in an emergency.
3. Hammerhead Turn Around – This is a creative solution to a complex problem. While lanes have a recommended width, perhaps it makes sense to narrow down the lane width in an area where we are looking to slow traffic. That may allow some reallocation of space to eliminate the encroachment on residents on Zenith Ave. I believe utilizing the existing city owned sidewalk, and minimizing the raised curb island width, there may be a creative way to accomplish the hammerhead turn around with minimal impact.

Thank you all for your time and efforts to increase the safety of our neighborhood. I appreciate your careful thought and creativity as we wade through the various solutions.

Sincerely,

Ryan Schleiger

20162 Spruce Ave.

From: [fred levine](#)
To: [Denys Oberman](#)
Cc: [Barto, Michelle](#); [Stapleton, Joe](#); [city](#); [City Clerk's Office](#); [sheri.morgan@gmail.com](#)
Subject: Re: City Council Session of October 14 2025--Comments for the Public Record re Item XI
Date: October 13, 2025 3:27:29 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

Thank You

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 13, 2025, at 2:46 PM, Denys Oberman <dho@obermanassociates.com> wrote:

Councilmember Barto,

As residents of the Balboa Peninsula ,we would like to express appreciation and support for your proposal to bring forward,

“Amendments to the Newport Beach Municipal Code to enhance enforcement of bicycle safety ...” to include restrictions re ebikes).

We are aware that you have been leading a Council committee charged with evaluation and recommendations to the City to improve regulation and safety of ebikes.

The City has been aware of this issue as a growing concern, not only to the Balboa Peninsula, but the City-at-large.

The City and the Community have experienced several years of leaning into “Education” with little if any material improvement,
The time is ripe to take this as a major Public Safety issue and exercise Enforcement --- for the benefit of all.

We look forward to learning more about the Council committee’s direction on its recommendations, and stand by to provide insights and support.

Denys H Oberman
Resident and Community Stakeholder

.....

(Please disregard the signature and notice,below.)

Regards,

Denys H. Oberman, CEO



OBERMAN Strategy and Financial Advisors

19200 Von Karman Avenue, 6th Floor

Irvine, CA 92612

Tel [\(949\) 476-0790](tel:(949)476-0790)

Cell [\(949\) 230-5868](tel:(949)230-5868)

Fax [\(949\) 752-8935](tel:(949)752-8935)

Email: dho@obermanassociates.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The documents accompanying this transmission contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this telecopied information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately at [949/476-0790](tel:(949)476-0790) or the electronic address above, to arrange for the return of the document(s) to us.

From: [Neil Treffers](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Traffic Calming and Safety Study Response
Date: October 13, 2025 4:00:28 PM
Attachments: [Traffic Calming & Safety Response.docx](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

Traffic Calming & Safety Study Response:

The same issues have been a concern and raised for over 6 years

The study session prepared lacks depth, context, and legitimate support for real solutions

Not only were speed cushions and a spruce closure requested, but several other items also were requested such as flock cameras installed and paid for by the city, finishing off horse trails in the neighborhood, decorative streetlights throughout, repaving of the streets, and general housekeeping and upkeep for a community of Newport beach. Currently, we have cut through traffic from Birch and Bristol, we have no street lights, we have horses throughout, we have no sidewalks, we have a Montessori school, we have a public park with no public parking aside from parking on the neighborhood streets, we have direct access from people coming or going to Back Bay, we have businesses that surround the outer border of the community. All these aspects play a direct role and impact on our quality of life, and why our concerns for the community need immediate solutions. The community is taking on burdens from the outside with no counter measures to address these issues.

Although the petition was supported by the city, the roll out and process was very convoluted:

- It started with just getting signatures from a sub section in the community via door-to-door signatures
- Once the petition was turned in for that subsection and the % support for closing spruce was obtained; the city stated we now had to extend the footprint of needing signatures and every house was now included in the petition process
- Instead of allowing us to continue with door-to-door signatures, the city sent out blanket mailers asking for a vote with no real conversation or context. Majority of those streets are not directly affected by the closure or understand the impact the cut through traffic and safety concerns the subsection or residents are dealing with.
- The mailers were disproportionately in favor of neither speed bumps or closure; mind you they are not directly impacted by a closure or the impact of cut through traffic.
- We weren't told until in the last inning that "non respondent" addresses were counted as "no" votes
- I also strongly believe a lot of the opposition just isn't clearly educated on all the facts or details about a spruce closure or speed cushions as the whole process as been somewhat ambiguous.

The real numbers and percentages for the petition are as follows:

260 respondents out of 315 addresses = 83% turn out rate

187 yes votes for spruce closure out of 260 respondents = 72% approval rating; meets criteria

73 no votes not in favor of closing spruce out of 260 respondents = 28% disapproval rating

55 non-respondent addresses; how or why are these automatically counted as “no” votes?

Considering the overview presented in the study session, 3 addresses are vacant lots, 3 or 4 are business addresses, and approximately 10-15 addresses are either due to the house being renovated, houses for sale and nobody lives there, or people refusing to sign the petition (door to door method). So why are non-respondents calculated as no votes? That should be separated for viewing and contextual purposes.

Traffic data provided in the study session; 2 out of 3 dates were from covid era where everything was down. Last traffic data provided was from 2 years ago.

Orchid St. meets level 2 traffic calming measures (speed cushion) and % support was there for orchid St.

We have a real problem with cut through traffic and speeding. It needs to be addressed now, before someone gets hit or killed. We don't have sidewalks, streetlights, and are an equestrian neighborhood. Our kids cannot play safely in the street; they cannot ride their bikes to the park safely.

Painting lines in a street will only make matters worse if other solutions are not first taken. Do we have to wait until a kid is killed like in Dover Shores before legitimate solutions are taken by the city?

The city is never going to make everyone happy, and individuals will complain about everything. But when there's legitimate majority concern for the welfare of kids and residents with proven ongoing issues in a community, it takes a leader to make the decision and take action. The community as a whole is displeased on many different levels due to the lack of attention our community specifically has or hasn't received from the city. I would rather be criticized for taking action than be criticized for not doing anything and taking no action at all. Protect the kids. Protect the Newport Beach community.

Neil Treffers

20171 Orchid St.



Neil Treffers

Mobile: 760.566.5087

From: [Laurie Kelly](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Bayview Heights Traffic Calming Plans
Date: October 13, 2025 4:27:22 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button above.

Hello,

I am going to try to make the meeting tomorrow, however want to make it clear that I do not support any speed bumps or striping down our street, Bayview Heights.

I have already reported this before but when you enter our neighborhood after exiting the 73, the speed limit stays at 45 in my car screen, it does not adjust as I was told by police it would when I pass the 25 miles per hour sign.

In addition, I support a median neighborhood gate at Zenith and Spruce but it must block also Orchid and Bayview too.

At minimum a traffic circle, but that will not solve the major issues we have with people speeding down the street.

Absolutely, no speed bumps or striping, as they decrease the value of homes.

Finally, what happened to the neighborhood cameras? Eastbluff has them.

Laurie Kelly

Sent from my iPhone