



On the Agenda: November 4 City Council Meeting

The next meeting of the Newport Beach City Council will be on Tuesday, November 4 at 4 p.m. The full agenda is available [here](#).

Agenda items include:

- A Study Session on the Corona del Mar Commercial Corridor Study. The study, initiated in June 2024, provides recommendations on zoning, parking and infrastructure changes to support the implementation of a successful, vibrant, walkable and connected “main street” destination. Staff will present the results of the study, including feedback from various outreach events, and receive input regarding potential implementation of the study’s recommendations. The public will have an opportunity to provide feedback on recommendations identified in the study. For more information on the CdM Commercial Corridor Study visit: www.newportbeachca.gov/cdmstudy.
- A water well permit and encroachment agreement with the City of Fountain Valley and a declaration of intent to issue tax-exempt bonds. The agreement would approve permits for the construction and maintenance of a new municipal water well at 17902 Bushard Street in Fountain Valley in partnership with the Laguna Beach County Water District. Under a cooperative agreement approved in 2024, Newport Beach is leading the project’s planning, design and construction in coordination with Laguna Beach. The new well would help strengthen both cities’ long-term water reliability and reduce dependence on imported water supplies from Northern California and the Colorado River. The City Council will also decide whether to allow early project costs to be reimbursed through bond financing if needed. Once complete, the well is expected to enhance local water supply security, provide cost savings and ensure greater local control over water resources.
- An ordinance and resolution designed to increase the safe operation of bicycles and electric bicycles in public rights-of-way, address the growing use of electric bicycles and improve safety for all riders. The ordinance would update the City’s bicycle regulations to include electric bicycles, require helmets for all riders under 18, outline unsafe riding behaviors and allow bicycle impoundment or safety training programs for minors who violate the rules. A companion resolution would expand the number of streets where sidewalk cycling is permitted to help less-experienced riders travel safely along busy corridors.

[VIEW THE FULL AGENDA >>](#)



From: [jim mains](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Questions for City Council consideration by sending them to the City Clerk
Date: November 03, 2025 3:05:57 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.

Hi

I have two questions:

1) What time periods do the cameras on the light poles on MacArthur near Birch record?
(Background: I was hit by two cars - one was a hit and run. The NBPD said the camera would have caught it but when I call the NBPD front desk, the person said they don't really know. I called again and the person said I think only if a chase. So I went to the PD station and that person didn't know.)

Why isn't this a simple answer?

2) So I asked for emails of the officer that took my statement and his boss. No answer after 2 emails. Then, I asked for the bosses boss and the chief. No answer. A total of 4 emails sent over 3 weeks and no answer.

What's the use of giving out emails and not getting a response.

I plan to come to the mtg tomorrow too.

Thanks
Jim Mains
29 Harcourt
Newport Coast, 92657

From: [Trisha Sanchez.](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Fwd: CdM CC Letter 11-3-25.pdf
Date: November 03, 2025 3:46:47 PM
Attachments: [CdM CC Letter 11-3-25.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, please and to the public record for tomorrow's meeting regarding the

-
- **[11/04/2025 City Council Meeting](#)**
 - Study Session begins at 4:00 p.m.
 - Regular Meeting follows Study Session

Thank you, Trisha Sanchez

From: "Trisha Sanchez." <tsanchez@me.com>
Date: November 3, 2025 at 3:36:14 PM PST
To: citycouncil@newportbeachca.gov
Subject: CdM CC Letter 11-3-25.pdf

Trisha L. Sanchez
Character Counts!

Corona del Mar (CdM) Commercial Corridor Study

November 3, 2025

Dear City Leaders,

The City of Newport Beach is conducting a comprehensive study to enhance the vibrancy of the Corona del Mar Commercial Corridor. This study proposes the integration of mixed-use residential housing development and zoning exemptions.

During recent community meetings with City staff, residents expressed concerns regarding the lack of early stakeholder input in the proposed changes to the Commercial Corridor within the CdM Village. Specifically, residents expressed dissatisfaction with the following:

Stakeholder Participation and Input

Residents did not have the opportunity to contribute to the development of the presented goals and actions within the Commercial Corridor Study. They also did not have the chance to shape the types of future businesses that would be permitted or declined as outlined in the study and presented to the public in recent forums.

The rating category options on all feedback survey questions did not provide for dissenting responses. The categories available were either more supportive, neutral, or less supportive, resulting in all options being categorized as supportive. There were no divergent options to disagree or strongly disagree with the rating categories presented.

Individual survey questions regarding goals and actions were merged with other questions, causing ambiguity and difficulty in agreeing with one and disagreeing with the other.

The survey did not explicitly address zoning changes to support mixed-use residential housing, which is a significant concern for residents. I hope that the City will recognize the significance of engaging resident stakeholders throughout the development and decision-making process.

Accuracy of Data Regarding Impacts of Zoning Changes

The proposed re-zoning to allow new second-floor residential housing above commercial buildings, coupled with the reduction of parking requirements, does not accurately reflect the current daily experiences of residents. Furthermore, it does not appear to be an accurate reflection of ongoing parking, traffic, and safety concerns along the corridor and surrounding neighborhoods.

The City invested significant time and effort in creatively and comprehensively addressing the State Housing Mandates, fulfilling the anticipated requirements. However, incorporating additional non-mandatory zoning changes for new mixed-use residential housing into an excessively dense commercial and residential area along PCH is not favored by residents and numerous businesses. Such modifications will have

detrimental consequences for the Village safety, quality of life, charm, and character.

Negative Impacts on Quality of Life

Residents residing outside the CdM Village do not experience the constant 24/7 traffic and safety issues. Modifications to building density, inadequate parking, and limited space to accommodate the existing population and infrastructure will only deteriorate the area and not enhance it.

Individuals residing near the commercial corridor on either side of PCH encounter persistent traffic and parking challenges, hindering their ability to park their vehicles or host guests during the spring, summer, and fall. Regrettably, this situation has become the norm annually on weekdays due to the presence of workers, visitors, construction vehicles, long-term parking, mobile car washes, and delivery drivers.

The proposed business upgrades to align CdM with its character, including traffic safety and parking alternative suggestions such as trolley systems, employee shuttles, and increased parking lot sharing, are commendable and have been well-received. However, the introduction of mixed-use residential housing poses a significant challenge by increasing the number of individuals parking on residential streets. This exacerbates traffic congestion, parking shortages, and heightened safety concerns, potentially leading to overpopulation and a decline in the overall quality of life within the neighborhood.

Given the existing strained local infrastructure, which has contributed to challenges such as traffic congestion, parking shortages, and heightened safety concerns, it is prudent to exercise caution before implementing additional measures. Continued collaboration and support from City staff are essential to address these challenges and ensure that CdM remains a safe and vibrant community for future generations.

To ensure transparency and direct stakeholder engagement, it is recommended to extend the decision-making process until all CdM residents are informed through direct mailers. This will provide an opportunity for residents to discuss these critical proposed changes in greater detail or decline the re-zoning mixed use residential option.

Sincerely,

Trisha Sanchez
CdM Resident

From: [Lisa Sutton](#)
To: [Dept - City Council](#); [City Clerk's Office](#); [Jurjis, Seimone](#); [Westmoreland, Liz](#); [Perez, Joselyn](#)
Subject: Corona Del Mar Commercial Corridor Study - Study session resident feedback and comments
Date: November 03, 2025 4:55:07 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.

Subject: Opposition to a number of the numerous Core recommendations and presented findings in staff presentation/recommendations to Newport Beach City Council 11/4/25 re: The Corona Del Mar Commercial Corridor

Dear Members of the City Council and City staff,

I am writing to you as a concerned resident of the Corona Del Mar village in the City of Newport Beach. I am strongly **opposed to a number of the staff recommendations (including the mixed use/residential housing inclusion, rezoning of the corridor and land use designation proposed changes in the recommended land use table and permit requirements).** I am also opposed to **some of the high level parking solutions such as leveraging the Oasis/Grant Howard City parking lot)** in the proposed CDM corridor plan. More cars driving to off street parking will only add to existing traffic circulation issues at peak seasonal times of the year or on weekends. Of particular concern are staff comments that extensive community outreach has been conducted. The weak residential community attendance of the outreach meetings (and attendance of 40-70 people per session at Oasis meetings) for a CDM residential community of 12,000+ is a “sad” outcome. The sample size of survey respondents or attendants is questionable and reflects of poor community involvement, outreach/residential neighborhood engagement given the scope and scale of the potential impact of the proposal on the entire community. Of the 10+ business and 60+ resident’s I talked with directly (since first learning about this project in August), it is clear that outreach has been a limited, closely contained and lacking in full disclosure and inclusion of all community members for input early in the project development phase. Staff and outside consultant recommendations appear “Baked In” before any residential public disclosure presentations were made to the residential public on this project. It is my opinion that the core components of the proposal (related to land use and re-zoning) were developed not in the best interest of the residential community (or anyone that travels up and down PCH through CDM), but with the intent to help benefit existing commercial land property owners enhance development potential, and in turn

increasing the underlying land value of their commercial property land value once these zoning recommendation changes move through the Planning Commission and City Council approval process.

The proposed project raises significant concerns regarding its potential negative impacts on our community's quality of life and public safety. My primary objections are based on the following specific issues:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->**Concern # 1. Traffic**

Congestion/circulation, parking during the peak summer months. The staff recommendations do not address current traffic circulation elements, noise and safety risks in our residential neighborhoods – especially during the peak seasonal times (May through September). Traffic focus was on PCH and offsite parking. It is unimaginable that any supporting traffic study did not include a peak season residential neighborhood circulation element study component. The City has not demonstrated an ability to manage the huge influx of visitors and parking/noise issues in CDM during the peak summer and shoulder months. Despite numerous resident complaints of multiple traffic and parking violation reports, problems continue to exist and have gotten worse every year. During high season months, the Flower streets on the ocean side of PCH have become packed with visitors vying for parking and vendors (Door dash/Uber eats) committing multiple moving and traffic/noise violations racing down our streets and now alleys. Unattended vehicles are left in the middle of streets while vendor deliveries are made. The increased zoning capacity development implemented in CDM over the years (and lack of parking enforcement or garage use for parking) has already added to neighborhood parking problems. Too many new homes/higher density/adu's added to our CDM neighborhoods (which are already congested) has exacerbated daily traffic issues – especially during May through September. Employees from businesses on PCH already park in our neighborhoods, construction vendors clog our available parking spots, and delivery vendors waiting for food deliveries are waiting in cars in parking spots or neighborhood areas to pick up food. Service/construction vendors and residents illegally park in our alleys blocking accessibility. All of this makes our streets and community less safe for pedestrians and drivers. The 2016 Cal Tran traffic study for PCH and Corona Del Mar is outdated. A current traffic data study that includes a circulation study of residential streets that connect with PCH (during peak month timeframe) is recommended before any final council decisions.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->**Concern # 2. Environmental and quality of life Impact:** Noise is a huge problem in Corona Del Mar, and further development

along the corridor including any potential for building 2nd and third floor residential housing, or rooftop use of any new building will destroy the neighborhoods along the corridor in CDM. Roof top dining, extended hours for restaurants next to neighborhoods is not something CDM residents want. Making these decisions at a “Director Level” land used decision vs. the existing land permit process is only good for the land honors and NOT GOOD for the local residents or property owners that are within blocks of the CDM commercial corridor. The summer traffic generates added traffic, dirt, debris, airborne pollutants throughout CDM. Dining outdoors on a side walk next to PCH in the summer months with exhaust, debris and noise is a questionable recommendation and liability issues with sidewalks and traffic safety on PCH should be further addressed and researched. “Cars, trucks and motorcycles zoom by, spewing a steady stream of pollutants — carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide. These aren't just bad smells, they're chemicals that have been shown to trigger asthma, decrease lung function, and raise the risk of heart and respiratory diseases over time.” Noise from emergency vehicles traveling out of the local CDM fire station has increased dramatically and has continued to negative community impact quality of life as has noise from helicopters, other emergency vehicles, and loud cars that revved their engines and race on PCH and out CDM streets at all hours of the night. Corona Del Mar has a huge pest problem – rats and roaches. More outdoor dining will only bring more pests which carry disease and pose other health safety risks to neighborhoods and outdoor diners.

• **Infrastructure Strain.** City staff resources appear currently strained .response times and are less then desirable for certain types of calls for service from residents (public safety, peace officer, parking enforcement, code enforcement, etc) We have problems with Car wash vendors that do nothing but use our city streets as their place of business. Some ongoing problems such as loud noise vehicles do not seem to be something the City is capable of resolving. This is especially evident during summer months and on weekends. Moreover, outdoor dining could lead to more thefts and pose safety risks for children unless restaurant barriers are solid. Increasing the density of restaurant type businesses with potential for any extra-extended hours would require an increase in need for police officer presence in the CDM village. Valet service for restaurants on PCH isn't solving any of the noise or traffic issues – it will just move cars around the city and in fact create a new set of circulation and noise issues for some residents. An example would be if Grant Howard park were to be used for valet service parking and the result being valet drivers racing up and down CDM our

streets to get to and from for delivering cars to drivers. In addition, to parking constraint issues, trash collection in evening hours or added collection scheduling for residential waste disposal on top of commercial 1st level will add more noise and strains on city with logistics management of these added state waste management requirements. (3 trash cans for each residential until or 30 trash cans for 10 new residential units – coupled with multiple different trucks for waste and recycle) If we can't provide space for parking now – where are all these trash cans going to go in addition to the potential of alleyway obstructions? If the city allows for more restaurant without reasonable parking requirements including pickup and delivery, business will have to designate specific spots for more pick-up and delivery vehicles - - especially if City considering lowering the parking requirements for new restaurants.. More outdoor dining (especially if allowed into City sidewalk right of way) will put demands on more required outdoor lighting for safety purposes and other sewer and water delivery related services. Existing infrastructure may not be capable of addressing the potential added needs due to any larger scale development along the corridor. The city took on the expense of PCH and coast highway along the corridor based on pressure and desire from the business in the Corridor years ago. The City has the ongoing liability and the cost for PCH as a result of this decision years ago at the request of the CDM Business Improvement District.

• **Aesthetic community impact.** 2 and 3 level buildings (including potential for residential above commercial) will impact all adjacent residents and neighbors on the CDM commercial corridor. Proposed building's height and design will most likely not be aesthetically compatible with the surrounding residential area and may cause homes within blocks of these proposed changes to lose value due to added noise, residential disclosure requirements and activity during any potential extended hours of operation. In addition, if the City leases some parking lots from entities such as banks, added lighting/insurance requirements for these uses may create added neighborhood light not compatible with neighbor hoods and city costs..

I urge the City Council to carefully consider these concerns and the overall safety, quality of life and well-being of our community. I respectfully request that you conduct further study and expanded residential and business community engagement for this project. Please explore alternative options, such as purchasing some of the commercial area on the corridor to accommodate more parking, NO on mixed use, so the resulting efforts are better aligned with the residential community's needs and desires.

Thank you for your time and public service. I hope for an open and transparent process that allows for further community participation in decision-making.

Sincerely,

Lisa Sutton

Corona Del Mar Resident

From: [Mikayla Cook](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Public Comment on City Council Meeting Agenda
Date: November 03, 2025 3:43:28 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.

Dear City Clerk,

My name is Mikayla and I am a student at UCI Law. In advance of tomorrow's City Council meeting, I would like to comment on item number #5 on the consent calendar, which is to amend the Newport Place Planned Community Development Plan. This resolution specifically aims to cut the required minimum affordable for-sale housing percentage in half, from 15% to 7.5%, within the zone called the Residential Overlay.

This amendment is part of the overall 6th Cycle Housing Element Implementation Program, which was adopted in 2022 to help the city meet its regional housing needs by allocating almost 5,000 new housing units with varying affordability levels. The program originally required that 30% of the new housing development within the Residential Overlay area would be affordable to lower-income households. "Lower-income households" includes households that make under 50% of the area median income (very low-income households) or between 50% and 80% of the area median income (low-income households). The area median income, per the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, is \$136,600.

In 2023, the Council adopted an amendment to halve the minimum affordable housing percentage from 30% to 15%, where it currently stands. The minimum affordability percentage was ostensibly dropped because of burdensome governmental constraints that rendered projects financially infeasible. For this amendment, the developer requests the adoption of the reduced rate to mitigate "potential governmental constraints" and to facilitate construction of market-rate housing. Newport Beach should carefully consider whether it really needs more market-rate housing, or whether it needs to provide for the many residents who contribute meaningfully to its community but cannot afford to buy a home at market rate.

I respectfully request that the Council consider: (1) pulling this item from the consent calendar to allow residents to more fully understand and respond to the proposed changes, and (2) seeking to improve, not remove, opportunities for more affordable housing in Newport Beach.

Sincerely,

Mikayla Cook (*she/her/hers*)
J.D. Candidate, 2028
University of California, Irvine School of Law
mmcook1@lawnet.uci.edu

From: [Christian Pederson](#)
To: [City Clerk's Office](#)
Subject: Public Comment for November 4th City Council Meeting on Ordinance No. 2025-35
Date: November 03, 2025 1:03:13 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.

Dear Mayor Stapleton and City Council Members,

Please accept the following public comment regarding Ordinance No. 2025-35 on bicycle and e-bike regulations. I urge the Council to focus on improving street design and infrastructure rather than increasing enforcement, as unsafe behavior is a product of unsafe streets. My full statement is included below.

I am writing to provide public comment on Ordinance No. 2025-35. While I appreciate the City's concern for public safety, I believe this ordinance focuses too heavily on enforcement and not enough on design. Unsafe behavior is a product of unsafe streets.

Every person who uses our public roads, whether driving, biking, or walking, makes a personal risk assessment. Some people are more risk averse than others, but that is not a moral failing; it is a natural response to the environment around them.

A fifteen-year-old on an e-bike traveling over twenty miles per hour and weaving in and out of the bike lane is not doing it because they are reckless by nature. They are doing it because they do not fully understand the risks, and the design of the road allows them to do it. The same principle applies to drivers who routinely exceed the speed limit. When roads have wide lanes, long straight stretches, and few physical cues that suggest danger, people naturally go faster. The problem is not poor character. It is poor road design that prioritizes speed over safety.

I live on the Peninsula along West Balboa near PCH, and I hear speeding cars every day and night. The road design encourages that behavior. The same forgiving design that allows drivers to speed also allows young cyclists to take risks. Criminalizing these actions will not make anyone safer; it only punishes people for reacting to unsafe and poor road design.

Painted bike lanes are not real bike infrastructure. They are painted gutters placed inches from fast-moving traffic. These lanes often run through door zones, next to parked cars, and alongside vehicles traveling at 35 to 60 miles per hour. Drivers regularly swerve into bike lanes, block them while parking, or cross them to reach driveways. Expecting bikes to share space with cars moving at high speeds is inherently unsafe.

Cyclists, including e-bike riders, are vulnerable road users just as much as pedestrians, and the infrastructure should reflect that reality.

Allowing cyclists to ride on sidewalks is not a real solution either. It shifts the conflict to pedestrians and sends the message that cyclists do not belong on the street. Bikes and cars should never mix at vehicle speeds above 20 miles per hour, and bikes and pedestrians should not be forced to share space either. Each mode needs its own protected and clearly defined space.

Right now, Newport Beach's bike network is fragmented, inconsistent, and often unsafe, forcing cyclists to improvise—sometimes in dangerous ways. The city should instead focus on building a safe, continuous network of protected bike lanes that physically separate cyclists from both cars and pedestrians, connecting schools, parks, and major points of interest across the city. A connected and predictable network will make cycling safer for everyone and reduce the kind of unsafe behavior this ordinance is trying to address.

I ride frequently along Seashore Drive, the boardwalk, and the Santa Ana River Trail. On Seashore Drive, the painted bike lane runs counterflow to traffic, squeezed behind homes with garages that open directly into it. Cars pull out blindly, and pedestrians walk in the bike lane because the sidewalk is too narrow. The boardwalk, while free of cars, is a crowded mixed-use path where many people are distracted and unaware of others. By contrast, the Santa Ana River Trail is completely separated from car traffic and provides enough space for both cyclists and pedestrians. It is no coincidence that I rarely see unsafe cycling behavior there. When people are given safe, well-designed space, they ride predictably and responsibly.

Regarding the proposed diversion program, it is my understanding that the Newport-Mesa Unified School District already provides bicycle safety education. If unsafe youth behavior remains an issue despite existing programs, then education alone is not enough. Good design, not more lectures or citations, is what produces lasting safety.

If Newport Beach truly wants safer streets, the city must invest in infrastructure that protects and respects everyone who uses it. Only then will enforcement be fair, effective. Until that happens, ordinances like this will continue to treat symptoms rather than causes.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Chris Pederson

Newport Beach Resident

November 4, 2025, City Council Agenda Comments

The following comments on items on the Newport Beach City Council [agenda](#) are submitted by:

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

Item 2. Presentation on the Results of the Corona del Mar Commercial Corridor Study

I do not live in, or even near, Corona de Mar, but I have these somewhat random comments:

- The stated objective is to create a “*successful, vibrant, walkable and connected “main street” destination.*”
 - Newport Beach has been described (rightly or wrongly) as a collection of “villages.”
 - Do any of the other villages have more successful or vibrant “main streets”?
 - If so, what can be learned from them?
 - If not, do they need equal help?
- Of the case studies we might emulate from other cities:
 - Coast Highway, through the CdM Commercial Corridor, is believed to have Average Daily Traffic of 48,500. How does that compare to the other “main streets” reviewed?
 - What is evidence that the ““Historic and Interesting Places” ([HIP](#)) District of Laguna Beach (a stretch of Coast Highway between Thalia Street and Bluebird Canyon Drive, south of the main city center) is more successful or vibrant than the CdM Corridor? Doesn’t Laguna Beach have other more vibrant and walkable districts?
 - The [Main Street district](#) in the Ocean Park neighborhood of Santa Monica seems quiet different, being on a secondary street parallel to a wider one, and with the sidewalks amply buffered from the two remaining lanes of traffic. It also seems to have many more shade trees. Could PCH through CdM be similarly reconfigured?
- Getting responses to outreach is difficult. The staff report says that “*a total of 42 business owners, managers, and property owners*” were “engaged,” and, apparently included in that number, “*19 businesses were interviewed.*” What fraction of all the business owners, managers, and property owners along the corridor does this represent?
- Much emphasis is placed on outdoor, and especially sidewalk, dining. Apparently it attracts business, but I have never understood the charm of eating on a sidewalk adjacent to lanes of either congested or high-speed traffic.
- It is not clear to me how improving bicycle infrastructure on Fifth Avenue (Goal 3, Action 12) will help to revitalize the Commercial Corridor. It seems quite distant, especially from the eastern end.

Item 4. Water Well Permit and Encroachment Agreement with the City of Fountain Valley; and Resolution No. 2025-76: Declaration of Intent to Issue Tax-Exempt Obligations (Bonds)

Attachment C, the proposed resolution of intention to issue tax-exempt bonds is a bit difficult to read. Section 6 on page 4-22 seems to say the City has no reasonable expectation of paying any of the project costs with anything other than the bonds. Doesn’t this contradict the staff report which suggests the resolution is being proposed only to leave open the door to issuing bonds?

Regarding Attachment D, the CEQA analysis, a great deal of this is devoted to a Noise Impact Analysis starting on page 4-55. It is not obvious how it reaches its conclusion at the bottom of page 4-78 that the pumping operation, when complete, will not impact neighboring residences. The numbers that say they are quoted from Figure 14 (which is on page 4-88), “*between 36 and 49 dBA Leq at first floor levels of nearby residential properties and between 46 and 56 dBA Leq at second story levels*,” do not quite match Figure 14, which appears to show 36-45 dB on first floors and 47-55 dB on second floors. The numbers in excess of 50 dB would seem to exceed the nighttime external residential noise standard cited on page 4-72. While it is true that the short-term measurements in Table 1 on page 4-69 show the daytime levels from traffic noise at these locations exceed the daytime standard, the long-term measurements of Table 2 on page 4-70 show the existing noise is below 50 dB during all but two of the nighttime hours. Is the pump station noise constant? If so, how could 55 dB late at night not be in excess of the 50 dB standard and limit?

Item 5. Resolution No. 2025-77: Initiating an Amendment to Newport Place Planned Community Development Plan Related to the Minimum Percentage of Inclusionary For-Sale Housing within the Residential Overlay (PA2025-0196)

The City’s continuing abandonment of the affordable housing promises made in our certified Housing Element is disturbing.

The staff report, on page 5-2, says “*Representatives of Intracorp Homes are requesting that the City consider lowering the required inclusionary percentage applicable to for-sale housing, **as the approved project is no longer financially viable to implement** (Attachment B).*” However, I am unable to find in Attachment B the statement highlighted in bold. Intracorp’s president does indeed request a reduction in the affordability requirement from 15% to 8% (in his subject line) or 7.5% (in the body of his letter), and he says it would “facilitate” the project. But he does not say building the project as approved is infeasible.

Item 6. Approval of Amendment No. Two to Maintenance & Repair Services Agreement with Merchants Landscape Services, Inc. (Contract No. 8772-1) for Athletic Field Re-Sodding at Buffalo Hills Park

The proposal to replace the sod rather than using chemical weed treatment is an interesting one, but why are staff and the Council bypassing the City’s Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission, which the people of Newport Beach, through [City Charter Section 709](#), require to “*Act in an advisory capacity to the City Council in all matters pertaining to parks, beaches, recreation, parkways and street trees.*”

Where is their advice on this?

Regarding the Council’s three-member Integrated Pest Management Ad Hoc Review Committee, it is good to hear they met with members of the public and not just staff. However, according to Section 2 of [Resolution No. 2025-16](#) creating it, “*The sole purpose and responsibility of the Committee shall be to review the City’s Integrated Pest Management program and make recommendations to the entire City Council regarding revisions thereto.*”

Rather than a recommended revision to the IPM program (which seems to be a 23-page [policy document](#)), this seems to be a proposal for a park project and a kind of experiment in weed management (likely duplicating similar experiments conducted elsewhere).

As to the ad hoc committee's "sole" responsibility, to recommend revisions to the IPM program to the full Council by December 31, 2026, how does this inform the policy revisions? It would seem the results of this proposed three-year experiment will not be known before that deadline.

Item 8. Approval of Amended and Restated Property Maintenance Agreement with Newport Coast Community Association

The staff report presents this as a document that is part of the settlement of a lawsuit regarding which, although not mentioned in the staff report, the Council appears to have met in closed session at least once (October 28, 2025, [Item XIV.B](#)).

It is rare for the settlement documents to be presented for approval at an open, public meeting. While the transparency of the approval in this case is commendable, the staff report does not explain what effect any change to the presented language would have on the lawsuit.

Adding to that uncertainty, under "Fiscal Impact" on page 8-3, the staff report mentions "*the separate Settlement Agreement*." Is that referring to Attachment A, or to something different? If there is a separate Settlement Agreement, why would it not be provided for public inspection?

Item 10. Ordinance No. 2025-35 and Resolution No. 2025-78: Adding Provisions Related to Bicycle and Electric Bicycle Activity in the Public Right-of-Way

As someone who prefers using a bicycle for most daily local transportation needs, this is an item of considerable interest to me.

Unlike Item 7, above, which involves a recommendation from a formally-constituted three-member Council committee (albeit arguably outside the scope of what they were appointed for), it is a bit disturbing here, to see extensive revisions to our Municipal Code being presented fully-baked by a three-member "working group" that was not, as best I can tell, publicly appointed. The the longstanding concerns about e-bikes, it seems a subject that would have merited more extensive public discussion before specific revisions to the Municipal Code were proposed.

From the staff report, it is unclear if the "informal working group" even met with the Police Department, which will be tasked with enforcing the new rules.

Regarding sidewalk cycling, the proposed replacement of existing [Resolution No. 82-148](#), which lists the segments and sides of streets on which riding is allowed, with [Resolution No. 2025-078](#), which is proposed to provide only a map, does not seem adequate to me. At least as posted, it is not evident from the proposed map if riding is allowed on both sides, or only one. And since no context of other streets is provided, it is impossible to tell where many of the segments start or end. For example, near the bottom, there is a floating segment of "Coast Hwy East." I do not know where it starts or ends. And from a policy perspective, the choices are not always explicable. For example, above "Bison Ave," the short street "La Felicidad" is shown as another floating segment. Why would sidewalk cycling be allowed there and on Bison and Jamboree, but not on Camelback Street (which connects all three)?

To many residents, I suspect there will be more concern about the absence of any distinction between conventional bicycles and e-bikes on sidewalks, and the absence of clearer rules for operating in the presence of pedestrians on the same sidewalks. And I would think allowing e-bikes (or even bikes in general) on *all* sidewalks fronting residential dwellings, as is being proposed in the new Subsection 12.56.030.B.4, would not be met with universal acclaim, not to mention the visual clutter and the burden it will place on the City Traffic Engineer to post each and every residential sidewalk.

Overall, I think this a matter of enough public interest and complexity that it would benefit from a much better advertised public workshop or Council study session before any set of new regulations is proposed for adoption.

If the Council proceeds without that, on what I would hope would be a non-controversial matter, in the definition of “*Motorized wheeled conveyance*” on page 10-7, I think “*combustible*” is definitely not the intended word. Possibly a “combustion-powered” vehicle, but not a “[combustible](#)” (= “flammable”) one. Similarly, I am pretty sure that the start of line 2 of proposed Subsection 12.56.080 on page 10-10 was intended to read “assessed to a minor ...”

Item 11. Confirmation of Appointments to the Newport Beach Police Headquarters Assessment Committee

I have no objection to the appointments, but I continue to think this should be committee whose meetings and deliberations take place in public.