

From: Jim Mosher
To: [Planning Commissioners](#)
Subject: Corrections to PC minutes
Date: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 4:10:33 PM
Attachments: [2018Sep13_PC_AgendaItem_1_Comments_JimMosher.pdf](#)

Please find attached some suggested corrections to the draft August 9, 2018, Newport Beach Planning Commission meeting minutes, which are scheduled to be presented for approval as Item 1 at the September 13 meeting.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Mosher

September 13, 2018, Planning Commission Item 1 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. 1. MINUTES OF AUGUST 9, 2018

Suggested changes to *draft minutes passages* are shown in ~~strikeout~~ underline format.

Page 3: paragraph 2, first sentence: “*In response to Commissioners' questions, Senior Planner Jaime Murillo explained ~~the~~ how the floor area is calculated, and the 4,528 square feet.*” [The last part is confusing since “4,528 square feet” is not previously mentioned in the minutes. From the staff report, it was the proposed amount of above-ground construction, excluding the garage.]

Page 3: paragraph 2 from end: “*Brant Dahlfors, 211 Larkspur, wished to ensure the large shrubs and trees at 3128 Ocean Blvd. on the subject property do not recur in the future on the subject property.*” [Mr. Dahlfors was grateful the approval was conditioned on the removal of existing trees and shrubs along the Larkspur side of 3200 Ocean Blvd., but hoped a condition could added preventing future plantings at 3200 from growing and impacting views as the City had allowed on the opposite side of the street.]

Page 4: paragraph 2, sentence 2: “*~~Commissioner Secretary~~ Kleiman concurred.*” [Since the vote on Item 1 (“Appointment of Officers” came after this, Commissioner Kleiman served as Secretary at the August 9 and July 19 meetings.)

Page 4: paragraph 7: “*~~Commissioner Secretary~~ Kleiman commented that the City did not have the authority under the existing LCP to grant a variance.*”

Page 5: paragraph 1, sentence 2: “*In addition, the applicant requests an ~~an~~ increase in the allowed building height to 28 feet for flat roofs and 33 feet for sloped roofs pursuant to the provisions of Use Permit No. UP3618.*” [note: This is part of what is normally a copy of the item as noticed on the agenda. In this case, the agenda as posted read in pertinent part: “... requests **to increase** the allowed building height to 28 feet ...” The typo is part of changes that were made to that more concise phrasing for unknown reasons.]

Page 5: long paragraph, sentence 3 from end: “*The proposed dwelling complies with Title 21 building ~~envelopment~~ envelope requirements and with development standards for height, setback, floor area, and bulk.*” [This is what was said, but the building envelope and development standards seem pretty much the same to me.]

Page 7: paragraph 2, last sentence: “*However, many planned communities have existing Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and homeowner associations that prohibit second dwelling units; ~~however, state.~~ State law does not supersede CC&Rs.*”