

From: Jim Mosher
To: [Planning Commissioners](#)
Cc: [Lee, David](#)
Subject: Comments on Planning Commission agenda items for June 6, 2019
Date: Tuesday, June 04, 2019 3:35:02 PM
Attachments: [2019Jun06_PC_AgendaItem_1_Comments_JimMosher.pdf](#)
[2019Jun06_PC_AgendaItem_2_Comments_JimMosher.pdf](#)

Please find attached comments regarding **Items 1 (draft minutes)** and 2 (Sessions Sandwiches).

Yours sincerely,

Jim Mosher

June 6, 2019, 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 MAY 23, 2019

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

Page 1: Item IV, paragraph 2: “Susan Skinner expressed concern regarding the Newport House project’s impact on parking~~impact of the Newport House project on parking for Bonita Canyon Sports Park~~ and related her conversation with a representative of the applicant.”

[As drafted, the minutes confusingly make it appear Ms. Skinner described the Newport House project as being *located* “on Bonita Canyon Park.” She, in fact, described it as being “on Ford Road” (see [video](#) at 2:48), and at the very end of her comment (5:15) suggested spill-over from the project would impact parking for the Sports Park.]

Page 4: paragraph 2, sentence 3 from end: “Staff does not believe granting the variance for ~~FAR~~ FAL would provide the subject property with a privilege that other properties do not enjoy.”

[The video confirms (at 39:40) that staff discussed the applicant’s request for a “**variance for FAL**” (floor area limit, *not* FAR), but confusing suggested the requested FAL was not a special privilege based on a comparison of the resulting **FAR** (floor area to land ratio) of this property to other properties. It might be noted there is no FAR standard for residential properties, and that the code-specified FAL for this property is 1.5. Staff later contended that if the separately requested/granted variance to the *setback requirements* was regarded as establishing *new* setbacks (ignoring the fact there is a legislative procedure for modifying setbacks), then the proposed development was within the *new* FAL (and presumably needed no additional variance).]

Page 4: paragraph 3, sentence 1: “In reply to the Commissioners’ inquiries, Associate Planner Zdeba advised that there should be no encroachments into the alleyway such that the alley width of 14 feet is ~~not~~ maintained.”

[alternatively: “... advised that there should be no encroachments into the alleyway ~~such that do not maintain~~ the alley width of 14 feet ~~is maintained~~.” See video at 42:45. Staff’s actual statement regarding protection of the 14-foot wide alley was more along the lines of “there’s 7 feet dedicated on each property where there shouldn’t be any encroachment.”]

Page 8: last paragraph: “Carol ~~Andrew Anne Dru~~ advised that the neighbors would contest approval of the project without a community meeting.”

Page 9: paragraph 3: “Doug ~~Decinces DeCinces~~ suggested the applicant excavate the site in order to build the maximum square footage for the house without exceeding the height limit.”