

**From:** Trent Brown  
**To:** [Planning Commissioners](#)  
**Cc:** [Lee, David](#)  
**Subject:** Sessions West Coast Deli-Patio  
**Date:** Monday, June 03, 2019 7:19:17 PM

---

Dear Newport Beach City Planning Commissioner,

I write you because I am a long-time patron of Sessions Deli on the peninsula. I am a former Newport Beach resident, and I still live nearby in Orange County and enjoy coming for a meal at Sessions when I can. I love the food and atmosphere.

One aspect of Sessions that I have always felt needed some improvement was the lack of a patio. The interior of the restaurant is a little cramped, and let's be honest....people don't come down to the peninsula because they want to spend time indoors.

My understanding is that Sessions is in talks with the city about approval for a patio. I think this is a great idea. I would love to be able to come down to Newport, and enjoy a Sessions sandwich and a cold beer out on a patio on a nice summer night, like I am able to at so many other dining establishments in Newport.

I am a big supporter of approval for the patio at Sessions. Thanks for taking the time to read my e-mail!

Best Regards,

Trent Brown

**From:** Lee, David  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 04, 2019 7:36 AM  
**To:** Lee, Amanda; Ramirez, Brittany  
**Subject:** FW: Sessions Deli Patio Permit & Liquor Service

**From:** Clarence Yoshikane [<mailto:clarence.yoshikane@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 03, 2019 10:44 PM  
**To:** Lee, David <[dlee@newportbeachca.gov](mailto:dlee@newportbeachca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Sessions Deli Patio Permit & Liquor Service

Good evening David Lee,

I am an owner & year around resident @ 213 & 213.5 - 29th street & I oppose Sessions Sandwiches' plan for an outdoor patio.

Sessions shouldn't be allowed to serve alcohol outside and they should not be given further breaks on their parking requirements.

Clarence Yoshikane

714.606.5765

===

**From:** Peter Belden <peter@newportboardclub.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 04, 2019 11:45 AM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Cc:** Lee, David  
**Subject:** Sessions Outdoor Patio

Dear Planning Commissioners,

My name is Peter Belden and I'm a born-and-raised Newport resident. I've been a Newport Beach Lifeguard for 21 years and a Newport Beach business owner for 3 years.

Sessions West Coast Deli is one of my favorite restaurants in Newport and an important part of our community. I am a **STRONG** supporter of an outdoor patio so that I can enjoy a beer or glass of wine with my lunch/dinner. We have very few places in Newport Beach that allow for this and I urge you to approve this patio.

Thank you!  
Peter

--

Peter Belden  
(949) 375-2461

[OC Register](#) | [LA Times](#)  
[Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#)  
[www.newportboardclub.com](http://www.newportboardclub.com)

**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 2 Comments

These comments on a Newport Beach Planning Commission [agenda item](#) are submitted by:

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

### **Item No. 2. SESSIONS SANDWICHES PATIO EXPANSION (PA2018-241)**

#### **Comments on the draft resolution:**

**Handwritten page 12:** The facts presented in support of Finding C (that the requested use is “*compatible with the allowed uses in the vicinity*”) fail to mention that the primary allowed use in the notification area immediately to the west of the subject property is residential (separated only by a City parking lot), or how compatibility with them will be ensured. The facts in support of Finding C should probably reference the facts in support of the rather similar Finding E on page 20.

**Handwritten page 21:** By comparison with [handwritten page 12](#) of the resolution formerly presented to the Zoning Administrator, it appears some words are missing from the paragraph at the top of handwritten page 21 of the present staff report. It was presumably intended to read: “*The **Planning Commission determined in this case that the** Minor Use Permit is consistent with the legislative intent of Title 21 (Local Coastal Program Implementation Plan) of the Newport Beach Municipal Code and approves the Coastal Development Permit based on the following findings per Section 21.52.015.F of Title 21:*”

#### **Additional comments:**

1. It is not clear from photos or plans that the existing use provides the outside trash receptacles for patron use required by Condition 17 (handwritten page 24), and carried over from prior permits (originally [Condition 15](#) in [2013](#)). Does anyone monitor the conditions imposed? **Will this now be enforced?**
2. Considering that the parking analysis is predicated, in part, on the assumption that a substantial fraction of the patrons arrive, and will continue to arrive, by bicycle, it is good to see that a need for bicycle parking appears to have been recognized as a Condition of Approval from the start: in [Condition 40](#) from [2013](#) and in [Condition 40](#) from [2015](#).
  - a. As best I can tell, the promised bicycle parking has failed to materialize (which is particularly ironic when one considers the former tenant was a [bike shop](#)).
  - b. So it is good to see Condition 41 on the present handwritten page 27 has become a requirement. But **it remains unclear where the bike parking will be provided, or how many bikes it will accommodate.**
  - c. This [Google street view](#) from October 2014 shows bikes parked awkwardly (without benefit of a rack) in the narrow space between the planter box and a car in the now striped-out stall. The proposed outdoor seating area will eliminate this area entirely. In my own observation, bikes are now sometimes chained to the utility connections to the left of the entry.

3. Regarding the parking study (Attachment No. PC 4):
  - a. On handwritten page 52, it is not entirely clear why the data collected on Saturday, March 10, 2018, are not shown. We are told that due to rain, fewer people arrived by bike or foot. But we are not told what impact that had on auto parking. Was it heavier than on the days presented? Or lighter? It also seems likely that observations from “typical” days in February and March are *not* typical of summertime conditions when there may be both an increase in demand for sandwiches and no availability of on-street parking.
  - b. It is extremely difficult to distinguish when the author is reporting counts of vehicles belonging to Sessions Deli customers versus when (if ever?) he is reporting the total occupancy of the off-street lot (including the dry cleaners’ customers and possibly others).
  - c. The “Totals” reported in Table B (handwritten page 53) for March 8 appear to match those on page 56 (suggesting they are both reporting the same data), but many of those for February 16 do not match the totals on page 57 (suggesting they are reporting something different, such as Sessions Deli cars versus all cars). But even then, I can’t make it work, because Table B is not consistently less than page 57 and not less than page 56 at all.
    - i. For example, for Saturday from 8:00 to 9:00 p.m., Table B gives “4” while page 57 give “7” – suggesting Table B for Saturday is listing Sessions customers only and page 57’s 3 cars on NB Newport Blvd were not their customers.
    - ii. But at 10:30 a.m, Table B gives “4” (3 in the lot and 1 on the street) while page 57 gives “3” (3 in the lot and none on the street). I don’t know what to make of that.
4. Although the maximum occupancy of the outdoor area does not seem to be set as a Condition of Approval (should it be, for example in Condition 11?), the “Project Description” on handwritten page 5 says “*The proposed outdoor dining area would consist of a 130-square-foot patio with seating for nine patrons.*” The number “9” is confirmed by the call-out label on handwritten page 76. However, in comparison to the 30 inside seats shown on page 78, I see only 4 seats clearly depicted in the labeled expansion area. Nine seats would seem to make for a pretty congested outdoor area.
5. Since this matter was referred to the Planning Commission by the Zoning Administrator due to the existing permit having by granted by the Commission, the [minutes](#) of that 2015 hearing (held on February 19 with final [adoption](#) on March 5) seem relevant, as do [those](#) from the original Zoning Administrator hearing in 2013.
6. It might also be noted that the original [staff recommendation](#) from 2015 was for denial of alcohol sales.

**From:** Kendra Fisher <kendrafisher@lululemon.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 04, 2019 4:28 PM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners  
**Cc:** Lee, David  
**Subject:** Sessions Newport Patio

To whom this may concern,

I am writing you in hopes of upping the chances of Sessions getting a Patio at their Newport location. I am from Newport Costa Mesa area and drive to the Irvine location so that way I can have a beer outside on a sunny day.

I have found that having a patio creates a sense of community and if I was able to ride my bike to the Newport location with my friends I would be thrilled!

Sessions gives so much to our community and they are all such incredible people. I want them to keep growing and keep being a space that our community loves and enjoys.

Thanks!

**Kendra Fisher**  
regional community lead | orange county  
lululemon irvine spectrum  
714.606.3376