

Carr, Kristal [JWA]

From: Jim Auster <jimauster@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 6:38 AM
To: Mailbox, ALUC; COB_Response
Cc: citycouncil@newportbeachca.gov; Joselyn Perez; Seimone Jurjis; Chloe@Coastal Seifert; NB Surf Park; Danielle Lyons
Subject: Coastal Commission Housing overlay

Attention: This email originated from outside the County of Orange. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

ALUC board members, OC Supervisors

Thank you for finding Newport Beach Coastal Housing Overlay inconsistent with AELUP. Last night NB City Council again started the process of overriding your decision. JWA is the shortest commercial runway in US and at risk of runway override. If that happens FAA is likely to require runway extension over Bristol and 73 onto NBGC back nine. CCC Approval of Coastal Housing overlay will allow 690 units high density housing on NBGC front nine and five story Surf Farm building close to the end of runway extension and directly in the flight path noise and crash zone. This may prevent runway extension and force FAA to close JWA until Element housing and Surf Farm are removed at great expense. NBGC must be removed from the CCC HO overlay. There is community support, means, and commitment to challenge Surf Farm and Element housing in court for as long as it takes to kill these absurd, inappropriate, and not in the public interest projects.

RECEIVED

Jim Auster, Save Newport Beach Golf Course
20401 Bayview Ave
Newport Beach
9706187692

APR 16 2025
AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Item 12. Resolution No. 2025-13: Notice of Intent to Override Orange County Airport Land Use Commission's Determination of Inconsistency for an Amendment to the Housing Opportunity (HO) Overlay Zoning and Coastal Zoning Districts (PA2024-0205)

As the staff report indicates, this item is not about the merits of the "project," but simply an announcement that the Council might, at a future meeting, consider overriding the [ALUC's](#) determination of its inconsistency with the County's [JWA Airport Environs Land Use Plan](#).

As such, it seems curious it does not make clear the ALUC's sole concern was with the proposed addition of Footnote 1 to Table 2-16, reserving 179 of the Airport Area Housing Overlay units for the City-owned property at 1201 Dove Street, as shown on page 12-4.

County staff recommended a finding of consistency based on a belief that although the Commission had previously found adding a housing overlay to the Airport Area inconsistent with the AELUP, it would be better to confine the units to what it believed to be a lower noise area than allowing them to go anywhere. The Commission itself felt it needed to repeat its message that any additional housing in the Airport Area would be inconsistent. Additionally, the Commissioners felt 1201 Dove was a particularly bad place, both in terms of noise and safety, because the propeller-powered planes heading initially south from the airport would be passing over it while turning and climbing at relatively low altitude (between 500 and 1,000 feet). This seems to be supported by the flight tracks shown on page 12-132, in which 1201 Dove would seem to be at approximately the location of the added green dot:

