

# La Jolla Community Planning Association Trustee Final Minutes

## 16/20 July 2020 Special Meeting 5pm

Regular Meetings: 1st Thursday each month, La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect St

PO Box 889, La Jolla CA 92038  
<https://lajollacpa.org>  
[info@lajollacpa.org](mailto:info@lajollacpa.org)

President: Diane Kane  
1<sup>st</sup> Vice President: Greg Jackson  
2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President: Helen Boyden  
Secretary: Suzanne Weissman  
Treasurer: Mike Costello

Due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, LJCPA meetings currently are online only. Instructions for registering and attending are <https://lajollacpa.org/ljcpa-online-meeting-instructions/> (copy and paste the URL into your browser if clicking on it doesn't work). **Those who wish to attend (including viewing, listening, and possibly speaking at the meeting) must register in advance.**

This is a recorded meeting. Please make sure mobile or otherwise noisy **devices are off** or silent, and in online meetings keep microphones muted except when called on. Please **address the chair** and refer to projects or issues, not to applicants or opponents. Chair calls on public and then trustees, closes discussion upon consensus, and calls for motions. Trustees vote by roll call or show of hands as appropriate.

**LJCPA welcomes donations**, which can be made in cash at physical meetings or by check payable to "LJCPA". Please email the Treasurer ([emsmike@san.rr.com](mailto:emsmike@san.rr.com)) for instructions and address.

Supplemental materials & comments:

<https://lajollacpa.org/ljcpa-special-meeting-7-16-2020-materials-comments/>

**Quorum Present:** Ahern, Brady, Costello, Courtney, Davidson, Fitzgerald, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Little, Neil, Shannon, Steck, Weiss, Weissman, **Absent:** Boyden, Mangano, Manno

### 1. Call to Order (5:02pm)

#### 1.1. Approve Agenda (action item)

Motion to approve Agenda (Fitzgerald/Jackson) Vote: unanimous, Motion carries.

### 2. Non-Agenda Public Comment

Opportunity for public to speak on matters not on the agenda, 2 minutes or less

None

### 3. Non-Project Discussions & Reviews (action items)

*Supporting materials, if any:* <https://lajollacpa.org/ljcpa-special-meeting-7-16-2020-materials-comments/>

#### 3.1. Complete Communities (Kane)

**Kane:** This is a special meeting to further discuss the Complete Communities proposal that is rapidly making its way through City Review. It is likely to go to City Council 7/27 or 8/3. We have two weeks to develop a community response. At our last meeting we ratified some positions developed by the CPC; we have a few more things to ratify that were

recommended by districts in the Coastal Zone to provide a unified voice on the effects of the Complete Communities Plan in the Coastal Zone. We also need to prepare for a meeting Monday with Barbara Bry.

Per vote at last meeting, an ad hoc committee was formed consisting of members from La Jolla Committees –list presented. Thanks to Neil, Fitzgerald, Courtney for their assistance.

At the 7/7 CPC meeting a motion was passed with a few additions to the CPC motion from the prior week. These changes are:

- Reduce maximum FAR to 2.0 (to stay under 30', max. FAR is 1.8)
- Double the off site affordable housing requirement.
- Add higher percentages of affordable housing.
- Require all affordable units be in the same planning area as original units.
- Base Development Impact Fee - DIF-on FAR rather than on lot area.
- Wait to docket Complete Communities until both housing and infrastructure are reviewed and fully developed.

**Motion:** Ratify CPC motion stated above (Steck/Ish) Vote: unanimous. Motion carries.

*Discussion:*

**Kane:** Showed maps showing which parcels were flagged in LJ. These were base zoning maps that do not align with community planning maps. She pointed out parcels that can't be developed as MF housing:

- LJ Beach and Tennis Club & tennis courts, golf course, Marine Room parking lot, rental house all zoned separately
- Shores Hotel, large condos & Clubdominiums, office bldg. at Laureate Park all over 30'.
- Avenida de la Playa
- Laureate Park
- Throat and up TP Road all built out.
- LJ Village mostly multi-family, up to 30' built out.
- Bird Rock also built out at 30' with beautiful multi-family garden apts. that could be historic and affordable.
- RM1-1 at Windansea to Fay Ave. Bike path. 25' and 50' frontages redeveloped with 2 units.

This proposal pertains to properties that will support 5 or more units so Zone RM1-1 allowing only 1 unit per 3,000' lot is not eligible for this proposal. It is not economical to try to make it fit into this proposal.

**Jackson:** Described his chart analyzing what could be built in this RM1-1 area within current FAR and setback requirements. Possible to remove small cottages and build larger units but no gain in number of units. If FAR limit removed, but 30' remained, large, blocky buildings could be built degrading character of area. Without changing FAR, it is limited what can be done.

**Kane:** Explained that comments by City staff that there are areas in LJ where 40' is allowed and 4.0 FAR would be possible are incorrect. In addition, parts of LJ Village were not included in the proposal.

**Fotsch:** Showed and discussed where more density in LJ Village could be advantageous offering vitality to the Village. We could offer to increase FAR and height along commercial areas of Girard, Herschel, Fay, all east of Prospect in place of the areas described above. He then showed examples of multi unit projects he was building in Hillcrest, North Park and College areas that could work in LJ Village -- 40' to 50' height and 2 to 3.0 FAR.

**Kane:** Discussed 2 recent multi unit projects approved in LJ under current limits.

**Emerson:** Historically there were residences above shops on Girard and other streets in LJ.

**Brady:** T & T passed a motion that Complete Communities plan should not apply in LJ until there is a high-quality transit line on the ground and operating. There is not enough information available to understand how the Plan affects LJ.

**Kane:** Adding high density in MF areas into transit priority areas is proposed to provide ridership for transit, and is driven by the need to reduce greenhouse gasses and adoption of the new formula to assess the environmental impact of traffic and traffic congestion called Vehicle Miles Traveled, VMT. A map was presented showing that the transit priority area in LJ roughly follows the route 30 bus line. High quality transit is not clearly defined yet. A bus on 15 minute schedule could be HQ transit. It penalizes people living outside of the Transit Priority Areas by charging them a fee that would be transferred to TP area to provide amenities. Any new construction in Zone 4 would pay a fee to be transferred to a TP area and to "communities of concern." Some complained that the fee in LJ was too low.

**Motion:** Adopt T & T motion: Complete Communities should not apply in La Jolla until there is a High Quality Transit Line on the ground and in operation in La Jolla: (Weiss/Steck)

**Discussion: Courtney:** We don't want to appear to be saying that we don't want affordable housing in LJ. We should try to work with the City. It could work in LJ, just needs more work.

**Kane:** What do we want to accomplish: 1. This proposal doesn't work for LJ. Proposed FAR of 4.0 is not achievable if 30' height limit remains. 2. There are areas in Village where FAR near 4.0 might work, but those areas were not included in plan.

**Douglass:** Need to consider limited road access in and out of LJ. How can we handle more traffic that will be created with higher density.

**Little:** No such thing as affordable housing without subsidizing. No 40' height limit in LJ.

**Kane:** Advice from La Cava & Hadley: slow down and try to find something that could work. Or that it is too complicated and will implode.

Courtney reported that the CPC meeting on infrastructure focused on Parks only.

**Fitzgerald:** Moving along so fast that our comments will not make a difference. Maximum impact will be to ally with entire community and ask Council to delay action until all CPGs have had opportunity to weigh in and do more analysis. People who are going to live with these decisions have every right to have input into those decisions.

**Weiss:** Stress that this is in the guise of affordability but is driven by people who want to make money through development.

**Abrams:** Fallacy when it comes to LJ is based on the idea that the route 30 bus is a HQ transit line which it isn't. Reject the whole thing until improvements are installed and operational.

**Davidson:** Need to be prepared to proceed after it passes Council.

**Motion** Ratify CPC motion at 7/7/20 meeting stated above (*restated from above*) **Vote:** unanimous, Motion carries

Meeting suspended to reconvene Monday, July 20, 2020 at 6 PM

#### **Continued meeting: July 20, 2020, 6 PM**

**Quorum present:** Ahern, Boyden, Costello, Courtney, Davidson, Fitzgerald, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Little, Mangano, Neil, Steck, Weiss, Weissman. **Absent:** Brady, Manno, Shannon

**Kane:** Housing Element delayed until. Sept. City staff is engaged addressing questions associated with the Parks Plan.

At today's meeting with B. Bry we found the other District 1 communities had not done the analysis that we did. A suggestion to put together a "how to" sheet to help other communities look at City's information and do similar analysis to see if our analysis held true across other communities.

What we found:

- Housing Element had sloppy research not based in reality. Places shown to get MF housing did not agree with what was on the ground.
- Top FAR to stay within 30' height limit is 1.8 not 2.0.
- LJ is maxed out at 30' in most MF areas flagged.
- Discovered affordable housing in Coastal Zone is achievable with preservation of existing housing units.

- RM1-1 between Windansea and bike path could accommodate more density if zoning amended to add additional units within current height limit – raise FAR, but not height limit.
- 2.0 -3.0 FAR in Village might be acceptable
- Housing Element not needed; there is sufficient density already planned in SD in revised Community Plans to accommodate state requirements.
- Development Impact Fees need to stay in communities accepting higher density.
- It seems our Council Member is sharing our skepticism on viability of this entire plan. She asks our assistance to lobby other Council Members to change their minds. Try for unified voice from all CPGs

She will let us know when docketed.

**Fotsch:** The PRC moved to recommend 2.0 FAR in commercial district of Shores.

LJ Village needs density to survive in future. Density would provide vitality and housing for more people to live and work in LJ. Projects in development in Hillcrest, North Park, College area and Micro unit project in LJ Village were shown. In central part of LJ Village the density allowed and height limit is restrictive; for density to be effective height limit needs to be raised. One project shown was a 7 unit building with 2 units under 500 sf. affordable; 2 -1 bdr. units at 1,000 sf.; 2-2 bdr., 2 ½ bath units at 1500 sf. and 1- 2200 sf. penthouse; 40' high, 2.4 FAR. Another 20 unit micro unit bldg., average 600 sf. units to get density bonus of double number of units allowed; 50' high, FAR 2.25. Something similar could work in LJ Village.

**Kane:** Discussed 2 projects recently approved by LJCPA: Pearl St. 26 units, 30' ft. 1.3 FAR; Herschel Condos, 30' 1.3 FAR with basement. I would like to do the following:

- Letter to Barbara Bry thanking her and summarizing main points.
- Work with other community groups
- Try to stop this proposal or get it delayed for more analysis.
- Fall back and accept some density by raising FAR in Village and/or accept greater density in RM1-1 zone by making allowance for smaller units.

**Mangano:** We need to be careful not to lock ourselves into something with unintended consequences when so much is happening behind the scenes and moving so fast. Not long ago we were talking about ADUs, now we are talking about more density in Windansea using ADUs. We may be falling victim to density creep, making too many concessions and losing community character at an accelerating rate.

**Weiss:** Many areas where buildings like Fotsch described could be built are occupied by historical buildings or in neighborhoods with a historic character. Think about financial pressure that would be put on the historicity of the community; we ought to ask the LJ Historical Society for letter of support. This is the impetus, should it pass, that would

accelerate the degradation of the community. People who stand to make money from this proposal are not concerned about historical value.

**Courtney:** Density without open space, parks will negatively affect SD ocean oriented outdoor lifestyle.

**Fitzgerald:** Even if Council meeting moved to Sept. it is not enough time for community groups to review. I recommend the City Council refer the C.C. proposal to the CPC which is the official land use advisory committee for their comments. Infrastructure is not there in the Village for increased density. People who live in LJ don't necessarily work in LJ. Smaller units are not advisable for families so may not help housing crisis.

**Ahern:** What would we be willing to accept; what could benefit LJ? If we take away our character and historicity, that will devalue LJ. Let us identify places in and around LJ Village where we will accept change. Consider incentive based zoning; specify zones with defined specifications such as articulation to create interesting looks, setbacks in certain areas.

**Kane:** I made the point to Barbara Bry that if we were to lift the 30' height limit it would be done in context of a Specific plan and voted on by the community. Community input is needed to protect views per the original intent of 30' height limit. Development in LJ needs to be carefully reviewed.

Further comments about generational conflicts and costs affecting demographics in LJ, need to build coalition among community groups, focus on Parks first, CA state protected view corridors and beach access.

**Motion:** Send thank you letter to Barbara Bry with summary of main points listed above. (Mangano/Weiss) **Vote:** unanimous, Motion carries.

**3.2. Current State Legislation (Kane)** Not presented, moved to August regular meeting.

Develop and approve responses and recommendations

**3.3. Code Revisions (Ish)** Not Presented, moved to August regular meeting.

Hear and act on report from City code revision workshop

**4. Non-Agenda Trustee Comment**

None

**5. Adjourn to next LJCPA meeting (6 August 2020, 6pm)**