

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Agenda – Tuesday September 19, 2017 – 4:00 pm
La Jolla Recreation Center – 615 Prospect Street, Room 1
La Jolla, California

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Issues not on agenda and within LJ DPR jurisdiction. Two minutes maximum per person.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Meeting September 12, 2017

3. FINAL REVIEW 8/15/17

Project Name: Hardiman Residence
5626 Dolphin Place

Permits: CDP

Project No.: 550448

DPM: Pancho Mendoza

Zone: RS-1-7

Applicant: Joshua Wood

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit for the demolition of existing Single Dwelling Unit and construction of a new SDU of two stories over basement with a total of 4,110 square feet of new construction. The 0.11 acre site is located at 5626 Dolphin Place in the coastal (Appealable) overlay zone of the RS-1-7 base zone in the La Jolla community plan area.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: 7/11/2017 (Joshua Wood)

- Passed out site photos and material board
- 2400sf, 1235sf basement, 475sf garage on alley
- Dolphin place side is all pedestrian, back of sidewalk is PL
 - Pull retaining wall off sidewalk (add planting)
- Entry level is bedrooms, living above, Master in back of entry level
- Large front lawn, 23'-8" front setback where 15' required
- 10-10 + 5-2 side setbacks, touch 5' setback at alley garage
- Upper level (inverted floor plan) opens front and back
 - Second floor stepped back on all but East side
- Basement, Family, Garage, Exercise (high windows)
- Brick, wood, glass, stucco
- Presented perspectives
- Large two story glass element with lightwell, to bring light down to basement
- Frosted/obscured glass at stairs for neighbor privacy, and ground level bathrooms
- 8' of grade change across lot (NE to SW) – steep slope beside garage to be planted out.

COMMITTEE QUESTIONS: 7/11/2017

- **Welsh** – Relation to neighboring houses? – presented phot montage – all 2 story
 - Common retaining along sidewalk, proposed to setback and landscape to buffer
 - Grade of home behind? 5-6’ higher at grade level
- **Welsh** – neighbors? Applicant has reached out. Neighbors are here
- **Gaenzle** – FAR? Allowable=2628, 2400 above grade, 226 of garage counted (2626) – basement and garage combined 1710 sf
- **Kane** – transition to home on East is abrupt

PUBLIC COMMENT: 7/11/2017

- **Randy Kelly** – Took work to figure out where to go. (this meeting needs better notification) 1929 Spanish classic 800 sf being demolished, 5x larger structure, concerned about density/character, diminish views, floor area workarounds, 30’ height grading, opposed to project without cutbacks to satisfy neighbors.
 - Chair suggestion to public to compare FAR/height to neighborhood
 - Kelly – what is intent of FAR? ... control visible bulk and scale
 - Kane – FAR items not included is loophole.
 - Kelly – request accommodation to affected homes
- **David Shepards** – Remodeled, but chose not to go up second floor. Other neighbors exhibited similar restraint
- **Jordanna Marsh** – Concerned about mansionization, why “downtown urban element” (per applicant presentation). Other neighbors view is completely gone. Vacation home?
- **Theresa Leshner** – Picture is “killing her” Received notice of project, architect reached out last week, shocked/sad. Purchased last year (forever home). They hired a LJ architect who prepared them to lose first floor views but not second floor. Grading allows applicant to start higher than current home. Current plan will eliminate most of Westerly views and all of views from some areas. Storage on second floor deck blocks partial view, requested movement towards Dolphin or lower. Architect said it is possible with redesign. Sent letter to Hardimans. No response. Request to lower 2’. Presented graphic representations of proposed impacts on view. Deck looks into master bedroom. Glass rails would help. Did not expect to lose second floor.
 - **Costello** – CCC and SDMC and LJCP do NOT protect private views.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION: 7/11/2017

- **Costello** – Neighbors should be good neighbors
- **Leira** – Neighbors home looks further setback.
 - Floor to Ceiling heights?, 9 basement/11 main/10 upper
 - Work with neighbors to lower floor to ceiling heights, think there is opportunity to lower
 - Applicant presented image of how much more the neighbor still maintains view
 - Main level is up 2’ from current
- **Gaenzle** – upper level storage would be great to get rid of. East elevation is too long/plain, not articulation, 60’ long
- **Leira** – remove storage on second floor deck or reduce and rotate 90° to reduce disruption to neighbors

- **Kane** – poor transition to neighboring home with long East wall. Style is too urban.
- **Gaenzle** – main level, where is west neighbor obstruction? Neighbor (west) roof matches proposed upper level ceiling. Can home slide North? Please investigate.
- **Leira** – Strong elements need to allow some flexibility, consider lower ceiling heights.
- **Kane** – total height – 30', 24.5" height
- **Will** – angled building setbacks? – 6" below

FOR FINAL REVIEW: Please provide for the next presentation

1. Consider design changes, discuss with client/neighbors
 - a. Consider breaking up East wall
 - b. Consider eliminating or turn second floor deck storage 90°
 - c. Consider lower floor to ceiling heights
 - d. Try shifting house North
 - e. Consider glass walls at rear deck
2. Cross section at neighbors, window alignment, add to section B
3. Aerial View

Applicant requested to return July 18, 2017

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: 7/18/2017 (Joshua Wood)

- Site section including neighbors on E and W.
- Lowered main level 6" to 10' (from 10'-6")
- Follows trend of roof heights down slope of Dolphin Pl
- Easterly elevation
- Vacation home until retirement
- 10.5' overhang has support post at end, 8' of 18' deck left uncovered
 - Allows openness/shade when not in town.
- Minor material changes along front half of East elevation.
- Wall already exceeds required setback by 2', articulation would create moving closer to setback
- Aerial photo – second floor size is in keeping with neighborhood
 - Neighbor second floor is stepped back, applicant is forward, opening views for neighbor
- Opened up storage area wall by using guardrail height storage bench instead of full-height closet. View provided through new wall cutout above storage bench.
 - Explain sliding panel? – Wood sliding panel can be closed to provide owner privacy when deck is in use and left open when owners are away.
- What is offset material - Fiber Reinforced concrete "stone" look panel
- FAR is consistent in the neighborhood
- Unarticulated 2 story walls along East PL is consistent in neighborhood
- Original cottages are not the dominant archetype anymore ... eclectic neighborho

COMMITTEE QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION: 7/18/2017

- Consider glass railing – Yes, decided not to for maintenance, railing is 2’ below neighbors window sill
- Setbacks?
- Height? 24’-6” from grade
- Collage from street views ... presented

PUBLIC COMMENT: 7/18/2017

- **Merten** – FAR is .5975, (4 sf left)
 - Representing some neighbors, 8 names/families
 - Cathy Carpizo, Pam Dekema, Tom and Tina Duffy, Michael Ishayik, Todd and Teresa Lesher, Jordana March, David Shepardson
 - Project exceeds FAR, 5’ exemption line follows 57’ contour line, deck at 62’, should connect to corner (35 sf should have been counted)
 - Roof Plan: not available today
 - Parapet at one elevation (86.5’)
 - Contours of existing grade below (55’ at one point)
 - Roof height of 31.5’ at one corner
 - Does not meet code
 - Must provide 2 parking spaces, plus 2 guest spaces. Must be provided in driveway or on street in front of project, not enough street frontage for two. (35’ of frontage) ... deficient 1 space.
 - Driveway gradient limits, if greater than 5% requires 25’ long transition areas, driveway slab is warped, 9% on East edge down, 6% slope up on West edge.
 - Visibility areas – adequate site lines, view up alley is blocked, visibility area is not defined for alleys and requires city attorney opinion if adequate site.
LJ Community Plan “New development should transition, setback upper floor”, second floor steps forward.
 - East Elevation, translucent glazing will light up like lantern, light intrusion into neighbor. Code sections about light intrusion require light cast to stay on property.
 - Urge committee to ask applicant to come back with compliant design.
- **Jordana March** - Neighbor to West
 - Did not hear from applicant.
 - Windows look directly into bedroom windows
 - Light directly into her bedroom
 - It is difficult to park on Dolphin Place – project has insufficient parking
 - Concern for soil stability digging basement, 100 year old trees on applicants lot. Palm tree Roots wrap around street water lines
 - Concerned about flooding
 - Applicant: all site drainage mitigated on site
 - Applicant: Proposed structure does not dig deeper than neighbor
 - Alley has heavy travel, vehicle and pedestrian/bike/skateboard

- **Tom Duffy** – not suitable for neighborhood, not setbacks, style is horrendous, sticks out like a sore thumb.
- **Todd Lesher** – digesting all of this. Have discussed many specific issues for their home on the East. There are more broad issues. In extended neighborhood only saw what appeared to be 5 homes with what looked like 3 stories. 4 of the 5 had a tiered (wedding cake) design.

COMMITTEE DELIBERATION: 7/18/2017

- Applicant responses to Merten issues
 - Reviewed with city staff and engineering has been reviewed by city staff
 - Driveway slope can be worked out, his garage is not abnormal for this street.
 - None of houses on street offer the guest parking.
 - Context, next door neighbor has 2 story façade at street, this is common in neighborhood.
 - Translucent glass meant to create privacy and still provide articulation to neighbor, can provide low level lighting
 - Could be replaced with wood (Welsh)
- Need to review FAR and height issue
- Views are improved by redesign.
- Applicant: Lot looks like a vacant lot, but consistent and larger than majority of lots
- Neighbor: What is short version of historic status?
 - Applicant: full historic report and city review. Major renovations, few original elements.
- View safety, visibility triangle?
 - Applicant: Garage located at flattest place he can.
 - Applicant can adjust site storage wall if it was the only issue.
- FAR issue
 - Applicant: now there is a comment on cycle issues to review FAR issue.
- Premature to vote without answer to significant items.
- How did you lower the roof?
 - Applicant: Reduce interior space. (any more puts second floor roof in neighbors' view)
- Any opportunity to add perforated screen or redesign translucent selection at stairs.
- Would applicant be amenable to coordinate with neighbors or neighbors' representative?
- What is exempt floor area?
 - Applicant: 1484 sf is exempt from floor area. (all in basement/garage level)

Applicant Presentation (8/8/2017) Joshua Wood, Architect

Response to previous issues:

- Height. Roof line adjusted on southwest corner. Original drawings had errors. Now, grade is 56' and roof is 86'
- FAR reduced by 28.5 sf. by moving garage back from alley.

- Parking spaces. Architect contends that the requirement for 2 additional parking spaces and a 20' drive way does not pertain to alley access. When a garage is off the alley, a driveway is not necessary, and 2 off street parking places are not required. Current site has 38' of frontage, not enough for 2 cars. LDC Sec. 142.0520 Table 142-05B does not apply.
- Visibility at garage. Retaining wall canted back to provide visibility safety angle into alley.
- Driveway gradient: All the houses /garages in alley exceed 5%. Grades between 5%-20% can be approved by City Manager. Drive average in the center is 5.4% (3.2% at east end; 8% at west end.)
- Glazing on East side. Clear and translucent. Not transparent, 8% transmittance glass. Will do interior shading with shades on a timer to come down in evening.
- Architecture. Client wants contemporary home. Neighborhood has diverse community character. Many 2 story modern homes recently built.
- Set Backs. All are well within set back requirements.

Committee Deliberation (8/8/2017)

Leira: packing too much structure into available space; little room for landscaping; how does garden function with streetscape? 30 ft. height limit can be easily exceeded during construction;

Kane: what is Bird Rock community character at this point? Many projects in area approved ministerially with only LDC for guidance, not Community Plan.

Public Comment (8/8/2017)

Merten: Muni Code requires 2 off street parking spaces. LJ Com. Plan requires transitions between new and old building. building projects forward, should setback, 2nd FL & sides should step back to enough to provide light & air. Findings can't be made for CDP.

Portia Wadsworth: View corridor down alley encroached upon by new homes and construction staging; no parking on Chelsea;

Tina Duffy: new to community; project not incorporated into community; style cold/unwelcoming; 2nd floor not setback like rest of area.

Rick Kruse: Remodeled Kessling home 3 yrs. ago; only added 87 sq. ft. (SOHO award winner); lived in Bird Rock for 26 years; no lots designed to fit homes now built; no effort to accommodate neighbors.

Jordanna Marsh: lives next to property to west. Awaiting discussion with new owners; privacy of her BR windows impacted; alley very busy and impacted with beach activity.

Tod Leshner: lives to east of project. Bulk and scale a concern; drop roof height? (Wood: roof dropped 6"); applicant not talking to neighbors.

Collins: LDC observed although it doesn't please neighbors; if DPR doesn't approve, we would need a new set of rules.

Ragsdale: look for alternatives to reduce bulk & scale;

Leira: good modern design but it doesn't quite fit neighborhood; look at lowering roofline in front; look at adding third parking space re: beach impact; FAR very close to limit; consider reduction to modify bulk.

Kane: design meets LDC but pushes scale; drawings with no context not very descriptive of final product; neighbors assuming the worst; applicant needs to live in neighborhood that is very unhappy with design.

Please Provide for FINAL REVIEW:

1. Consider more flexibility in street elevation roofline
2. Consider additional underground parking (add third space)
3. Open 2nd floor wall on east elevation next to front balcony
4. Consider more solid wall in stair area to eliminate night glow
5. Talk to neighbors

Applicant Presentation (8/15/2017) Joshua Wood, Architect

- Parking is acceptable per city, no guest parking provided except one on curb in front of house.
- Break-up east wall line at front second floor deck, similar to rear where slides (front does not slide).
- Treating the 2-story window at stairs with exterior louvred system in wood (or wood color).
- Met with 3 adjacent neighbors Sunday night
 - Changed to glass rail at rear deck instead of steel bar.
 - Addressed west neighbor privacy with solid guardrail at center of house
 - Proposing a hedge row along West property line
- Changes to front were reviewed but only adding opening on East wall (front) upper level was decided.
- Character: applicant showed homes of various character within 2 block of abalone and dophin.

Public Comment (8/15/2017)

- Merten
 - Not compliant with SDMC or LJCP
 - SDMC parking, 20' driveway or if not, 2 additional spaces by some other means, on curb directly in front of curb, not enough frontage to do this “nothing in code can exempt a project from this requirement, but because no driveway, there is no requirement.” (from SD Planner)
 - No further response from city
 - Another project didn't have 20' parking, had to add underground with elevator
 - LJCP – How does bulk fit in neighborhood? Second floor should be setback, but proposed overhangs on North and West (section A) was missing for today.
 - Previous home by Josh on Abalone had better articulation
 - Parking and house should be reconfigured
- CA Marengo
 - 24' does not have to step back
 - Step away from angled plane, applicant is stepping away further than required
- Name?
 - Read a letter Catherine Carpizo, neighbor, project not consistent with neighborhood character
- Todd Leshner
 - Thanked Josh for meeting with them
 - Still disagree on bulk and scale
- Michael Ishayik
 - Lives in house to West
 - Bulk and scale (character on page 90 of LJCP)
 - Majority of neighbors oppose

- Tina Duffy
 - Low ceilings/dark is uncomfortable, low ceilings with lots of light is enough.

Committee Deliberation (8/15/2017)

- Costello – Mr. Merten asked DSD leadership to resolve parking issue
- Costello, applicant has made significant improvements
- Ragsdale, Would applicant consider moving forward on lot
- Parking is only SDMC issue and does not appear to be a problem
- Leira – parking is a big issue, glass box with terraces, opening help a lot, floor to ceiling heights create an issue. Beach cottage neighborhood – lower ceilings would help
- Kane – improvements have been positive, angled wall near garage is proposed correct? (yes), reviewed privacy concerns with neighbors. Neighbor repeated bulk and scale concern.
- Leira – section C shows impact of high floor to ceiling heights
- Will – section C shows height is consistent with neighbors
- Kane – can they lower floor heights? 6” maybe, but what does that accomplish?
- Ragsdale – FAR concerns?
- Costello – how many neighbors do not have 2 guest spaces, many do not.
- Kane – if city decides to require parking, then they will handle that.

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 8/15/2017: Findings **CAN NOT** be made to approve the Hardiman Residence Project: the building height should be reduced, relief should be provided to the East wall, and the requirement for two off street parking spaces should be resolved since the Project location is in the beach parking impact area.

- (Ragsdale / Collins 5-1-1)
- In Favor: Collins, Kane, Leira, Ragsdale, Welsh
- Opposed: Will
- Abstain: Costello, as Chair
- **Motion Passes**

4. FINAL REVIEW 9/19/17

Project Name:	Abbott Residence CDP / SDP	Permits:	CDP & SDP
	6340 Camino de la Costa		
Project No.:	538814	DPM:	Glenn Gargas
Zone:	RS-1-5	Applicant:	Lauren Williams

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for a second story addition to an existing residential single dwelling unit with detached garages for 4325 square feet of construction and a total of 9580 square feet. The 1.37-acre site is located at 6340 Camino De La Costa in the Coastal (Appealable) overlay zone within the RS-1-5 base zone in the La Jolla community plan area.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: 7/18/2017 (Lauren Williams, Mike McCarley)

- Large property on bluff at Camino de la Costa
- Remodel only ... adding more than 10% Floor Area triggers CDP
- Proposed street trees

- Very little of house will be visible from street due to dense landscape
 - Existing/proposed house main level is 15' below street elevation
- Removing structure from 25' bluff setback.
- Front setback is 88', almost 100' back from street
- FAR is .19 where .45 allowable.
- Stepping back second floor
- Main house Sides 30' and 28' where 8' and 6'-10" required (existing garages are consistent with that, slightly further away from PL)
- 75% of lot is landscape
- City issues –
 - Importance of view corridors, proposing to make sideyard gates transparent (open) gates, no vegetation over 36" in sideyards.
 - Street trees, 6 new palms
- Mature developed landscape to remain

COMMITTEE QUESTIONS: 7/18/2017

- Can we consider this as final (no, Costello)
- Do you have an FAR study? No ... far under allowable.
- How does it look from beach, applicant presented photo
- What portion to be removed on bluff side

PUBLIC COMMENT: 7/18/2017

- Name? – represent neighbor (Midler), would like to see actual plans.
 - Is this an amendment to previous CDP? - this is a new CDP. All previous CDPs have been exercised
 - Norther garage with Lanai (2008), was a view corridor required then?
 - All existing landscape/hardscape to remain in place. Some concern that North/West palm tree has been removed.

FOR FINAL REVIEW: Please provide for the next presentation

APPLICANT PRESENTATION August 8, 2017

Mike McCarley, Matrix Design Studio

- Plans for view corridor
City requires that all landscaping is below 40" high in view corridor; site slopes down to ocean (40-50 ft. below street level) with all vegetation below 40" height as measured from sidewalk; existing solid 5 ft. wall & gate at sidewalk remain 5 ft. tall, but are 75% open (glass & metal).
Ganzle & Leira: is view corridor a straight line or a "view cone"? Can the ocean shoreline be seen from the corridor?
- Provide CDP paperwork for previous projects
2000 CDP approved but not used; expired after 3 years; 2007 CDP for pool room & outdoor area beneath garage; no recorded CCC view easement with either CDP; view easement will be recorded for this project to proceed (8'6' wide)

- Compare elevations (existing vs proposed)
Drawing provided; proposed 2nd story 12 ft. above existing
- Applicant presented materials board at earlier meeting

Committee Deliberation (8/8/2017)

Gaenzle: Lush site with a lot of landscaping; make effort to open view corridor?

Collins: Previously permitted garages are in current front & side yard setbacks. Although not part of project, can they be modified to open view corridor?

Leira: Do study to see if there is a shoreline view that can be established with tree trimming.

Please Provide for FINAL REVIEW:

- Provide study to determine if there is a shoreline or ocean view from the sidewalk
- If so, consider solution to open view corridor, IE, remove walls and plants in sideyard setback, move the garages if they are in the setback

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: 9/12/2017 (Lauren Williams, Mike McCarley)

- Condition of approval will limit all vegetation in side setbacks
- 75% open fence at front in side setbacks
- Existing garages encroach into front setback, outside of scope of work, no encroachment into side setbacks.

COMMITTEE QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION: : 9/12/2017

- Views cannot see water line due to grade change, even with view easement 36” ht limit. Any fence in side setback at beach side? No.
- Side setbacks 8’ and 6’-10” = 14.8’ = ½ of required for this width lot, dual lots only require one setback?
- To maintain previously conforming rights, 50% of existing exterior walls must remain. Applicant does not have <50% demo schedule.
- Landscaping and garages kept in place to minimize disturbance to neighborhood.
- Coastal Permit from 2007 allowed garages to remain
- Are there structures in the south side setback
- Letter about garages that they did not comply.
- Property seems to sit taller than its neighbors North and South
- 36” foliage limit in side setback

PUBLIC COMMENT: 9/12/2017

- CA Marengo - Previously conforming requires 50% exterior walls to be tallied, garages don’t count in your favor (as accessory structures)
- Neil Hyytinen– represents neighbors to north – mature landscaping removed from NW corner – current landscaping is to remain except in view corridor, previous work was finalized, previous conforming nature of garages did not come up in review. Any work in 25’ setback? No. Second story setback ... approximately 10’-12’ North and South. No changes to grade.

- Antony Nash – represents Abbots - can we provide 50% calculation without coming back. Geology report under review is only one we should consider right now.

BRING FOR NEXT TIME:

50% calculations for house and buildings

DSD opinion on garages counting towards 50% or separate from building structure.

5. FINAL REVIEW 9/19/17

Project Name:	5785 La Jolla Blvd Mixed Use	Permits:	CDP, PDP
Project No.:	552695	DPM:	Morris Dye
Zone:	PDO Zone 4	Applicant:	Manuel Oncina

(Process 4) Planned Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for the demolition of an existing single story mixed use building for the development of a new 2-story 14,150 9,439sq ft mixed use live/work building at 5785 La Jolla Blvd. The 0.173 acre site is in zone 4 of the La Jolla Planned District, Coastal (Non-appealable) overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan Area.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: 9/12/2017 (Patrick Banning)

- Site map (PD zone 4)
- Project Description is incorrect. Total project is 9,439 sf including covered parking
- 4 retail units, 4 residential units, covered parking
- Planter removed to create ADA access to retail
- 1.3 FAR allowed, 1.25 proposed
- Presented color board, stucco, shiplap, wiremesh for vine growth
- Clear glazing at retail, grey tinted at residential above.

COMMITTEE QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION: : 9/12/2017

- Zero side yard requirements all PL, 16' street setback (curb to building) – proposed closer to 30' along LJ Blvd
- Stormwater – standard priority, exempt from permanent BMPs and hydromodification
- Trench drain in front of building face (alley side), area drains in garage with sand/oil filter
- Height = 19' above grade on alley side.
- Likely remove stairs from retail rear into each private residential stair well.
- No openings along South side. Wall seems large, monotonous, could use decorative modulation. (even just color)
- Have not been to Bird Rock CC
- Loading zones? Requested deviations from PDO, limited frontage on alley, 600sf invites trash, loitering, transients.
- Revise parking to angle spaces 4a/b 15 degree.
- Prominent corner ... is it soft enough?
- Project will include new curb and gutter along CDLC, and improvements along alley

- Landscaped 10'x14' open air stairwells
- Alley is 15', exceeds parking requirement by 1 space

PUBLIC COMMENT: : 9/12/2017

- Sally – How wide is sidewalk? Parking off alley is gated? Yes. Think it is out of compliance and is offensive. Should be Mediterranean.
- Celia/Ben Cravat – own both homes across from alleys. Opinion of neighbors that without commercial loading zone, alley will be blocked. Plenty of empty retail in Bird Rock, empty retail but not enough parking. Not enough parking for visitors and workers. Emergency vehicles might need to use alley too.
- Philamen Offen (sp) ... echo everything Sally, Celia, Ben said ... not a fan of architecture. Parking (practically need 4-8 spaces for retail only)

FOR NEXT MEETING

- Perspective from traffic circle
- Streetscape to include neighboring houses for height comparison
- Consider adding loading zone
- Consider softening the corner
- Consider adding more parking
- Review requirement for 21' back-up space at alley
- Is there a City request to make alley standard width?

6. FINAL REVIEW 9/19/17

Project Name:	Henley Retaining Walls	Permits:	CDP
	615 Wrelton Drive	DPM:	Hugo Castaneda
Project No.:	551969	Applicant:	Sven Gierlichs
Zone:	RS-1-4		

Site retaining walls located at 615 Wrelton Drive. The 0.33-acre site is located in the Coastal Overlay Zone (Appealable) and RS-1-7 zones of the La Jolla Community Plan Area.

RECUSAL

- Costello recuses himself (lives on street)
- Nominee Collins as pro-tem

MOTION: 9/12/2017 (Collins/Welsh)

- Collins as pro-tem
- In Favor: Collins, Gaenzle, Welsh, Will, Zynda
- Oppose: 0
- Abstain: 0
- **MOTION PASSES 5-0-0**

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: 9/12/2017 (Stuart Peace)

- Site plan and photos, above tourmaline beach parking wall.

MEETING PROTOCOLS

1. The Meeting will proceed in three parts:
 - i. **Presentation by the Applicant.** The Applicant presents the proposal and Members of the Committee may request information or clarification. No public comment is heard in this part.
 - ii. **Public Comment.** Members of the Public may address the Committee about the proposal.
 - iii. **Deliberation by the Committee.** The Members of the Committee discuss the proposal. Note that the Members of the Committee may initiate questions of the Applicant and the Members of the Public during this part. The deliberation may lead to requests for additional information or to a resolution and voting.
2. The Committee may elect to impose time limits on presentations by the Applicant, comments by Members of the Public, and other participants as judged by the Committee to manage available time.
3. The Committee may, by a unanimous vote, proceed to consider a vote of recommendation on a project presented for Preliminary Review.
4. This Meeting will adjourn no later than 7:00 pm, regardless of the status or progress of any presentation or other business.