



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board

DRAFT Meeting Minutes for April 16th, 2018

615 Prospect Street

La Jolla, CA 92037

Trustee	Attendance	Trustee	Attendance
Dolores Donovan	Absent	Herbert Lazerow	Present
Dan Goese, Chair	Present	Jane Potter	Present
Andrea Moser	Present	Susanne Weissman	Present

1. **Call to Order:** 11:00 a.m.

2. **Approval of the Agenda**

Agenda approved. 5-0-0.

3. **Approval of the Minutes**

January 22 - Bert moved to correct the minutes on page 2, fourth bullet point under comments to read, "the project could benefit from more of a setback on the downhill side." Motion to approve passed 5-0-0.

February 26 – On page 3 of the minutes regarding the Candela comments Bert moved to strike the word "no" in the second line, first bullet point. Motion to approve passed 5-0-0.

March 19 – Jane moved to substitute Phil for Trustee before Merten. Motion to approve passed 4-0-1 (chair abstaining)

4. **Non-Agenda Public Comment:**

Bert Lazerow posed two questions. First, he questioned why the LJSAB has never reviewed several of the projects he has noticed ongoing in the community. Staff said that the projects he is seeing may not require discretionary development permits, and so would not require review by the LJSAB. Bert then said LJSAB approved an addition involving construction of an observation deck and the LJSAB was assured that the street setback would not be reduced. However, Bert said a later site visit indicated that deck support beams protruded into the setback. Bert assumed the applicant went to the planning board for an amendment to the original plans allowing the deviation. Bert asked what process would be involved for having the deviation come back to LJSAB for consideration. Staff recommended contacting Code Enforcement if someone thinks there has been a violation of something that is not to code. Dan then asked what the direction would be for the projects under construction that have not come before the LJSAB. Staff responded to reach out to Marlon Pangilinan. Bert said that just because a project is minor does not mean it conforms with the neighborhood. Jane said that is why the LJSAB asks for everything. Peggy said a neighbor of one of the applicants on today's agenda had an addition for 900 sf with a new permit without any plans that she

could review, and asked if that was the usual case. Staff responded that, not being familiar with the PDO and development in the Shores, it was hard to comment, but that there is a process called Substantial Conformance Review that can amend permits. Staff then suggested contacting Code Enforcement.

5. Project Review

ACTION ITEM A

Project: PTS # 602487– Pathria Residence Remodel/Addition

Location: 7985 Calle de la Plata

APN: 346-502-0100

Description: Proposed 626 sf addition/remodel to an existing 1,355 sf residence and 420 sf garage on a 10,890 sf lot. *See ATTACHMENT 1 for additional details*

Presented by: Rodrigo Villalon, Rodrigo@t7architecture.com, (858) 345-1295

Presentation

The proposed addition of 626 sf is to permit existing non-permitted habitable space. Applicant said the City considered the project minor in scope and the applicant requested the board take this into their consideration of the proposal.

Comments

- Jane asked if the project proposed a decrease of the front yard setback on the Paseo Dorado frontage. Applicant responded that the reduction would be from the existing 15 feet to 9.6 feet. Applicant said neighbors across the street have setbacks of between 3 and 4 feet. Suzanne asked if the driveway was wide enough so it didn't intrude into the wall plate. Applicant replied they are not changing the width of the driveway. Bert mentioned that Mr. Merten had earlier said the driveway length requirement was 20 feet. Merten said that if the 20 foot requirement is not met the two guest cars can park in the street contiguous to the property. But Merten said, since the site is within the Beach Impact overlay, the policy is to keep on-street parking available for residents, not guests. Applicant said garages don't count as FAR but Merten disagreed. Merten said that the total FAR was around .60 which was way under the allowable FAR anyway. Bert asked if 220 sf was built without a permit and the applicant is just including that unpermitted sf in this proposal to legalize it. Applicant responded in the affirmative.

Motion: Motion to approve as a minor project. Moser/Weissman. 5-0-0.

ACTION ITEM B

Project: PTS 565738 – Price Cohen Residence SDP/CDP

Location: 2045 Lowry Place

APN: 346-482-0400

Description: Demolition of an existing 2,432 sf single-story residence and construction of a new 3,684 sf two-story residence (includes garage areas). *See ATTACHMENT 2 for additional details.*

Presented by: Bruce Peeling, brucepeelingaia@me.com, (619) 517-7400

Presentation

The presenter mentioned he replaced another architect for the project and that the footprint of the development basically remains the same as the original except for the addition of a second story, though actually smaller in sf than the original remodel. Presenter said that they complied with a condition for approval by the California Coastal Commission to reduce the shared drive way curb cuts to create more on-street parking. Step backs were increased on upper levels. The presenter said the project, featuring modern architecture, was not an unusual San Diego style and also that the PDO states that residences next to each other should not be the same style.

Comments

Mr. Merten mentioned that the buildings in the area were predominately one-story. The occasional two-story buildings have upper stories set in from the ground floor stories. The previous design for this project did not step back the upper stories and was not in character with the existing neighborhood. But the current project does appear consistent with community character in terms of upper stories being stepped back. Merten said, because of the changes in step backs, the project can be supported. Bert said the proposal featured a different architectural style than other residences in the area and asked if there were other residences having a similar (modern and horizontal) style. Other committee members applauded the design as enhancing the eclectic area. No major concerns or issues expressed by the Advisory Board.

Motion: Recommend project as a Major Project Process 2. Project conforms to the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance. Potter/Moser. 5-0-0.

ACTION ITEM C

Project: PTS 516011 – Black Halibut SDP/CDP

Location: 8470 El Paseo Grande

APN: 346-050-0100

Description: Demolition of an existing 2,578 sf single-story residence and 639 sf building and proposed construction of a new two-story 6,927 sf single-family residence on an approximate 11,761 sf lot. *See Attachment 3 for additional details.*

Presented by: Claude-Anthony Marengo, cmarengo@me.com, (619) 417-1111

Presentation

Presenter described details of the project. The existing house has a 7-foot private easement to help serve all the properties in this row, a zero lot line and garage with a 4 foot setback. Project features two garages, side setbacks with view corridors, with all mechanical/HVAC equipment located in the basement, upper story step backs with articulation, an outdoor patio, open courtyard and lap pool.

Comments

Suzanne asked what the lot width is and if it is consistent with neighboring lots. Presenter replied project is 61 feet by 94 feet while the neighbor's is 61 feet by 71 feet. The pool width was questioned and the reply was 7 feet by 38 feet. A neighbor, Mr. Johnson, had concerns about project bulk, which he felt detracted from available breezes, sunlight, and views and would lower his property value. He said his patio would also be impacted by the project, as the project string line would extend beyond his back property line, indicating the proposal would further detract from his views. He said the proposed 4-6 foot wall would be within 6

feet of his property line and that the pool should be on the south side of the subject site, adjacent to his residence. Of further concern was a planned basement impacting groundwater and possible causing sinking. Presenter said a bio-retention basin would collect any water plus temporary shoring piles would be installed for shoring up the site during construction. Presenter said the string line was a Coastal Commission conformity measure that is no longer used. Regarding bulk, presenter said the setbacks and upper step backs mitigate for bulk satisfactorily. Merten said a visual fraud was being perpetrated on the committee based on the 20-foot west elevation rendering/montage of the entire block. He said the rendering/montage did not accurately portray the true height of a neighboring project, thereby making the project appear consistent with neighboring development. Goese questioned whether the PDO height was being violated. Merten said the PDO requires project structures and setbacks shall be in general conformance with those in the vicinity and that the project is not, as the proposal is 5 feet further forward/west than its neighbors. Presenter's response was for board members to not consider the montage then but the actual measured setbacks and step backs, floor plans, elevations in response to bulk. Ms. Davis said the project was too bulky and out of character with neighboring residences and that water discovered down the street is a concern for this proposal.

Motion: Motion to deny project for excessive bulk and scale and that balconies would protrude onto the beach further than neighboring properties. Weissman/Lazerow. 5-0-0.

6. **Next meeting date:** May 21, 2018.

7. **Adjournment:** 1:00 p.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, City of San Diego