



La Jolla Community Planning Association

Regular Meetings: 1st Thursday of the Month | La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street

Contact Us:

Mail: PO Box 889, La Jolla, CA 92038

Web: www.lajollacpa.org

Voicemail: 858.456.7900

email: info@lajollacpa.org

President: Bob Steck

Vice President: Helen Boyden

2nd Vice President: Brian Will

Secretary: Cindy Greatrex

Treasurer: David Gordo

DRAFT AGENDA –

Regular Meeting | Thursday 5 July, 2018

6:00pm

1.0 Welcome and Call to Order: Bob Steck, President

- Please turn off or silence mobile devices
- Meeting is being recorded

2.0 Adopt the Agenda

3.0 Meeting Minutes Review and Approval: 7 June 2018

4.0 Officer Reports:

4.1 Treasurer

4.2 Secretary

5.0 Elected Officials – Information Only

5.1 Council District 1: Councilmember Barbara Bry –

Rep: **Mauricio Medina**, 619-236-6611, mauriciom@sandiego.gov

5.2 78th Assembly District: Assemblymember Todd Gloria

Rep: **Javier Gomez**, 619-645-3090 javier.gomez2@asm.ca.gov

5.3 39th Senate District: State Senator Toni Atkins, Senate President pro Tempore

Rep: **Chevelle Newell Tate**, 619-645-3133, Chevelle.Tate@sen.ca.gov

6.0 President's Report – Information only unless otherwise noted

6.1 New procedure for pre-meeting information distribution items

Items received by Tuesday noon will be eblasted to the LJCPA 500+ list. Additionally the LJCPA will see if the City will post addenda to our agenda. Items received later will need to be reproduced by the sender and distributed at the meeting.

6.2 Ratify as LJSA appointee to T&T: Darryl Tschirn; and as LJCPA appointee: John Gilchrist to the Hillside Ad Hoc Committee **ACTION ITEM**

6.3 Consider the recommendation of the Membership Committee: **ACTION ITEM**

7.0 Non-Agenda Public Comment

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

7.1 City of San Diego – Community Planner: Marlon Pangilinan, mpangilinan@sandiego.gov

7.2 UCSD - Planner: Anu Delouri, adelouri@ucsd.edu, <http://commplan.ucsd.edu/>

7.3 General Public

8.0 Non-Agenda Trustee Comment

Opportunity for trustees to comment on matters not on the agenda, 2 minutes or less.

If a Sign Language Interpreter, aids for the visually impaired, or Assisted Listening Devices (ALDs) are required, please contact the City's Disability Services Coordinator at 619-321-3208 at least (5) five work days prior to the meeting date to insure availability.

9.0 Reports from Ad Hoc and non-LJCPA Committees - Information only unless noted.

- 9.1 **Community Planners Committee** <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpc/index.shtml>- John Shannon, Rep.
- 9.2 **Coastal Access & Parking Board** <http://www.lajollacpa.org/cap.html>
- 9.3 **UC San Diego Long Range Development Plan CAG, one of LJCPA delegates, will report on discussion** <http://lrdp.ucsd.edu> (Steck, Greatrex)
- 9.4 **Hillside Drive Ad Hoc Committee – Diane Kane, Chair**
- 9.5 **Airport Noise Advisory Committee – Cindy Greatrex, Delegate**

10.0 Consent Agenda- Action Items

The public is encouraged to attend and participate in Community Joint Committee & Board meetings before the item/project is considered by the LJCPA.

PDO – Planned District Ordinance Committee, Chair Deborah Marengo, 2nd Monday, 4:00 pm

DPR – Development Permit Review Committee, Chair Brian Will, 2nd & 3rd Tuesday, 4:00 pm

PRC – La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee, Chair David Gordon, 3rd Monday, 4:00 pm

T&T – Traffic & Transportation Board, Chair David Abrams, 3rd Wednesday, 4:00 pm

The Consent Agenda allows the LJCPA to ratify recommendations of the community joint committees and boards in a single vote with no presentation or debate. It is not a decision regarding the item but a decision whether to accept the recommendation of the committee/board as the recommendation of the LJCPA. The public may comment on consent items.

See Committee minutes and/or agenda for description of projects, deliberations, and vote.

Anyone may request a consent item be pulled for full discussion by the LJCPA.

Items “pulled” from Consent Agenda are trailed to the next LJCPA meeting

10.1 Dow Slope Stabilization – VAR, 7001 Fairway Dr, Project No.: 593074 (Process 3) Variance to construct a slope retention wall at an existing single dwelling unit located at 7001 Fairway Road, that exceeds height requirements in the residential base zone in the RS-1-4 and Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay Zones within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1. **DPR MOTION:** Findings **CAN** be made for the Variance and the project as presented (Costello/Kane) Motion Passes (5-0-1)

10.2 LOOKOUT LOTS 4 & 5 Project #: 482904 7729 Lookout Drive (and adjacent lot) (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for the development of two detached, two-story, single family residences totaling 7,132 square feet on two existing vacant parcels at and adjacent to 7729 Lookout Drive. The entire 0.295 acre site is in the single family (SF) zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay zone, within the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1. Note – Lot 2 removed from this project.

AND

LOOKOUT LOT 2 Project #: 589178- 7729 Lookout Drive: (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for the development of a two-story single family residence totaling 4,070 square feet, located on a vacant lot at 7729 Lookout Drive. The 0.12-acre site is in the single family (SF) zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1. This development is within the Coastal Overlay zone and the application was filed on March 1, 2018.

PRC Motion: Findings **CAN** be made for Site Development Permits and Coastal Development Permits for Projects 482904 and 589178. VOTE 3-2-1 in favor.

10.3 All-Way Stop at Olivetas and Sea Lane Intersection- City endorsed change in response to a resident request (Ira Parker)

T&TMotion: To **Approve** All-Way Stop at Olivetas Ave at Sea Lane Intersection: Brady, Second: Tschirn 7-0-0

10.4 Taste at the Cove- Request by San Diego Sports Medicine Foundation for Temporary No Parking on Coast Blvd adjacent to Scripps Park for the 17th annual event on Wednesday August 29, 2018 (Kira Finkenberg)

T&T Motion: To **Approve** San Diego Sports Medicine Foundation's request for No Parking on Coast Blvd adjacent to Scripps Park for the 17th annual Taste at the Cove event held on Wednesday August 29, 2018: Tschirn, Second: Warwick 7-0-0

The following agenda items, are **ACTION ITEMS** unless otherwise noted, and may be *de novo* considerations. Prior actions by committees/boards are listed for information only.

11.0 Time Certain 6:30 PM Update on 1-5/Genesee and Mid-Cost Trolley Projects Genevieve Fong, Sarah Czarnecki

12.0 Immediately following item 11.0 Parking Time Limit - Request for 2-hour parking time limitation for section of north-bound La Jolla Scenic Drive North on the East side, between Scenic Place and Sugarman Drive (Carol Hernstad)

T&T Motion: To **Approve** 2-hour parking time limitation between 8:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Friday excluding Saturday, Sunday, and Holidays, for the section of northbound La Jolla Scenic Drive North on the East side between Scenic Place and Sugarman Drive: Tschirn, Second: Ryan 7-0-0

This item is being given a full hearing as the T&T motion characterized the boundaries of the proposed 2-hour zone. The request and accompanying diagram proposed the boundaries to be: beginning at Scenic Place and ending at the north boundary of 8615 La Jolla Scenic Drive North (i.e. at its property line with Adat Yeshurun. Both home owners north of Sugarman signed the petition. (Hernstad/Boyden)

13.0 SIDE LLC Project - Project #: 571249--7687 Hillside Drive--: (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for a 3,868 sq ft addition and interior remodel to and existing 3,126 sq ft single dwelling residence and construction of a new 6,880 sq ft residence with new 815 sq ft 3 car garage located at 7687 Hillside Drive. Each of the two homes will be constructed on separate but adjacent lots. The 0.368 and 0.265 acre attached sites are within the Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) overlay zone within the LJSPD-SF zone(s) of the La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan Area within Council District 1

PRC Motion: Findings **CAN** be made for Site Development Permit SDP and CDP for Project #571249;
VOTE Passed 4-2-0 *Pulled from the May consent agenda; not heard in June)*

14.0 Webber Residence CDP, 622 Palomar Avenue, Project No.: 587593 (PROCESS 2) Coastal Development Permit for the remodel of a 1,005-square-foot two story detached single family residence and converting a 488-square-foot existing detached second floor office to a companion unit at 622 Palomar Avenue. The 0.12-acre site is located within the RM-1-1 zone, Coastal (Non-appealable) overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

DPR Motion: Findings **CAN** be made to amend 1998 CDP because the CDP only required 4 off-street parking. (Will/Ragsdale) **Motion Passes (3-2-0)** Chair broke tie. *Pulled from June consent calendar*

15.0 Allos Residence, 8333 Calle Del Cielo No. 596085 : (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for demolition of an existing 4,085 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence and construction of a new 5,958 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence. The 0.46 acre (19,988 sq ft) site is within the Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) overlay zone within the LJSPD-SF zone(s) of the La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan Area within CD 1.

PRC Motion: Approve the project as modified dated 5/21/18 for a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for demolition of an existing 4,085 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence and construction of a new 5,958 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence.

(J. Emerson, M. Czajkowski. 5-1-1) *Pulled from June consent calendar.*

16.0 Black’s Overlook letter to Code Compliance: provided at end of agenda (Rasmussen) **ACTION ITEM**

17.0 Janie Emerson requests that LJCPA send a letter in reference to the new hawk lights on TPR. They are well-signed on TPR but not on Princess Street. Rasmussen suggests flashing light on Princess. Emerson suggests Triangle signage. **ACTION ITEM**

18.0 Adjourn to next LJCPA Meeting: Thursday August 2, 2018 at 6:00 PM

Letter re: Black’s overlook:

La Jolla Community Planning Association

July 5, 2018

Michael Richmond mrichmond@sandiego.gov

Deputy Director, Code Compliance Department, City of San Diego

CPPT Barbara Bry barbarabry@sandiego.gov

Re: Removal of Out-of-Compliance 6’ fence on La Jolla Shores Lane, overlooking Black’s Beach

Dear Mr. Richmond and Ms. Bry:

This letter requests the removal and lowering of an unpermitted fence overlooking Black’s Beach, so as to substantially meet California Coastal Commission requirements associated with the Coastal Development Permit that granted this fence. The location of this fence is the ocean end of a short concrete pedestrian walkway at the end of the cul-de-sac on La Jolla Shores Lane. This walkway is used by surfers to check the surf at Black’s, and by the public for its spectacular ocean views. An aerial photograph showing the walkway and its public access easement is attached.

The CCC pulled the file on this fence last year, upon the request of a resident. The file indicates that in 1977, the CDP required (in SPECIAL CONDITIONS #3):

“a low profile (approximately 4-foot high), low maintenance, wooden or metal fence be constructed by the property owners on the bluff edge or seaward side of the public access easement. This fence would serve to designate the limits to public access on the bluff edge to provide for safe, visual appreciation. A sufficient number of signs shall be posted to warn of the hazards of crossing the fence.

A copy of that permit is attached to this letter. It was issued by the CCC and the San Diego Coast Regional Commission to Victor Fargo in June, 1978. It is Permit # F-6086. 2 older photographs of the fence are attached. It complies with Special Condition #3. We believe the concrete walkway shown in the photograph is in a similar location as the present easement walkway.

The permitted four foot fence with signage shown in the photograph was removed and replaced with the existing 6-foot chain link fence without signage, which was apparently erected without a permit, as no one can locate any permits or documentation. We ask that the 6-foot chain link fence be removed and replaced with an updated 4- or 5- foot unclimbable fence with vertical bars and signage, substantially in conformance to the CDP, as those have been placed in other, similar locations in La Jolla.

La Jolla Community Planning Association

June 2018 Regular Meeting Draft Minutes

Page 4 of 38

Sincerely,

Bob Steck, President
La Jolla Community Planning Association
info@lajollacpa.org

cc:

Melinda Merryweather mbeherenow@sbcglobal.net
Sammi Ma sma@sanidiego.gov
Alex Llerandi alexander.llerandi@coastal.ca.gov
Mayor Kevin Faulconer kevinfaulconer@sanidiego.gov
Mauricio Medina mauriciom@sanidiego.gov
Kristy Reeser kreeser@sanidiego.gov



La Jolla Community Planning Association

Regular Meetings: 1st Thursday of the Month | La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street

Contact Us

Mail: PO Box 889, La Jolla, CA 92038

Web: <http://www.LaJollaCPA.org>

Voicemail: 858.456.7900

Email: info@LaJollaCPA.org

President: Bob Steck

Vice President: Helen Boyden

2nd Vice President: Brian Will

Secretary: Cindy Greatrex

Treasurer: David Gordon

DRAFT MINUTES –

Regular Meeting | Thursday 7 June, 2018

6:00pm

1.0 Welcome and Call to Order: Bob Steck, President

- Please turn off or silence mobile devices
- Meeting is being recorded

Meeting Commences at 6:04 PM with Quorum present.

Trustees Present:

Ahern, Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Greatrex, Kane, Little, Mangano, Merten, Rasmussen, Shannon, Steck, Weiss, Weissman, Will

Trustees Absent:

Collins, Courtney

Brief discussion by Trustee Little on nature of Agenda Item 17. Boyden explains that this Item is in reference to Section 6.2D-1 of the LJCPA bylaws.

Little: Will there be a Bylaws committee?

Gordon (in response): Plan is to vote on this when we have our next General Meeting.

2.0 Adopt the Agenda

Motion: To Remove Item 10.8 “Proposal to Construct Parking Garage”, as date of charette has passed: Little/Greatrex 13-0-1

In Favor: Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Greatrex, Kane, Little, Mangano, Merten, Shannon, Weiss, Weissman, Will

Oppose: --

Abstain: Steck (Chair Abstains)

Motion: To Adopt Agenda Boyden/Will: 13-0-1

In Favor: Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Greatrex, Kane, Little, Mangano, Merten, Shannon, Weiss, Weissman, Will

Oppose: --

Abstain: Steck (Chair Abstains)

3.0 Meeting Minutes Review and Approval: 3 May 2018

Motion: To Approve May 3rd Minutes: Boyden/Gordon 11-0-3

In Favor: Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Greatrex, Little, Mangano, Merten, Shannon, Weissman, Will

Opposed--

Abstain: Kane, Weiss (Both abstain due to Absence on May 3rd). Steck (Chair Abstains)

4.0 Officer Reports:

4.1 Treasurer

La Jolla Community Planning Association
Treasurer's Report for June 7, 2018 Regular Meeting

Beginning Balance as of 5/1/18	\$ 616.49
Income	
• Collections	\$ 105.00
• CD Sales	\$ <u>0</u>
Total Income	\$ 105.00
Expenses	
• Agenda printing	\$ 62.67
• AT&T telephone	\$ <u>79.73</u>
Total Expenses	\$ <u>142.40</u>
Net Income/(Loss)	\$ (37.40)
Ending Balance of 5/31/18	\$ 579.09

4.2 Secretary

Secretary Greatrex states: If you want your attendance recorded today, you should sign in at the back of the room. LJCPA is a membership organization open to La Jolla residents, property owners and local business and non-profit owners at least 18 years of age. Eligible visitors wishing to join the LJCPA need to submit an application, copies of which are available at the sign-in table or on-line at the LJCPA website: www.lajollacpa.org/. We encourage you to join so that you can vote in the Trustee elections and at the Annual Meeting in March. You can become a Member after attending one meeting and must maintain your membership by attending one meeting per year. If you do not attend one meeting per year, your membership will expire. To qualify as a candidate in an election to become a Trustee, a Member must have documented attendance at **three** LJCPA meetings in the preceding 12-month period. You are entitled to attend without signing in, but only by providing proof of attendance can you maintain membership or become eligible for election as a Trustee.

5.0 Elected Officials – Information Only

5.1 Council District 1: Councilmember Barbara Bry –

Rep: **Mauricio Medina**, 619-236-6611, mauriciom@sandiego.gov

Mauricio: Needs to leave meeting early to attend Paws and Pints event. City of San Diego Regulation of Dockless Bikes and Scooters meeting on June 20. His office tried to secure vote for an emergency halt to electronic scooters but that effort failed. No update on STVR.

5.2 78th Assembly District: Assemblymember Todd Gloria

Rep: **Javier Gomez**, 619-645-3090 javier.gomez2@asm.ca.gov

Gomez: May Revisions out on May 11. Total of 17B in reserves with 7.7 from surplus. 359M funding being allocated to help address homelessness.

Senate and Assembly currently in middle of cycle, Senate looking at Assembly bills and Assembly looking at Senate bills.

5.3 39th Senate District: State Senator Toni Atkins, Senate President pro Tempore

Rep: **Chevelle Newell Tate**, 619-645-3133, Chevelle.Tate@sen.ca.gov not present but reminded us that Senator Atkins sock drive for homeless veterans will extend until June 18. You may drop off new socks or undergarments at the La Jolla Riford Library.

6.0 President's Report – Information only unless otherwise noted

6.1 Oath of office: Diane Kane, elected in March

6.2 Ratify new appointees, if any. List will be sent **ACTION ITEM**

Ad-Hoc Committee of Hillside Drive Issues: Diane Kane, Nancy Manno, Christopher Day. *Notes: Meetings must be noticed by Electronic Notice or mention at a Public Comment. This Committee lives for nine months.*

ANAC: Cindy Greatrex

Motion: To Approve New Appointees: (Will/Costello) **Vote:** 15-0-1

In Favor: Ahern, Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Greatrex, Kane, Little, Mangano, Merten, Rasmussen, Shannon, Weiss, Weissman, Will

Oppose: --

Abstain: Steck (Chair Abstains)

6.3 Request approval of revision of Little letter re: 50% rule **ACTION ITEM**, sent to Trustees

General discussion on revision.

Public Comment: Bob Whitney: Can such letters be sent out to the community? Requests this concept to be on Agenda for next month.

Trustee Comment:

Merten: Discusses project in his neighborhood that left a wall in place and circumvented 50% rule.

General discussion follows on intent and purpose of letter.

Boyden: This letter is an opening gambit, so to speak.

Little: This letter is about the concept of 50% abuse.

Motion: To Approve Letter with one identified sentence removed Gordon/Kane: **Vote:** 13-2-1.

In Favor: Ahern, Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Kane, Mangano, Merten, Rasmussen, Shannon, Weiss, Weissman, Will

Oppose: Greatrex, Little

Abstain: Steck (Chair Abstains)

6.4 Whether to resend Black's Overlook letter re: lowering of fence and directly address it to Mayor Faulconer and CPPT Bry and staff. Previously they were cc'd. **ACTION ITEM** resent to trustees

Boyden reads letter from James Gartland, City of San Diego Interim Life Guard Chief.

Letter will be sent to Mayor Faulconer and Barbara Bry as they may be the more appropriate recipients.

Presenter: Melinda Merryweather. Provides photos and the specific background on the wood and metal bar fence and permits associative. The original fence had been removed and replaced with a 6 ft fence with no permit. Would like us to ask the City where the permit is for this fence.

Greatrex: Who should this letter actually be sent to, that will help?

Gordon: Requests Mauricio Medina to follow up on this unpermitted fence in re: code compliance.

Medina: This fence is compliant.

In response to Medina:

Will: Almost doubling the height is compliant?

Rasmussen: Not compliant, also it's a different fence completely.

Gordon: So I can request a 3 foot fence and build a 6 foot fence?

Greatrex: Our Community Plan is 4 feet not 6 feet.

Weiss: Saying no one has been injured with a 6 foot fence is lacking in logic. You can say no one was injured with a 50 foot fence, that doesn't mean we should have a 50 foot fence.

Kane: It has been said that no one has ever been injured there, which means that no one was injured when the fence was 3.8 feet.

Merryweather: We need a fence height compliant with view corridors in the Community Plan, which is 4 feet. Letter to be rewritten.

No Action Taken

6.5 LJCPA help needed: Possible search for an intern to help with LJCPA's website and tracking projects. President Steck to send out Help Wanted ad.

6.6 Report from Membership Committee June 7 meeting Brian Will states that there will be an update to the LJCPA Application for it to match Bylaws.
Membership committee has a vacancy to build this membership body.

7.0 Non-Agenda Public Comment

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

7.1 City of San Diego – Community Planner: Marlon Pangilinan, mpangilinan@sandiego.gov Not present.

7.2 UCSD - Planner: Anu Delouri, adelouri@ucsd.edu, <http://commplan.ucsd.edu/>

Three Projects to Report:

North Torrey Pines Living and Learning Project Groundbreaking: June 18th

Osland Parking Structure: A parking structure for 1350 parking spaces

Long Range Development Plan: Associated with LRDP, EIR anticipated to be out in July for public review.

Commencement Ceremony from June 15-17 so there will be more traffic on the roads.

7.3 General Public

Janie Emerson requests that LJCPA send a letter in reference to the new hawk lights on TPR. They are well-signed on TPR but not on Princess Street. Rasmussen suggests flashing light on Princess. Emerson suggests Triangle signage.

Janie Emerson as Chair of LJSA: Meet and Greet session a half hour prior to meeting this month.

Pat Granger: Regarding parking garage under Rec Center project. Has a concern about car exhaust around the children playing. Requests to know who is proposing this and who is benefitting from it.

Nancy Manno: Regarding Hillside Drive, addressed to Brian Will and Dave Gordon. Can DPR and PRC coordinate on items like construction mitigation? Gordon: We can't put restrictions on construction.

Manno: Perhaps a set of instructions can be created for parking etc.

8.0 Non-Agenda Trustee Comment Opportunity for trustees to comment on matters not on the agenda, 2 min or less.

Merten: References Manno's Public Comment in terms of the boundary of Hillside Drive (the line going down the middle of the street) which is unlikely to change.

Merten: Wants Committee Agendas posted five days in advance. He says that he does not get eblasts and that postings are being done day-of. Gordon/Greatrex/Boyden/Steck all state that Agendas are posted prior to 72 hours and eblasts are sent. Greatrex: We only have one distribution list, all committee Agendas go to one distro. Costello: Frustrating that you sent something to the City and its not posted. Boyden: E-blasts do go out by LJCPA.

Gordon: Brought up issue in April and is revisiting: Requests that documents sent to Trustees also be sent to Applicant and community members. References Brown Act and 600-24 Guidelines on documents be made available to everyone.

Boyden: If we do not share electronically, these items will have to be printed. There is no capacity to do that.

Gordon: Perhaps set a deadline on when applicants and others can send materials.

9.0 Reports from Ad Hoc and non-LJCPA Committees - Information only unless noted.

9.1 Community Planners Committee <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpc/index.shtml>- **John Shannon, Rep.** David Moty re-elected as Chair. Transit concept which proposes to create a significantly faster, more direct, better-located, and more useful transit system for the region.

9.2 Coastal Access & Parking Board <http://www.lajollacpa.org/cap.html> Did not meet.

9.3 UC San Diego Long Range Development Plan CAG, one of LJCPA delegates, will report on discussion <http://lrpd.ucsd.edu> (Steck, Greatrex) Three Items:

1. A Transportation Improvements Status Overview wherein the regional transportation improvements in the vicinity of the campus were presented. These include the I-5 Genesee Widening, the Light Rail Transit extension from the Old Town Trolley Station with two stations on the UC San Diego campus and three in vicinity of the campus, the

Gilman Bridge which connects the east and west UC San Diego Campus which is anticipated to be complete in January 2019.

2. A Long Range Development Plan Status Update wherein the group was presented with the information on growth to 42,400 students from its present approximately 36,000 students, housing, with a goal of providing 65% on campus housing, transportation and the various elements that will be analyzed in the Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report. Associated with the traffic the University is working on solutions that will help streamline and reduce the impacts on traffic by working with the City of San Diego to provide SMART signal controls along major transportation corridors. The public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report is anticipated for July 2018. Anu will keep us posted as the date for release and review is determined.

3. An Update on the Status of the North Torrey Pines Living and Learning Project. The groundbreaking for this project is planned for June 18th with construction to begin later in the week. The University is working with its neighbors and will bring information to the group associated with Construction Logistics. The project is slated to be open Fall 2020.

10.0 Consent Agenda- Action Items

The public is encouraged to attend and participate in Community Joint Committee & Board meetings before the item/project is considered by the LJCPA.

PDO – Planned District Ordinance Committee, Chair Deborah Marengo, 2nd Monday, 4:00 pm

DPR – Development Permit Review Committee, Chair Brian Will, 2nd & 3rd Tuesday, 4:00 pm

PRC – La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee, Chair David Gordon, 3rd Monday, 4:00 pm

T&T – Traffic & Transportation Board, Chair David Abrams, 3rd Wednesday, 4:00 pm

The Consent Agenda allows the LJCPA to ratify recommendations of the community joint committees and boards in a single vote with no presentation or debate. It is not a decision regarding the item but a decision whether to accept the recommendation of the committee/board as the recommendation of the LJCPA. The public may comment on consent items.

See Committee minutes and/or agenda for description of projects, deliberations, and vote.

Anyone may request a consent item be pulled for full discussion by the LJCPA.

Items “pulled” from Consent Agenda are trailed to the next LJCPA meeting

Items 10.1 and 10.2 are pulled and trailed to the July meeting.

Consent Agenda: Items 10.1 and 10.2 pulled and will trail to July for Full Review.

Motion: To Approve Consent Items of 10.3-10.8: (Boyden/Brady) Vote: 11-3-1

In Favor: Boyden, Brady, Costello, Greatrex, Kane, Little, Merten, Rasmussen, Shannon, Weissman, Will

Oppose: Ahern, Gordon, Mangano

Abstain: Steck (Chair Abstains)

10.1 Webber Residence CDP, 622 Palomar Avenue, Project No.: 587593 (PROCESS 2) Coastal Development Permit for the remodel of a 1,005-square-foot two story detached single family residence and converting a 488-square-foot existing detached second floor office to a companion unit at 622 Palomar Avenue. The 0.12-acre site is located within the RM-1-1 zone, Coastal (Non-appealable) overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

DPR Motion: Findings **CAN** be made to amend 1998 CDP because the CDP only required 4 off-street parking. (Will/Ragsdale) **Motion Passes (3-2-0)** Chair broke tie.

10.2 Allos Residence, 8333 Calle Del Cielo No. 596085 : (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for demolition of an existing 4,085 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence and construction of a new 5,958 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence. The 0.46 acre (19,988 sq ft) site is within the Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) overlay zone within the LJSPD-SF zone(s) of the La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan Area within CD 1.

PRC Motion: Approve the project as modified dated 5/21/18 for a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for demolition of an existing 4,085 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence and construction of a new 5,958 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence. (J. Emerson, M. Czajkowski. 5-1-1)

10.3 Saffron Thai restaurant PDO Zone 2, 1055 Torrey Pines Road. Sign (Wall Signs) There will be 2 signs facing North and one facing East. Both signs will say Saffron THAI. (see PDO minutes for details.)

PDO Motion: Recommend APPROVAL: The sign as presented conforms to the LJ PDO. Approved unanimously.

10.4: Pacific Premier Bank PDO Zone 2. 875 Prospect St at Fay (formerly Regents (see PDO minutes for details.)

PDO Motion: The signage as presented conforms to the La Jolla Planned District Ordinance, recommend **APPROVAL** Passed Unanimously.

10.5 La Jolla Management Company, 7660 Fay Ave.(at Kline) PDO Zone: 2 Proposal for a monument sign 6'4" tall and approx. 5" wide at the 15' setback. (see PDO Minutes for details)

PDO Motion: The sign, as presented **CONFORMS** to the Planned District Ordinance however for safety purposes (fire numeral identification) the street numerals will be moved to the upper quadrant of the sign. Passed unanimously.

10.6 : San Diego Triathlon Challenge- Request by Challenged Athletes Foundation for Temporary Street Closure and Temporary No Parking on Coast Blvd between Prospect St and Girard Ave and Lane Closure on Torrey Pines Rd between Prospect and La Jolla Shores Dr. for the 25th annual event on Sunday October 21 2018 (**Kristine Entwistle**)

T&T Motion: To **APPROVE** San Diego Triathlon Challenge Request for Temporary Street Closure and Temporary No Parking for the 25th annual Event on Sunday October 21, 2018. 8-0-0.

10.7 Parking Time Limit- Request for 2 hour parking time limitation for sections on the east side of La Jolla Blvd between Midway and Forward Streets: (Antonio Sacido)

T&T Motion: To **APPROVE** 2 hour parking limitations for sections on the east side of the 5500 Block on La Jolla Blvd between Midway and Forward Streets 8-0-0

10.8 Proposal to Construct Parking Garage Under LJ Recreation Center (Tom Grunow)

T&T Motion: To **SUPPORT** the concept of the Charrette which will include the possibility of Building a Parking Garage underneath the playground area of the La Jolla Rec Center: 8-0-0

The following agenda items, are ACTION ITEMS unless otherwise noted, and may be *de novo* considerations. Prior actions by committees/boards are listed for information only.

11.0 Time Certain 6:30 PM 202 Coast Walk, Emergency repair LA JOLLA -WBS No. B-17029.01.02, Emergency

Authorization SDP & CDP to replace the beach access staircase located on PROW between the private properties at 100 and 202 coast blvd. just south of Nicholson Point in La Jolla. The existing beach staircase was destroyed by storm surf in the winter of 20015-16. Issued Em. Authorization Permit. Return for After-the-fact permitting. City staff to present. Slated for City Council Process 5 hearing on June 19.

Presenter: Jeff Gehrwine, Civil Engineer for City of San Diego. Discusses emergency repair of Coast Boulevard staircase off the seawall at 100 Coast. Damage occurred during 2016-2017 El Nino. Concrete structure with steel strand.

Motion: To Approve as Presented (Kane/Costello): **Vote:** 15-0-1.

In Favor: Ahern, Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Greatrex, Kane, Little, Mangano, Merten, Rasmussen, Shannon, Weiss, Weissman, Will

Opposed: --

Abstains: Steck (Chair Abstains)

12.0 La Jolla Boulevard Traffic Calming- Consideration of a proposal for Pedestrian Refuge Island at Mira Monte Intersection. (Zoe Kleinbub) Scheduled in May, but neither Ms. Kleinbub nor City Staff were present. City provided a drawing of proposal.

T&T Motion: APPROVE City Staff Suggested Pedestrian Refuge Island in La Jolla Blvd. near Mira Monte Intersection. 8-0-1 (Bailey)

Applicant Presentation: Resident Zoe Kleinbub states that she requested four sets of flashing beacons and a pedestrian island, designs of which have been approved by Engineering.

Mauricio Medina: Kleinbub reached out to Barbara Bry's office with the requests for beacons and a pedestrian island due to her concerns on speed. Met with Bry twice and Bry is putting this all on her Priority Funding List, for priority funding.

Public Comment:

Trace Wilson: Says drivers get tunnel vision on La Jolla Boulevard. States that he has small boys and Kleinbub has two small boys and they worry about drivers.

Trustee Comment:

Brady: Notes that T&T did not vote on beacons. He believes that the refuge island should be.

Ahern: Supports beacons.

Greatrex: Notes speed has been lowered already, just recently.

Greatrex: A recent installation of same at of E Street and Kettner Blvd had four months of studies performed prior to Install. In La Jolla, there have ben no studies. The beacons were never Noticed. Medina stated City Council wants "community review" but that is impossible with no Noticing. This project is being rushed and expedited for June budget, why?

Also, study presented was rushed out and is not new, its from 2012. Land use planners do not want cluster beacons, and these do constitute cluster beacons.

The Brown Act not honored due to failure in Noticing. Also this was presented to T&T as City Staff Request vs. the correct statement, that this is Resident Request.

Boyden: Most items through T&T are a Resident request, that is a common.

Greatrex: But T&T voters were not told that, they were told it was a City Request.

Shannon: It's important for to have something to calm traffic and mitigate tunnel vision.

Mangano: Suggests that someone else take a look at the Refuge design (conceptual drawings) between the only turning lane and the bottleneck. Civil engineers may want project this further down the strip.

Greatrex: Concurs with Mangano that it's a design flaw and is the reason why this didn't happen in 2012.

Rasmussen: Are we voting on beacons or island?

Boyden: Island. Not everything in transportation

Motion: Recommend island be installed and continue to develop the concept before it is installed: (Boyden/Kane) 11-2-2

In Favor: Ahern, Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Kane, Mangano, Merten, Rasmussen, Shannon, Weissman

Oppose: Greatrex, Little

Abstain: Costello Abstains as he does not believe that we have a complete Plan. Steck (Chair Abstains).

13.0 Revote Black Halibut Project #516011 Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for demolition of an existing 2,578 sq ft single story residence and 639 sq ft building. Proposed construction of a new two story (over basement) 6,927 sq ft single family residence (proposed FAR 0.60). The 0.27 acre site is located at 8470 El Paseo Grande within the Coastal Overlay Zone (appealable area) and the Sensitive Coastal Overlay Zone, n the LJSPD-SF zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District Area within Council District 1. Pulled from March consent. Passed 7-6-2 by LJCPA in April. Revote based on receipt of new information as provided for in the Administrative Guidelines, September 2015, Page 29.

Presenter: Claude Anthony Marengo for Applicant.

Marengo states that information disseminated at LJCPA was outdated and also not given to the Applicant.

Marengo has brought LJ Shores PRC documents and LJCPA documents and renderings, the latter with modifications. He also brings a timeline of conversations with Phil Merten and City of San Diego. Notes that every time someone visits a project site it costs the Applicant money.

First item is plumb line height. States that when you have soil on both sides, the height stops at the plumb line.

Discussion on Cardenas, Black Halibut and Johnson houses. Swimming pool and setbacks in neighborhood in relation to the building envelope are discussed.

Public Comment:

Peggy Davis: Raises geotechnical issues on property as well as height issues.

Trustee Comment:

Gordon: Peggy is a geotechnical engineer? (No) And City of San Diego has signed off on geotechnical issues? (Yes)

Will: The City has found this to be in conformance. They have studied it extensively due to public concern. States that in this area, community character is represented by Applicants maximizing FAR. He believes there is nothing to debate on this project at this point.

Merten: Says that plumb line measurement did not exist in 2008. Discusses the swimming pool, ten-foot structure adjacent to the walkway, Compliments Marengo for pulling building back. Concerned that roofline viewed from beach appears three feet higher than neighbor. Believes Marengo needs to keep working on project because it is over-height vs. Municipal Code. States setbacks are not complaint with Development Code.

Motion (Merten/Costello): Project to Deny as it exceeds 30 ' stricture municipal code, plumb line structure height and also that the swimming pool and structures around it are not in general conformance in the vicinity. Grading proposed around pool is also not conformant.

To the Motion:

Little: States that exhibits presented are inaccurate and that he cannot support the Project. He also states that nothing is out of the LJCPA purview. (this is in reference to earlier comments on geotechnical aspects).

Gordon: PRC and LJCPA have already Approved this project. It was brought back because Trustee Merten said the information provided by Marengo was inaccurate. At this Meeting it is clear that the information is not inaccurate.

Boyden: Cites email from Joseph Stanco to Phil Merten that misstates the La Jolla Shores PDO. States she will not support the Project.

Brady: Why did you lower the height? Marengo: To work with Merten's request.

Vote: 6-7-2. Motion does not Carry.

In Favor: Boyden, Brady, Costello, Little, Merten, Weissman

Oppose: Ahern, Gordon, Greatrex, Mangano, Rasmussen, Shannon, Will

Abstain: Kane Abstains as this is her first meeting. Steck (Chair Abstainsc

Sevond Motion: Findings can be made for CDP and SDP (Gordon/Will) **7-6-2 Chair does NOT Abstain, for purpose of tie-break.**

Shannon Abstains as the matter is contentious, and he does not know what the right answer is and would like to be consistent in his Voting. Kane Abstains as this is her first meeting.

In Favor: Ahern, Gordon, Greatrex, Mangano, Rasmussen, Shannon, Will

Oppose: Boyden, Brady, Costello, Little, Merten, Weissman

Abstain: Kane Abstains as this is her first meeting. Steck (Chair Abstains)

14.0 Demolish Residence 9036 La Jolla Shores # 588291 (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish one existing residential building totaling 1,706 square feet as well as the 220 square foot detached garage. The 0.81-acre site is located within the appealable coastal overlay zone at 9036 La Jolla Shores Lane in the RS-1-1 and RS-1-4 zones of the La Jolla community plan area. The site is in the Sensitive Coastal Overlay Zones (B and CB), Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (Appealable), First Public Roadway, the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Coastal, Beach, and Campus), the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, and the La Jolla Community Plan area. The lot appears to contain Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) in the form of Steep Hillides and Sensitive Vegetation. It also appears to contain MSCP and Coastal bluffs. This should be coordinated with Project No. 478873 for the same address.

DPR Motion: Findings **CAN** be made for a CDP for residence demolition (Collins/Zynda).

Motion passes 4-1-2 *{Pulled from the May consent agenda}*

Presenter: Matt Peterson for the Applicant. City has cleared this from Historical Significance. Applicant is replacing cottage with landscaping and incorporating the land into his property by adding landscape to the teardown site. Landscaping Plan is presented. Noted that there have been 79 days of delay on project.

Slabs on property will be removed.

Public Comment: Hearing none.

Trustee Comment: Little: Could be good low cost housing (humorous comment)

Shannon: Similar humorous comment in suggesting this would be good UCSD housing.

Motion: To Approve as Presented (Boyden/Gordon).

To the Motion: Costello states that two DPR meetings needed to approve property, generally. States that CEQA does not allow projects to be broken up—Demolition Plan and Landscaping Plan were not consistent when there was the premise of keeping slabs. That issue no longer exists. **Vote: 14-0-1**

In Favor: Ahern, Boyden, Brady, Costello, Gordon, Greatrex, Kane, Little, Mangano, Merten, Rasmussen, Shannon, Weissman, Will

Oppose: --

Abstain: Steck (Chair Abstains)

15.0 SIDE LLC Project - Project #: 571249--7687 Hillside Drive--: (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for a 3,868 sq ft addition and interior remodel to and existing 3,126 sq ft single dwelling residence and construction of a new 6,880 sq ft residence with new 815 sq ft 3 car garage located at 7687 Hillside Drive. Each of the two homes will be constructed on separate but adjacent lots. The 0.368 and 0.265 acre attached sites are within the Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) overlay zone within the LJSPD-SF zone(s) of the La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan Area within Council District 1

PRC Motion: Findings **CAN** be made for Site Development Permit SDP and CDP for Project #571249;

VOTE Passed 4-2-0 *Pulled from the May consent agenda*

Side LLC: No one appears. Architect to be contacted.

16.0: Colima Street CDP,623 Colima Street Project No.: 575043 (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing single dwelling unit and construct two, new, two-story residential units totaling 5,675 square feet (sf) (2,777 sf west unit, and 2,898 sf east unit) located at 623 Colima Street. The 0.11 acre site is in the coastal (Non-Appealable) overlay zone in the RS-1-7 base zone of the La Jolla Community Plan area.

DPR Motion: Findings **CANNOT** be made due to the bulk and scale of the project, lack of articulation, and not conforming with the neighborhood character. (Costello/Welsh) **Motion Passes (3-1-1)** *(Full hearing requested)*

Presenter: Liz Carmichael, Eco-House—Architect, for the Applicant.

Two single family homes on separate lots on RSO. Lots are trapezoidal. No alley access. Garages at front. Second story of West side house gives a more vaulted feeling to kitchen and living room. East side house is more compacted footprint with bedrooms upstairs. Carmichael shows renderings indicating stories, and front and rear elevation of houses. Elevations of East house are two story Craftsman. Both houses are Craftsman style. Freight elevation and setbacks noted. East side house is 27.11 at peak. West side is 25.3 at peak. No roof decks. Line-of sight representation presented. A proposed tree will give neighbor some privacy while giving Applicant ocean view.

Public Comment:

Mark Previnger, neighbor. Discusses windows on project facing his property. Says that window in project reflects on very private area of his backyard. States that tree is not an answer. Asks that sight into his private area of yard (including his Jacuzzi) be removed.

Carmichael response: Discuss on height and placement of windows on project.

Previnger: Asks for one window to be removed. States that eventual purchaser will have problems

Chris Hermanian (Project Owner) : Asks Lavenger why he has no off street parking on his house, no driveway and no garage.

Previnger (response) Not possible to do so.

Sally Miller: Spec houses should be held to a higher standard.

Steck (response): There are no separate codes .

Hermanian: Met with Mark and tried to accommodate him, made concerted effort.

Trustee Comment:

Brady: How large is site?

Carmichael (response) 48.51, each site. West house: 23.77 East house: 24.35

Little: States this is a sub-standard lot as subdivided.

Merten: When there are two lots and you build over them, you create one lot. Now this one lot is being sub divided. What is minimum lot size for this zone?

Carmichael (response) This was confirmed as two legal lots.

Merten: Front and side setbacks should indicate second floor step-back.

Will: Speaks to pool and privacy issue. Can't set precedent that if someone wants privacy, and Applicant doesn't get windows. Applicant has gone out of their way to minimize windows.

Mangano: Asks about diagonal placement.

Ahern: Discusses that this project seems to fit scale of lots in the neighborhood.

Rasmussen: How to we accommodate the neighbor's privacy?

Carmichael (response): We have the tree.

Rasmussen: Can you put in a wing wall?

Will: Can you show interior floor plan showing room the window is in

Rasmussen: We are the hearing body who tries to make compromises between neighbors.

Will: Window is in corner, unlikely that projects residents will peer out there.

Motion: Support DPR findings that project cannot be approved due to substandard lot. (Little/Costello)

To the Motion:

Costello: Sub-standard lot, and neighbor was not at DPR (Will: Neighbor was there) and concerns on window.

Gordon: Re-states Ahern's comment on conformance. Sympathetic to neighbor view. Tree is not a great way to handle this. Nice if Applicant can work this out with neighbor.

Vote: 6-8-1. Motion does not carry.

In Favor: Costello, Kane, Little, Merten Rasmussen, Weissman

Oppose: Ahern, Boyden, Brady, Gordon, Greatrex, Mangano, Shannon, Will

Abstain: Steck (Chair Abstains)

Second Motion: (Will/Boyden) Findings can be made to support project. **Vote:** 6-8-1

In Favor: Ahern, Boyden, Brady, Gordon, Greatrex, Mangano, Shannon, Will

Oppose: Costello, Kane, Little, Merten, Rasmussen, Weissman

Abstain: Steck (Chair Abstains)

17.0 Proposal by Trustee Gordon to recommend to the membership at the next membership meeting a proposal to: Modify Article VI, Section 2. D.(1) of the La Jolla Community Planning Association Bylaws to read:

D. Abstentions and Recusals

(1) RECUSALS - Any Trustee of the LJCPA with a direct economic interest in any project that comes before the LJCPA or any committee must disclose the economic interest, and must recuse from voting and not participate in any manner as a Trustee or Committee Member for that item on the agenda. In the event of a recusal, the individual must disclose the economic interest, recuse before the item is discussed and physically leave the community planning group or committee seating area. It must be made clear to the audience that the member is not acting in any capacity as a trustee or committee member. The presence of the recusing member in the room in which the meeting occurs does not count toward a quorum for the item the member recuses on. Article VI, Section 2(c) of the Administrative Guidelines is the LJCPA's reference for determining direct economic interest.

Addition rationale and copies of current text of bylaws and appropriate section of the Administrative Guidelines are being sent to the trustees.

Presenter: Dave Gordon

Gordon: Began researching Recusals while on PRC. 600-24 says that Recusals only require leaving seating area, not the room. Important that Recusers can stay in room in case there are questions. Proposes we change our bylaws to match 600-24 so that Recuser leaves seating area but stays in room.

Little: If Recuser stays in room, they may influence with their presence.

Gordon: When Recusers presented at PRC and had to leave room, availability for questions was lost.

Will: DPR Bylaws say that Applicant does not have to leave the room as Recuser, just leaves seating area.

Will: As a sole practitioner had to leave room as Presenter and had no co-workers to see that false statements were being made in discussion.

Brady: Asking Recusers to leave for vote is like a secret ballot.

Gordon: Only Trustees have to leave as Recusers, yet we don't have Applicants leave the room?

Brady (response): Persuasion.

Mangano: As groups change, its okay for formalities to change.

Shannon: Physically leaving the room is unambiguous, providing no eye contact. Saw this mentioned in COW training.

Brady: As a person with economic tie to a project, they should stay?

Gordon: Stay in room, leave seating area.

Shannon: Improper Recusal can lead to Indemnification issues.

Shannon: In Discussion they can be in the room but leave the room in Voting.

Gordon: Hoped Marlon would be here. Suggests carry-over to next meeting.

No Action Taken.

Meeting Adjourns: 9:40

18.0 Adjourn to next LJCPA Meeting: Thursday, July 5, 2018 at 6:00 PM

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE

LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Combined Meeting Minutes – Tuesday June 12 and 19, 2018 – 4:00 pm
La Jolla Recreation Center – 615 Prospect Street, Room 1
La Jolla, California

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

- Kane: There is a Mayor’s initiative “Parks Plan” It is a 3 year planning effort to develop a 30 year plan for where to find and how to fund additional park space. La Jolla is deficient by 18 acres of park land per the community plan. Diane will monitor and add to agenda at a future meeting for review and discussion.
- Costello: Would like to remind committee members that even if they missed the first presentation of a project, to please ask questions of the applicant and do not automatically abstain from the voting process. Your opinions matter.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Meeting May 15, 2018
Meeting June 12, 2018

3. FINAL REVIEW 6/19/18

Project Name: The Reserve SCR (Encelia Res.) Permits: SCR
6850 Country Club Dr.
Project No.: 582128 DPM: **Glenn Gargas**
Zone: RS-1-4 Applicant: Kent Coston

(Process 2) Substantial Conformance Review to PTS 292065 for a 5000 SF two story residence. The site is located at 6850 Country Club Dr. in the La Jolla community and is within Zone: RS-1-4 / Coastal Overlay (Non- Appealable) /Coastal Height/ Parking Impact/Brush Management/ Very High Fire Hazard/ Earthquake Fault Buffer zones. Council District 1.

5/15/2018 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION Kent Coston

- Orientation, project directly adjacent to dead end of Encelia
- Heights and developable areas restricted by existing CDP
- Upper driveway level at Encelia port-cochere only
 - House below
- Highest developed structure is 8-10’ retaining wall to carve out the motor court.
- Height of ridge at port-cochere, is approx. 12’ (height above street view)
- Design guidelines require earth tones, restrictive “zoned” height restrictions.
- 36’ overall height from lowest walk-out basement
- Lowest level (3 bedrooms and multi-story volume)
- Buried mechanical equipment out of site, out of view
- Site (1.6 acres)
- Allowed 5000sf (.07 FAR)
- 1st floor 2711, 2nd 2289, 3rd floor covered (approx. 3000 sf – open all sides, FAR exempt)

5/15/2018 – SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION

- Ragsdale – show project height
- Will – received cycles, not original assessment letter.

- Will – Show height limit lines, Please email Exhibit A and CDP conditions
- Welsh – Client or spec (undecided yet), wouldn't a new owner prefer to see enclosed garages
- Costello – Clarified origins of SCR
- Costello – drainage, there is a bypass for city drainage to move past site to existing outfall (formerly drained onto site. Treating all water that falls on-site on pervious area.
- Collins – Golf course? (unpermitted areas is in process of re-vegetating)
- Zynda – how is bypass executed (piped underground)
- *Public* – Former Copley estate – yes

5/15/2018 - RECOMMENDATION TO DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION

- Zoning and Coastal Height Limit Lines on Elevations/Sections (please bring a colored marker to highlight on the CAD drawings)
- Please send CDP conditions and Exhibit A to DPR chair at earliest convenience for distribution.

5/15/2018 – SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION

- Make this first presentation a Final and Voting Presentation (Ragsdale/Costello)
 - In Favor: Costello, Ragsdale, Will Zynda
 - Opposed: Welsh
 - Abstain: Collins
- **Motion Fails (4-1-1)**

6/12/2018 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION Kent Coston

- Re-orientation to project. The CDP is already approved and its requirements are more restrictive than just zoning requirements
- Carport roof is the highest point of structure, 4' below Prop D height limit
- Design guidelines encourage flat roofs (as proposed)
- Stone pavers as roof deck materials
- Bio treatment and retention basins are included
- Carport above habitable space, all sides open (except elevator shaft), approx. 2,000sf

6/12/2018 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Merten:
 - Requested to see the site plan and developable footprint boundaries (complies)
 - The driveway is elevated
 - Prototype designs were made during original CDP review
 - Emphasis on preserving nature & compatible design
 - Complaint about items off-site: Romero entry, golf-course
- Applicant Response:
 - This is an SCR not a new CDP, project follows design guidelines
 - Grading and revegetation to return surrounding sites to original are approved and underway
 - Guidelines allow flexibility of architectural style

6/12/2018 – SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION

- Leira: by the numbers the project conforms, does not embrace nature, driveway disrupts public view from Encelia (app: High point of structure is 6' below grade at highest point on lot)
- Kane: recalled little discussion of style in original CDP
- Costello: appreciate integration into topography. The original Reserve presentation to the DPR stressed integration with the natural setting with such things as animal access and the “coyote fence”, and planting native botanicals. However, this structure design is a departure from that integration with nature.
- Leira: overpowerful, unlike Amalfi coast, suggest reducing upper terraces, reduce railings

- Will: Questioned need for 14 parking spaces with only 2-3 covered. (app: keeps guests off of Encelia Dr)
- Costello: would like to see PowerPoint from original CDP. Were we promised structures that would blend in with the natural setting, or was it our shortcoming not to require it.
- Kane would like to research design requirements
- Leira would like to see better compatibility with nature. Project screams “look at me”

6/12/2018 - RECOMMENDATION TO DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION

- All committee members MUST read the approved CDP and Design Guidelines. Specifically look for items that require an architectural style that blends in to nature.
- Applicant will consider ways to “tone down” the project.
- Provide the original PowerPoint presented to the DPR.

6/19/2018 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION – Kent Coston

- Project orientation, Questions about softening Balustrades, Overlaid onto actual site image
- Added Grass Crete at driveway, Decreased Balustrade, more wrought iron
- Planters to break rhythm of Balustrade, introduce nature
- Even native LS comes in in “fingers” into project.
- Is there a garage? (No, port-cochere only, 2,000 sf covered)
- Where is house? (Under view deck in front of carport)
- FAR? (.07 Limited by CDP to 5,000 sf)
- Building Height? Below allowable per zones and per CDP restrictions. 5’ below Prop D height limit.
- How many bedrooms? (3 lower, 1-guest on main level)
- Where is mechanical equipment (basement under rear parking area)

6/19/2018 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Merten – reviewed Design Guidelines, “... objective to utilize existing topology and native landscape as an amenity ... follow site topology ... introduce elements that integrate with nature and appear natural.” Italian Renaissance style is formal, not embracing nature. Character does not integrate. Guidelines include various styles, but examples are all “true to itself” Clay mansard roof is out of character with Renaissance. Green roofs shown as integrated with architecture, not hidden behind mansard ring. Controlled symmetry does not reflect natural contour or blend in any sort of way. Transition of formal landscape to native is critical and in the absence of detailed landscape plan can’t make findings. Frequently this committee reviews Landscape plans.

6/19/2018 - COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Design Guidelines require break-up of landscape areas (no huge lawn)
- Roof area treatment is important, what could be done to make surface parking look broken up, not so continuous. (Grass-Crete wherever possible, helps with stormwater percolation anyway)
- Details are critical to make findings of project consistency with CDP. More detail into presentation to track into construction.
- Where is the golf-course? Seems like club house for a golf course. Why 14 parking spaces?
- Setback issue at the top? All retaining walls are depressed into upper side of lot.
- Numbers match, but no relationship to “intent”. Not embracing nature. Would like to see landscape plan, is North east corner adequate to maintain native ecosystem.
- Guidelines suggest mixing native with proposed landscape.
- Could a trellis roof be proposed to open up carport, and decrease the powerful statement it makes.

- Materials are important and emphasized in guidelines. Should tie into nature of the site.
- Asked to see the PowerPoint of original CDP. Stressed integration into natural setting. This project does not.
- Like the nobility of the design. Suggest power and authority, regal. But not what was promised for this lot.
- Understand dilemma of landscape. How to integrate landscape into the natural environment.
- 5,000 sf is very small for such a large lot, not concerned about maxing out allowable 5,000 sf.
- Municipal code (IB 205, carport) limits a carport to 1,000 sf. (Applicant: This is a port-cochere)
 - Carports OFTEN end up enclosed after the permit.
 - (Applicant, current plan is 2,000 sf – 3,000 sf)
- Did applicant consider a different form for the carport structure. Something simple, trellis, overhangs,
- Design guidelines shows, low lying modern, wood, glass, or very natural Tuscan farmhouse (local natural, rough-hewn stone). Mansard roof fights that. Something simpler would work better
- Where PV considered (behind mansard if anywhere).

6/19/2018 – PREPARE FOR NEXT TIME

- Can other solutions be developed for carport, eliminate Mansard, consider the 1,000sf limit for carports
- Landscape plan and how integrates to native
- Details of roofs
- Materials board (enhance natural materials) w Colors are important, earthy colors.
- PowerPoint from original CDP
-

4. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 6/12/18

Project Name:	Dow Slope Stabilization – VAR			
	7001 Fairway Dr			
Permits:	VAR			
Project No.:	593074	DPM:	Tim Daly	
Zone:	RS-1-4	Applicant:	Bob Trettin	

LA JOLLA (Process 3) Variance to construct a slope retention wall at an existing single dwelling unit located at 7001 Fairway Road, that exceeds height requirements in the residential base zone in the RS-1-4 and Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay Zones within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.

6/12/2018 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION Bob Trettin

- Orientation to project and failed slope. Slope failure sent trees through applicant’s windows.
URGENT
- City built sewer outside of approved sewer easement
- Wall height ranges from 8-22’. Cannot be seen from street or uphill neighbor, only when viewed directly up applicant’s driveway.
- Wall will be hand sculpted, color treated concrete to resemble natural bluff

6/12/2018 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- none

6/12/2018 – SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION

- Kane: How will it be structured?

- (app: 4' deep footing at bottom, Anchored tie backs into hillside)
- Will: Will tie backs cross PL?
 - (app: yes, city standard agreement form (to be) signed by neighbor.
- Costello: Will the wall influence the adjacent stability?
 - (app: minor benefit in first few feet)

6/12/2018 – SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION

- Make this first presentation a Final and Voting Presentation (Costello/Collins)
 - In Favor: Collins, Costello, Kane, Leira, Will, Zynda
 - Opposed: -
 - Abstain: -
- **Motion Passes (6-0-0)**

6/12/2018 – SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION

- Findings CAN be made for the Variance and the project as presented (Costello/Kane)
 - In Favor: Collins, Costello, Kane, Leira, Zynda
 - Opposed: -
 - Abstain: Will
- **Motion Passes (5-0-1)**

5. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 6/12/18

Project Name:	Herschel Avenue MW & CDP		
	7460 Herschel Ave		
Permits:	MW & CDP Amendment (ref 472934)		
Project No.:	602979	DPM:	Pancho Mendoza
Zone:	RM-3-7	Applicant:	Kathi Riser

LA JOLLA: (Process 3) Map Waiver and Amendment of Coastal Development Permit No. 472934 for the creation of three residential condominium units under construction and to waive the requirements to underground existing utilities at 7460 Herschel Ave. The 0.11 acre site is in the RM-3-7 zone, Coastal (Non-appealable) overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1

6/12/2018 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION Kathi Riser

- 2009 CDP for 4 unit condo, delay for city to relocate storm sewer and Vacate Easement, CDP was activated, but TM Waiver expired.
- Staff approved modification to 3 units
- CDP amendment required to include new TM Waiver

6/12/2018 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Shayne Gilder: Neighbor two doors down
 - When stormwater inlet was moved, two feet of his 12' driveway was used. City has a Tier 3 hold on the project until addressed
 - Also backflow preventer on sidewalk is a trip/scratch hazard

6/12/2018 – SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION

- Leira: Would like to know status of undergrounding along Pearl
- Kane: Where is the storm drain. Where is the backflow preventer

6/12/2018 - RECOMMENDATION TO DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION

- Address the neighbor's driveway issue
- Inform committee on status of undergrounding along Pearl and Herschel and how this fits with proposed project

- Look at options to improve sidewalk safety at backflow preventer
- Provide an updated assessment letter from city PM

6. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 6/19/18

Project Name: Sumal Residence CDP
 622 Nautilus St
 Permits: CDP
 Project No.: 604488 DPM: **Pancho Mendoza**
 Zone: RM-1-1 Applicant: Tim Jones

LA JOLLA- (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing detached garage and construct new 2 story 3,020 SF single dwelling unit, on a site with 2 existing detached single dwelling units (for total 3 dwelling units) located at 622 Nautilus street. The 0.23 acre site is in the RM-1-1 zone, Coastal (Non-appealable) overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District (1)

6/19/2018 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION – Tim Jones

- Project Orientation, Demo garage, add a two story SFR
- Applicant has addressed all outstanding city cycle issues
- First Floor: 2 car garage from alley, laundry, and main living spaces plus one bedroom
- Second Floor: 3 bedrooms and 3 baths
- Owners live on-site. This is rental income unit, they will be there and are sensitive to community character.
- Offsets for roof plans, hipped roof, in keeping with neighborhood style, vertical and horizontal offsets, second floor steps back from alley
- Ridge height is 23’-6”, plate height is approx. 21’
- Asphalt shingle roof, stucco exterior, small balcony at “front” which is interior to lot.
- Only North (exposed to alley) and East elevation (exposed to side setback) face lot lines. Others are interior to the property.
- Offsetting planes vary from 1’, 3’, 6’, 15’
- Separation between buildings is at minimum required 6’
- Front building is single story
- Front unit does not have parking, rear (ex) unit has 2 exterior spaces (uncovered) off of alley.
- Landscape plan provided, point out that project will not include driveway.
- Lot area 10,183 sf, All 3 structures = 6,213. FAR .61 (Allowable .75)
- Addresses 622, 624, **626 New Address**
- 20’ wide alley, Applicant will improve alley.

6/19/2018 - PUBLIC COMMENT

- How many two story on Nautilus in this neighborhood? (Several 2-story homes on this block)

6/19/2018 - COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Going from 2 units and 4 cars parking to 3 units and 4 cars parking seems to be deficient.

6/19/2018 – PLEASE DELIVER NEXT TIME

- Identify parking requirements and proposed
- Aerial photograph to identify project site
- Materials board
- Photo montage showing 2-3 houses on each side.
- Massing profile to demonstrate relative of 3 structures.

7. Applicant request to present on July 10

LA JOLLA SHORES PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES (Draft)
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION
Monday, May 21st, 2018 @ 4:00 p.m.

Revision 0

La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect St., La Jolla, CA

Meeting Room 1

1. **4:00pm Welcome and Call to Order:** David Gordon, Chair
 - a. Committee Members Present - Matt Edwards, Janie Emerson, David Gordon, Myrna Naegle, Michael Czajkowski, Andy Fotsch, Tony Cridafi
 - b. Committee Members Absent - Angie Preisendorfer
2. **Adopt the Agenda -**
 - a. **Motion:** Modify Agenda Revision #2 but delete item #4
 - Moved – J. Emerson 2nd – M. Czajkowski
 - **Vote - 7-0-0**
3. **Approve April Minutes**
 - a. **Motion:** Approve April LJSPRC Minutes
 - Moved – J. Emerson 2nd – M. Czajkowski
 - **Vote - 7-0-0**
4. **Non-Agenda Public Comment:** None
5. **Non-Agenda Committee Member Comments -** Emerson requested that election for Committee Chair be an action item on June Agenda
6. **4:05pm Chair Comments** Chair reminded all present concerns about keeping the meeting on track, respectful and relevant to the scope of the LJSPRC. Specifically:
 - a. The committee is always interested in hearing concerns from the neighborhood residents.
 - b. Please keep comments relevant to the LJSPRC Scope. Specifically how a project conforms to the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, the La Jolla Shores Community Plan and the La Jolla Shores Design Manual, Also reviews significant planning items on cycle issues provided by the DSD.
 - c. Areas not appropriate are potential traffic and parking issues during construction, loss of views, potential for noise or contractors who violate city curfews. LJSPRC is sympathetic to the neighborhoods concerns about these type of issues, but they are not in the LJSPRC's scope.
 - d. Please keep comments respectful and avoid personal attacks.

7. **Project Review:**

a. **4:15-4:45pm ALLOS RESIDENCE (First Review)**

- Project #: 596085
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8333 Calle Del Cielo
- Applicant's Rep: Sarah Horton (619) 231-9905 shorton@golba.com
- Project Manager: Pancho Mendoza (619) 446-5433 FMendoza@sandiego.gov
- **Project Description:** (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for demolition of an existing 4,085 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence and construction of a new 5,958 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence. The 0.46 acre (19,988 sq ft) site is within the Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) overlay zone within the LJSPD-SF zone(s) of the La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan Area within Council District 1.

- Existing structure square footage and FAR: 4,085 square feet or a 00.20 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) - Proposed square footage and FAR: 5,958 square feet or a 00.30 Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

- Existing and proposed setbacks on all sides:

Existing:	Front Yard:	26'-3 1/2"
	Side Yards:	14'-8 1/2" &
	20'-8" Rear Yard	83'-1 1/2"
Proposed:	Front Yard:	28'-6"
	Side Yards:	8'-0" & 12'-0"
	Rear Yard:	92'-11"

Height if greater than 1-story (above ground): 2 stories over basement garage, 26'-6" high (existing height 25'-10")

Comments: It was brought up that the multitude of glass panels facing west could cause severe light refraction in addition to excessive heat within the residence. The Architect said he would use glass that addressed both issues. The majority of the discussion centered around the side yard set backs and articulation on the 2nd story. The Architect went ahead and modified the 2nd story set backs on both the north and south sides, signed the plans and dated them 5/21/18.

Motion: Approve the project as modified dated 5/21/18 for a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for demolition of an existing 4,085 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence and construction of a new 5,958 sq ft two story over basement garage single family residence.

Moved – J. Emerson 2nd – M. Czajkowski.

Vote - 5-1-1 (Against - M. Edwards & Abstain – M. Naegle because she wanted applicant to return with revised drawings)

T. Crisafi was able to remain for the next Agenda items to represent his client. Once deliberations begin, he will recuse himself and leave the room.

Discussion of reinstating item #4 as part of the entire discussion on the Lookout Drive projects.

Motion: Modify the Agenda Revision #2 to include item d (Lookout Drive Lot 4 & 5 and Lot 2

(Comments by Neighbors) – presentation by Deborah Rosenthal.) Moved – J. Emerson 2nd – M. Czajkowski

Vote - 7-0-0

The Committee opted to hear the next 3 Agenda items together with presentation by the applicant to cover all 3 projects prior to Public and Committee discussion.

5:15PM - M. Czajkowski left meeting (as planned and notified prior to meeting)

b. 4:45-5:15pm LOOKOUT LOTS 4 & 5 (Previously presented for info in 2016)

- **Project #:** 482904
- **Type of Structure:** Two Detached Single Family Residences
- **Location:** 7729 Lookout Drive (and adjacent lot)
- **Applicant's Rep:** Scott Frantz (858) 869-2865 sfrantz@islandarch.com
- **Project Manager:** Glenn Gargas (619) 446-5142 ggargas@san Diego.gov
- **Project Description:** (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for the development of two detached, two-story, single family residences totaling 7,132 square feet on two existing vacant parcels at and adjacent to 7729 Lookout Drive. The entire 0.295 acre site is in the single family (SF) zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay zone, within the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1. Note – Lot 2 removed from this project.

c. 5:15-5:45pm LOOKOUT LOT 2 (Previously presented for info in 2016)

- **Project #:** 589178
- **Type of Structure:** Single Family Residence
- **Location:** 7729 Lookout Drive
- **Applicant's Rep:** Scott Frantz (858) 869-2865 sfrantz@islandarch.com
- **Project Manager:** Glenn Gargas (619) 446-5142 ggargas@san Diego.gov
- **Project Description:** (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for the development of a two-story single family residence totaling 4,070 square feet, located on a vacant lot at 7729 Lookout Drive. The 0.12-acre site is in the single family (SF) zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1. This development is within the Coastal Overlay zone and the application was filed on March 1, 2018.
- **Comments:** The Applicant presented the designs for all 3 properties and distributed copies of data sheets including the 300 ft survey. Then there was extensive Public discussion by many attendees and neighbors including presentations and handouts.
 - **M. Furby** - Concerns on adequate parking, driveway to Lot #4 and storm water run off with possible damage to neighbors.
 - **D. Kellogg** - Had a number of concerns especially the appropriate uses of the easements on the properties and the excessive FARs (especially Lot #5).
 - **E. Heidelberg** - representing S. McKean (neighbor) - Her points:

- Distributed a 32 page document detailing her concerns including a 300 ft survey that conflicts with the data presented by the applicant.
- No available updated lot survey of neighborhood. (Note –applicant provided 300 ft survey at this meeting).
- Dwelling unit density is 2x that of the neighborhood average (claimed lots split in 1972).
- Setbacks do not conform to the average of 7.9’ for the area.
- **P. Merten** - Set backs are not in conformity with vicinity, specifically Lots #4 & #5 with neighbor S. McKean and Lot #4 to Cliff May historic house. Stated that setbacks should be addressed with respect to appearance and visual spacing, not just tabular data. In addition, lot density for these lots versus “occupied units” whose lots in the area average 10,500 sq ft. Two of the lots presented are half the size of those allowed in the area.
- **L. Hill-Hogan** - Lived in the area since 1968. Great concern for increased traffic with it’s impact on safety and quality of life in the area.
- **S. Pruett** (neighbor lives on Lot #3) - Great concern for soil issues and water drain off from Lot #2 on to her property. The level of the soil on Lot #2 has been raised 2’ and has caused water damage & flooding onto her property. Will this new construction be built to the original soil level or to the new level? It was suggested that she and the applicant discuss a resolution to this issue.
- **S. McKean** - Great additional concern about traffic & parking. SDFD has redlined the area and asked to reduce parking by 50%.
- **T. Lundberg** – Provided a four page letter that was distributed to the committee and the public. (Ms. Lundberg could not be present but another neighbor distributed her letter).
- **D. Mandelbaum** – commented that the City has already ruled on the lot merger demand.
- **T. Crisafi** - requested a Point of Order that the Rosenthal comments (Comments by Neighbors presentation) be tabled until a future meeting after the City of SD gives a ruling on this proposal. It was decided to proceed with an abbreviated presentation but without a detailed discussion until the City can provide a ruling.

d. 5:45-6:00pm LOOKOUT LOT 4&5 and LOT 2 (Comments by Legal Representative*)

- Project #: 482904 & 589178
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residences
- Location: 7729 Lookout Drive
- Neighbor’s Rep: Deborah Rosenthal* (714) 608-9424 drosenthal@fyklaw.com
- *Attorney representing the La Jolla Hills Committee – an unincorporated group of neighbors
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas (619) 446-5142 ggargas@sandiego.gov
- **Project Description:** The speaker is representing a group of neighbors and has requested time to present formal comments on these projects.
- **Presentation by D. Rosenthal** – Distributed a 48 page document focused on claim that the lots should be merged. The average lot size for the area 10,000-12,000 sq ft with minimum lot size in the area of 8,000sq ft. The lot sizes in the Applicants proposal are 5,000 sq ft for Lots #2 & #4

and 7,500 sq ft for Lot #5. She proceeded with a discussion of the Code and land merger requirement. This will be referred to The City of SD and DSD for a ruling. Ms. Rosenthal claimed that these lots are well below the standard in the area. She also presented concern that the set back numbers seem to be constantly changing and that drainage concerns need to be carefully considered. Rosenthal stated that the heart of the LJSPDO and Design Manual are not incorporated into the current designs for these 3 lots.

6:20PM – M. Naegle left the meeting (not planned). Quorum no longer met.

Meeting adjourned at 6:50PM.

Adjourn to next PRC meeting Monday, June 18, 2018 @ 4:00 p.m.

LA JOLLA SHORES PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Revision 0

Monday, June 18th, 2018 @ 4:00 p.m.

La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect St., La Jolla, CA

Meeting Room 1

1. **4:00pm Welcome and Call to Order:** David Gordon, Chair
 - a. Committee Members in Attendance: Tony Crisafi, Michael Czajkowski, Janie Emerson, Andy Fotsch, David Gordon, Myrna Naegle, Angie Preisendorfer
 - b. Not in Attendance: Matt Edwards
2. **Adopt the Agenda** - Motion made to adopt the agenda with a modification to discuss board elections after the presentations. Motion made by Janie Emerson, 2nd Andy Fotsch **VOTE 7-0-0**
3. **Approve May Minutes** - Motion made to Approve May Minutes with changes listed:
 - a. Removal of discussion of presentation and the list of items that Lookout Drive applicant was requested to address since a quorum was lost at 6:20pm as Myrna Naegle left the meeting.
 - b. Removal of the information provided by the City DSD following the meeting. It was agreed that these items could be added to the June 18th minutes if they were read to the public.
 - c. Ms Kellogg claimed that the Architect involved (Tony Crisafi) in the project was taking the minutes and that was a conflict of interest. It was confirmed by Janie Emerson that she was taking minutes and that Tony was assisting with minutes on the Allos project but did not take minutes for the Lookout Drive projects.
 - d. Ms Kellogg felt the dates of the splits/ boundaries were incorrect.
 - e. Motion made by Janie Emerson, 2nd Myrna Naegle **VOTE 6-0-1** (Angie Preisendorfer abstained absent at May meeting)
4. **Non-Agenda Public Comment:** None.
5. **Non-Agenda Committee Member Comments:** None.
6. **4:05pm Chair Comments**
 - a. Chair comments regarding elections moved to end of meeting per change of the agenda.
 - b. Chair read the following information provided by DSD:

Subsequent to the Mau 18th LJSPRC meeting, City officials provided that the City had already ruled on Ms. Rosenthal's demand that the lots be merged. The 48 page document was a letter addressed to DSD dated October 7, 2016. The City (Gregory P. Hopkins, Deputy Director DSD) provided the following response on Nov 18, 2016 that states: "To answer your question regarding the mandatory issue you indicate below, yes, that's part of the concern. The other, which is a major sticking point, is the application process and the fact you are not the owner or the owners authorized agent as defined in our Municipal Code, Section 112.0102. It basically states that unless you are an owner or have an interest in the property you cannot apply for this merger, nor is the City going to be initiating this process.

Our attorney's office has reviewed all your documentation and does not see any reason to meet on this, nor do I at this present time."

7. Project Review:

a. 4:15-4:45pm LOOKOUT LOTS 4 & 5 (Previously presented May 2018)

- Project #: 482904
- Type of Structure: Two Detached Single Family Residences
- Location: 7729 Lookout Drive (and adjacent lot)
- Applicant's Rep: Scott Frantz (858) 869-2865 sfrantz@islandarch.com
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas (619) 446-5142 ggargas@san Diego.gov
- **Project Description:** (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for the development of two detached, two-story, single family residences totaling 7,132 square feet on two existing vacant parcels at and adjacent to 7729 Lookout Drive. The entire 0.295 acre site is in the single family (SF) zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay zone, within the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1. Note – Lot 2 removed from this project.

c. 4:45-5:15pm LOOKOUT LOT 2 (Previously presented May 2018)

- Project #: 589178
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 7729 Lookout Drive
- Applicant's Rep: Scott Frantz (858) 869-2865 sfrantz@islandarch.com
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas (619) 446-5142 ggargas@san Diego.gov
- **Project Description:** (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for the development of a two-story single family residence totaling 4,070 square feet, located on a vacant lot at 7729 Lookout Drive. The 0.12-acre site is in the single family (SF) zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1. This development is within the Coastal Overlay zone and the application was filed on March 1, 2018.

Both presentations made by Lisa Kriedeman and Scott Frantz with assistance from Tony Crisafi.

8. Comments, discussion and deliberation for both projects was combined.

Just after May LJSPRC meeting adjourned, applicant was requested to gather the following information and come back to LJSPRC for review and decision when that information is available:

- Double check 300' radius comparison numbers. If possible, compare F.A.R. in two columns, one with garage, one without garage. It is understood that county records do not include garage area. Verify data (see conflicting data in survey provided by E. Heidelberg).
Applicant response: Lisa Kriedeman provided updated sq footage and FAR's with and without including the garages – also see Tony Crisafi comments below.
- Ruling from The City of SD/ DSD concerning the lot merger information presented by D. Rosenthal
Response provided by DSD (see above).
- Address all major cycle issues as identified in the most recent cycle issues.
Applicant response: All major cycle issues have been addressed. Updated cycle issues have not been provided by DSD yet.

- d. Address public comment regarding setbacks as they relate to adjacent homes and proposed structures. Please address concern that setbacks should look at the visual effect and not just a numerical table. *Note that this is not a deliverable but was a public comment.*
Applicant response: setbacks meet code.
- e. Address the basement setback from Lot 1 property line and compliance with the applicable municipal code.
Applicant response: The setback is 1'6" and meets applicable code.
- f. Elevations and information about WATER run-off onto the neighbor's properties (7809 & 7731). Please address how this is handled both prior to and after construction.
Applicant response: presented updated drainage
- g. Lot coverage and FAR compared to all in area showing compatibility with surrounding neighborhood.
Applicant response: see Tony Crisafi comments below.

9. Public Comment:

- a. **Evelyn Heidelberg:** (representing S McKean) Distributed a 27 page document detailing her concerns with FAR calculations off by 250-2500 sq ft and unresolved City cycle issues. Questioned where the FAR numbers came from, lots 4&5 have a FAR 35% higher, lot 2 has a FAR 50% higher, Lot coverage should be used versus FAR, Updated cycle issue report not available, Provision regarding lot split. Neighbor residing at 7809 Lookout Drive adjacent lot 4&5 has a setback of 4' avg in the area is 7'.
- b. **Tony Crisafi:** stated the original 2016 plans showed FAR numbers with garage and without garage and that all numbers came from City records, stated that the project conformed regarding bulk and scale, City accepts existing non-conforming sub division lot. The current map was filed in 1997 due to a lot line adjustment but all 5 lots existed prior to that and were essentially the same size.
- c. **Desiree Kellogg:** (7728 Lookout Drive) Claimed lots were created after 1972 and the La Jolla Shores PDO applies, specifically paragraph 1510.0304(a) and La Jolla Community Plan, page 89, code and zoning issues, living space vs out buildings (ie garage). Concerned about drainage from lot 2 and adequacy of storm drains.
- d. **Sue Pruitt:** (7731 Lookout Drive) concerned about 2' of added soil to the rear of the property. "Are you using original pre-existing grade?"
- e. **Sue McKean:** (7809 Lookout Drive) Concerned about retaining wall on her property line.
- f. **Phil Merten:** Concerned about lot density (history of lot property line changes).
- g. **David Mandelbaum:** (owner of subject lots) stated it is not their intention to sell the lots individually but he pointed out that the current design is well within limits of what is allowed and that if this becomes too much trouble, he might just sell the properties and that a developer could come in and build much larger homes (right up to the 30 ft height limit).
- h. **Peggy Davis:** Concerned about drainage considering all of the underground water in this area. Wanted to know where the location of the storm drains are in the area and that Mr. Wells from the City had not responded to her request for the location of all of the storm drains in the area. Requested a way that concerned neighbors could be provided with copies of drainage plans and where the storm drains are located. Applicant's rep responded that all site plans are available to view from the City public records.

10. Committee Comments and Discussion:

- a. **Janie Emerson:** Concerned about: the size of the edifices on the size of the lot, drainage between lot 1 (Cliff May historical house) and lot 4, large square footage of lot 4 and 5 below grade and only a 1'6" setback below grade, matrix changed regarding straight curb and curved curb, drainage is a concern if the owner is going to sell the lots separately. Uncomfortable with the size of the homes and the precedent being set.
- b. **David Gordon:** Requested applicant to clarify and update the concern raised by Phil Merten at the May LJSPRC meeting regarding setback on lot 5. Applicant showed the current setbacks.
- b. **Andy Fotsch:** Commented on setbacks and density. Void of space is one way to look at setbacks, but setbacks are simply measured. This neighborhood is very dense when compared to other La Jolla neighborhoods. These homes are above average with respect to FAR, however when one looks at the massing on the lots, they conform to the neighborhood. Cannot look at just the overall FAR.
- c. **Motion:** Angie Preisendorfer made a motion, Andy Fotsch 2nd
Findings can be made for a site development Permits and Coastal Development Permits for Projects 482904 and 589178.

VOTE 3-2-1

11. Continuation of Chair Comments and Discussion Regarding LJSPRC Election.

Discussion regarding election of chair and possibly a vice-chair, The LJSPRC charter only states "the LJSPRC shall choose its own Chair, who shall be responsible for seeing that all the provisions of this Charter are met." It does not state any requirement for annual elections nor does it have provisions for a vice chair. It has been proposed that the LJSPRC should hold these elections annually and that it should also include election of a vice-chair.

Committee discussed and agreed to hold elections for a Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary at the July LJSPRC meeting. It was also agreed that an update of the LJSPRC Charter could be done in parallel but does not have to be complete prior to the election. The revised LJSPRC Charter would need to first be approved by the committee with final approval by the CPA.

David Gordon commented that a Charter revision would be appropriate and could also update other areas that are not clear the Charter is more restrictive than City Council Policy 600-24 in that the recused person must leave the room as opposed to just the Committee seating area.

Motion made to adjourn

VOTE 7-0-0

Adjourn to next LJSPRC meeting Monday, July 16, 2018 @ 4:00 p.m.

LA JOLLA TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION BOARD
Regular Meeting: Wednesday June 20, 2018

Members Present: Brian Earley (Acting Chairperson) LISA, Tom Brady LJCPA, Donna Aprea LJTC, Nancy Warwick LJTC, Patrick Ryan BRCC, Sheila Fortune LJVMA, Darryl Tschirn LISA

Members Absent: Dave Abrams (Chairperson) LJCPA, Erik Gantzel BRCC, Aaron Goulding LJVMA

Approve Minutes of: May 16, 2018 **Motion to Approve: Fortune, Second: Tschirn 7-0-0**

Public Comments on Non-Agenda LJT&T Matters:

Melinda Merryweather is requesting to be placed on the July Agenda to try and reduce some of the red no parking zones on La Jolla Farms Rd. It is almost 90% red. She will be representing the Womens Sea Surf Club and Surfrider. She will also be requesting to change the parking time limitation from 2 hours to 3 hours. It is difficult to park, get down to the beach, surf, and return within the 2-hour time limit.

Mark Egan is requesting to be placed on the July Agenda to discuss getting rid of bus stops. He feels that there are too many bus stops. One block may have two busses going north and two busses going south. He would like to get rid of them on Pearl Street and Torrey Pines Road because of traffic concerns. This is an MTS issue but Mr. Egan is hoping that this is something LJT&T would want to do and propose to MTS. He recognizes it would be an uphill fight. Brian advised Mr. Egan to email Dave to be put on the Agenda and Mr. Egan responded that he already contacted Dave.

Tom Grunow gave an update on the Charrette he held last month. There were between 20-25 people who participated and everyone learned a lot over the course of those 3 days. He recognizes that he is operating outside of any authorized community group. He is trying to find a way to gain some structure so that he can move ahead. He has read the La Jolla Community Plan in detail several times and will be meeting with individual architects to superimpose some of the concepts that were clearly delineated from the group meetings. He would like to return to LJT&T with the first blush of what some of those concepts are for review. These concepts will be redone several times over before a final plan is put in place. Any project of this magnitude will have to go out for public notification and public hearings so there is still quite a process to get through. Tom will be returning to LJT&T over the next few months to show us the concepts and how they will affect the parking in the cultural zone.

Alisha Hawrylyszyn Frank, newly elected President of La Jolla Village Merchants Assn is in the audience. She noted that the crosswalk on La Jolla Boulevard at Genter Street does not have flashing lights (Beacons). She is finding that a dangerous situation. Drivers are used to seeing the flashing lights at the crosswalks up and down La Jolla Boulevard to alert them that a pedestrian is in the crosswalk but this crosswalk at Genter is different from all the other crosswalks because it does not have the flashing lights to alert Drivers of pedestrians in the crosswalk. This is only her second Meeting here so she does not know if it was discussed at past meetings but she did want to bring this crosswalk to our attention. Drivers have become trained to look for the flashing lights at the crosswalks but this crosswalk at Genter doesn't have the flashing lights to alert drivers someone is in the crosswalk.

Ira Parker is in the audience to present Agenda Item 2 but is supporting what Alisha is saying about the crosswalk at Genter. He has seen drivers not stopping for pedestrians in that crosswalk. He advised that LJT&T needs to speak to the Police Department because drivers are not stopping for pedestrians in crosswalks even with the flashing lights going off. He believes there should be a traffic light at the intersection of La Jolla Boulevard and Genter because that particular intersection is dangerous for pedestrians crossing the street, cars are barreling down the Boulevard at

a high rate of speed going much faster than pedestrians can cross. Several times he has had to position his car to block the other lane of travel so pedestrians could safely cross the street.

Bill Robbins has been appearing at some of the Community Groups who meet in this building to advise them of what is going on at the Rec Ctr. The building is being re-wired. There will be days we will not have electricity. This is Phase 1 of a 3 phase project so it will be going on for a while. The contractors will try to work around the Meetings but if we come in for a meeting this is the reason why we may not have electricity for wi-fi and laptops. The Rec Ctr is 103 years old so it needs to be done but there are 60 meetings a month in this building so some of them may be inconvenienced.

As Sheila was walking to the Meeting she thought she may have seen a tractor moving around while children were playing near to it. Bill said children's safety was discussed at a safety meeting and the backhoes are walked in and out of the playground. It is understood that children are fascinated by the tractors so all of the equipment is walked in and walked out of the playground.

No further public comments.

Carol Hernstad is present for her Agenda Item 4 but she needed assistance from her neighbor, Elaina Buchbinder, because of her health. For this reason, to accommodate Ms. Hernstad and Ms. Buchbinder, Agenda Item 4 was heard first.

Agenda Item 4: Parking Time Limit - Request for 2-hour parking time limitation for section of north-bound La Jolla Scenic Drive North on the East side, between Scenic Place and Sugarman Drive (Carol Hernstad) **Action Item**

Elaina Buchbinder, who lives on La Jolla Scenic Drive North, is speaking for Carol Hernstad regarding a proposal to install 2-hour parking between 8:00am and 6:00pm on the East side of La Jolla Scenic Drive North between Scenic Place and Sugarman Drive.

Ms. Buchbinder told the Board that UCSD closed several of their parking lots and now UCSD Faculty, Staff, and Students are parking on their street. Their cars are blocking fire hydrants, mail boxes, and are parked right at the edge of resident's driveways. There has been an increase in crime with mail boxes being broken into and trash has been left all over resident's property. The 2-hour parking time limit from 8:00 am to 6:00pm Monday through Friday will inconvenience the residents who live on that side of the street but they are hoping it will cut down on UCSD parking which has infiltrated their street substantially.

Ms. Buchbinder spoke about the difficulty of exiting their driveways. Residents cannot see the street because of the parked cars blocking their view of the street so someone is needed to direct them out of their driveways and to stop traffic on the street so they can safely pull out of their driveway. She described an incident where Ms. Hernstad was pulling out of her driveway and a driver travelling down the street at the same time did not want to stop for her so they drove up over the median to go around her and proceeded on their way. Parking is one issue they are dealing with but speed is another. The speed limit on their street is 25 mph but drivers are going much faster than 25 mph. The speed of the cars travelling down the street and the cars parked on it are making it difficult for mail carriers to deliver mail to resident mail boxes. All of their mail boxes are blocked by cars that never seem to move.

Darryl asked them if the 2-hour parking time limitation will cure their problem. Ms. Buchbinder responded that cure is a large word, she just hopes it will subside a bit. Drivers parking in a time-limited parking spot may be more cognizant of getting ticketed.

Tom asked her how many parking places on the street will be affected by the time-limited parking. Ms. Buchbinder responded there were maybe 6-8 parking places in front of her home but it would depend on the size of the cars. It

would be more or less at other houses on the street. The area of the new parking time limitation is between Scenic Place and Sugarman Drive. Patrick calculated perhaps 15 houses are in that zone with around 3 parking places apiece depending on the size of the driveways mean around 45 parking places may be affected.

Patrick recalled that parking time limits were installed in another location in the Cliffridge-Glenbrook area for the same reason they are requesting them, UCSD parking, and perhaps that drove the parking onto La Jolla Scenic Dr. North. Ms. Buchbinder responded that it was a direct result of UCSD closing down some parking lots. A woman in the audience responded that installing parking time limitations on La Jolla Scenic Drive is just going to move the problem into another location.

Brian read the email from City Traffic Engineers indicating that 72% of the property owners supported this proposal however, the religious facility (Congregation ADAT Yeshurun) north of Sugarman did not want to sign the petition so the posted signs will end at or before their property line. The signs will be 2-hour Mon-Sat, Sundays and holidays excluded, 8am-6pm.

Including Saturdays in the parking time limitation bothered Ms. Hernstad and she asked that Saturday not be included in the parking time limitations. She requested the parking time limitations specifically for Monday through Friday. Patrick asked why the Congregation ADAT Yeshurun (8625 La Jolla Scenic Drive North) did not want to sign her Petition. Ms. Hernstad responded they were concerned with the Jewish High Holidays and its for that reason she does not want to include Saturdays in the parking restriction. She is Jewish too and does not want to be penalized for congregants not having a place to park on Saturdays.

Motion to Approve 2-hour parking time limitation between 8:00 am to 6:00pm Monday through Friday excluding Saturday, Sunday, and Holidays, for the section of north bound La Jolla Scenic Drive North on the East side between Scenic Place and Sugarman Drive: Tschirn, Second: Ryan 7-0-0

Agenda Item 1: No Right Turn (Cont'd Item) - Request for posting of 'No Right Turn' from 4pm to 7pm on north-bound Torrey Pines Rd at Roseland Drive (Karen Marshall) Action Item

Continued from May Meeting. At the May 16, 2018 Meeting Ms. Marshall submitted to the Board a Petition for her No Right Turn traffic sign that had typed Names and Addresses but no authenticated signatures. This Petition she gave the Board is just a copy of the original Petition that does have original signatures that she sent to Oscar Cortes at the City but the Board has no confirmation or any documentation to back up the City's approval for her traffic sign. She is missing two key components: the signed Petition of her Neighbors and documentation that it was approved by the City. She was advised to return to the June Meeting with her Petition of authenticated signatures and back up documentation that the City approved her request.

The Board did receive an email from Oscar Cortes, City Traffic Engineer stating the Traffic Engineering Division will recommend installing the 'No Right Turn' sign as long as 75% of the affected properties were in agreement, and the Board subsequently received the email from Noor Kasto verifying that the Petition had the adequate signatures needed to move forward with the installation:

Good Morning Karen,

To follow up on our earlier conversation, Traffic Engineering Division will recommend installing the "No Right Turn" sign at specific times (3PM-7PM) From Torrey Pines to East Roseland Drive as long as we have 75% of the affected properties in agreement with this change. Keep in mind, that the residents will be affected by this change as well as they won't be able to perform a right turn either to East Roseland Drive.

Thank You,

Oscar Cortes Associate Engineer – Traffic

Hi All,

I completed the petition verification for the No Right Turn sign onto Roseland Dr from Torrey Pines Rd. The petition has adequate signatures and we met the minimum approvals needed for this location.

Thank you, Noor

The Board does not have the Petition with original signatures although Ms. Marshall said she left it on the table with the emails from Oscar Cortes and Noor Kasto. The email documentation is on the table but the Petition is not. Ms. Marshall cannot locate them on the table and thinks she left them in her car.

The wording on the Petition has become an issue after Tom received a phone call from a Resident who signed the Petition.

A Resident on Roseland who asked Tom for anonymity told Tom he signed the Petition only after wording was put into the Petition itself that there would be a requirement that the Residents on Roseland would not be subject to the penalties for making the right turn. The Resident made it clear to Tom that is the only reason why he signed the Petition. The email from Oscar Cortes is clear that the Residents on Roseland would be affected by the No Right Turn sign and now that Resident is very upset.

Ms. Marshall said there were one or two Residents that did not sign her Petition but 85% of the Residents on the Street did sign it so it would be unfair not to get her sign because of one or two people.

Patrick explained to Ms. Marshall the problem with her Petition. If some Residents on Roseland signed her Petition believing they would be excluded from the No Right Turn restriction and would be allowed to make the right turn then her Petition does not agree with the City. The Board needs to see the Petition and we need to see the signature sheet that the Residents on the Street signed to make sure there is not anything on that Petition that would cause Residents to believe they were exempt from the restriction.

Darryl told Ms. Marshall that if one person signed her Petition believing he could make the right turn then perhaps there are other Residents who also signed her Petition believing they could make the right turn. Ms. Marshall is showing the Board a copy of a Petition that she says she used and it does not have any wording that says Residents can make the right turn. She did not do anything dishonest but Darryl clarified there may be confusion over the Petition not dishonesty. Sheila is advising her that perhaps her survey might need to be updated with the understanding that everyone that has signed it also is agreeing to the fact they will not be able to make the right turn.

The Board is unable to obtain her Petition with signed signatures. Patrick asked Ms. Marshall to read the phrasing on her Petition. Ms. Marshall read " the Residents of East Roseland Drive and Roseland Place La Jolla California 92037 are requesting a No Right Turn sign between the hours of 3:00pm to 7:00pm on the corner of Torrey Pines Rd and East Roseland Drive. This will stop some of the through traffic and speeding Monday through Friday". Ms. Marshall is insisting this is the Petition she used for her sign. Tom told Ms. Marshall the Resident who contacted him signed a Petition that exempted the Residents of Roseland from being penalized if they make the right turn on their Street. He told Tom he would not have signed that Petition if that had not been included. Tom is advising Ms. Marshall there is another Petition which is the one he signed that has that wording, that Residents of the Street would be exempted from the restriction. Sheila asked Ms. Marshall to get her Petition from her car and Ms. Marshall left the room

Betsy McClendon of East Roseland Dr. is an independent interior designer. She enters and exits East Roseland drive 3-4 times a day. She lives just 100' from Torrey Pines Road. She would have to sit in that traffic through two more sets of traffic lights and wait through back up traffic going up Hidden Valley Rd to Via Capri every night just so she can go home through the back end of the street. There are 25 Residences between Torrey Pines Road and Ms. Marshall's home that will be forced to sit in traffic through the Throat and two more sets of stop lights and in back up traffic all the way up Hidden Valley Road. The No Right Turn restriction will add more traffic in the Throat. Ms.

McClendon left a message for Ms. Marshall that the No Right Turn will create a hardship and she could not support that Petition. Ms. McClendon did not realize she would have to campaign to all of her neighbors against that sign.

Kerri Smith is also a Resident of East Roseland Drive. She did not see the Petition and she has a difficult time understanding how 85% of Residents on the Street could knowingly sign that Petition understanding what was before them. That sign will add 10 additional minutes to get through the traffic lights and go around to the back end of the Street. It will add stress to their commute and to the Throat.

Darryl tells them that if one, or three, or perhaps more were under the impression that they will be excluded from the restriction, which the City cannot do, if that is what they were told and they signed the Petition believing that then the document has no validity. That is a cause for concern. Ms. Smith has asked the Board if they could be given more time to have an opportunity to talk to their neighbors because she really doubts all of the Residents on the Street would willingly sign it.

Ms. Marshall returned to the Meeting without the Petition. She is insisting she gave it to the Board and asked Brian if he put it in his briefcase. She does not know how it could have disappeared.

Brian summarized what the Board has at this point; we have the emails from the City certifying the signatures on the Petition and the agreement from City traffic engineers that the No Right Turn can be installed because the criteria was met, we have two Residents from East Roseland Drive opposing the traffic sign citing hardship, we have an unknown Resident who called Tom and told him he signed a Petition that had wording on it exempting Residents from the traffic restriction, we do not have Petitions that anyone signed. Darryl considers the request from Kerri Smith and Betsy McClendon to allow them some time to talk to their Neighbors about what it is they believed they signed. Until the Board is satisfied that 85% of the Residents of East Roseland Drive understand the ramifications of that No Right Turn sign; that they are not exempted from the No Right Turn, the Board cannot take any Action on it at this time.

Motion to Continue to July Meeting to give Residents of E. Roseland Drive the opportunity to come before LJ&T and say this is what everyone understood when they signed the Petition and they understand they will not be excused from the No Right Turn onto their Street: Tschirn, Second: Brady 7-0-0

Agenda Item 2: All-Way Stop at Olivetas and Sea Lane Intersection- City endorsed change in response to a resident request (Ira Parker) **Action Item**

Resident Ira Parker came to our Board and noted during Public Comment a safety problem at the referenced intersection. As a result, Dave referred the matter to City Transportation Staff and their evaluation concluded an all-way stop was warranted:

At the request of a member of the community, we evaluated the intersection of Olivetas Avenue and Sea Lane for the installation of stop signs. This email is to inform you that this intersection met the criteria established in Council Policy 200-08 for the installation of all-way stops. (Council Policy 200-08; In order to get a Stop Sign established the City has a checklist of features and characteristics for the intersection and traffic engineers assign points, called warrants, to these various characteristics. An Intersection needs 20 points to warrant a Stop Sign).

Mr. Parker described the intersection of Olivetas Ave and Sea Lane. Sea Lane is a one -way lane starting at Sea Lane Beach and heading east towards La Jolla Boulevard. There is a Stop Sign on Sea Lane at the corner of Olivetas Ave. Olivetas Ave runs parallel to La Jolla Boulevard going north-south. There is a Stop Sign on Olivetas at Sea Lane heading north bound towards Pearl Street. There is not a Stop Sign on Olivetas heading south bound towards Windnsea. Drivers coming up Sea Lane and stopping at Olivetas Ave mistakenly assume that drivers on Olivetas heading south bound have a stop sign, which is not the case. For safety reasons there needs to be a Stop Sign on that side of Olivetas Ave heading south bound making that intersection a three way Stop. Mr. Parker has lived near

that intersection for over 25 years and has seen impaired drivers, road rage and near misses. He spoke to Dave at one LJ&T meeting and then spoke to City Staff. City Traffic Engineers evaluated the intersection and expedited proceedings for the Stop Sign. It appears there should have always been a Stop Sign on that side of Olivetas heading south bound.

Tom commented that there is the Stop Sign on Olivetas heading north but there is a Yield sign on the street heading south. Mr. Parker advises that the Yield sign is not at the intersection with Sea Lane but at the intersection with Marine Street.

**Motion to Approve All-Way Stop at Olivetas Ave at Sea Lane Intersection: Brady, Second: Tschirn
7-0-0**

Agenda Item 3: Taste at the Cove- Request by San Diego Sports Medicine Foundation for Temporary No Parking on Coast Blvd adjacent to Scripps Park for the 17th annual event on Wednesday August 29, 2018 (Kira Finkenberg)
Action Item

Dr. David Chao is presenting for Kira Finkenberg.

The 17th Annual Taste of the Cove will be held on Wednesday, August 29. The event is the signature fundraiser for the San Diego Sports Medicine Foundation. The mission of the San Diego Sports Medicine Foundation is to provide a medical safety net for injured youth with limited financial means in order to return them back to health, life and sports.

Dr. David Chao advised the Board that nothing has changed from previous years events. The City asked them not to do everything on the day of the Event out of respect for the neighbors so they unload the bigger equipment the night before, the remainder of the load in on the actual day of the Event and load out the morning after the Event. They request No Parking on Coast Boulevard adjacent to Scripps Park beginning the afternoon of Tuesday August 28th 12:00 PM for set up of the larger equipment; Wednesday August 29 the actual day of the Event, until Thursday morning August 30 for final load out and clean up. Valet Service by Ace Parking will be provided for everyone who requests the service.

Dr. Chao clarified that the No Parking are for the parking spaces adjacent to Scripps Park directly across from La Jolla Cove Hotel and Suites. One side of the No Parking is for their Load in and Load out and the other side is for Valet Service, they will need parking spaces to keep the cars off the Boulevard.

Tom asked Bill Robbins about the Event being in the Park. Bill responded there have been some issues with limo's and valets parking in the Lifeguard parking spaces but it gets worked out. There is a walk through the day before their Event and Event Planners are very cooperative. Bill stated they try to keep the Park open for everyone and Dr. Chao clarified they use only one portion of the Park. Their footprints are not huge.

Sheila asked about the Event spanning three days. Three days of No Parking will cause a significant impact to the businesses located in the area. Dr. Chao explained that they need three days for the load in before the Event, for the day of the Event, and then for load out the day after their Event. Their Event starts at 5:30 pm until 8:30 pm. They are mindful of the noise generating from their load out being in close proximity to La Jolla Cove Hotel and Suites so they load out the morning after their Event. Bill supported what Dr. Chao is saying about the noise. Load out is noisy, the Hotel is directly across the street and all noise has to stop at 10:00pm not leaving the Event much time to load out. Its also beneficial to load out in the daylight so they can see things that may have been missed in the dark.

Brian asked about the parking closures on the map extending to what appears to be La Valencia and Sheila is also concerned about the amount of parking spaces that is needed over those three days. The map showed parking closures around the restaurants in that area which was a cause for concern. Dr. Chao explained those additional No Parking areas on the map is just the overall arrangement for one afternoon. They will not need the additional

parking spaces the day before the Event or the day after the Event but those three days have to be covered in the Event permits to avoid confusion over what day and time they will actually be needed. Dr. Chao clarified only the La Jolla Cove Hotel and Suites will feel the most impact and they sponsor their Event.

Motion to Approve Taste at the Cove request for No Parking on Coast Blvd adjacent to Scripps Park for the 17th annual event held on Wednesday August 29, 2018: Tschirn, Second: Warwick 7-0-0

Agenda Item 5: Nominations from the floor for positions of Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Secretary:

Chairperson: Dave Abrams nominated by Tom, second by Nancy
Vice Chairperson: Brian Earley nominated by Patrick, second by Darryl
Secretary: Donna Aprea, nominated by Nancy, second by Tom

Election of Officers take place at the next Regular Meeting in July.

Agenda Item 6: Report from Transit Subcommittee (Cont'd Item) Status update from Group exploring possible use of funds for Shuttle Bus to Mid-Coast Trolley and possible changes to La Jolla bus routes (Dan Allen) **Discussion Item**

Dan is unable to attend our Meeting but provided his subcommittee report which Brain read to the Board and Audience Members:

MTS will begin formal process of feeder bus planning for the extended Trolley (aka Mid-Coast LRT, Blue Line extension, north line Trolley, MCT) in August. Community input will be part of the process. A list of cognizant L J community groups would be helpful.

The extended Trolley will significantly alter transit patterns in the La Jolla, North University City and Pacific Beach areas now served by Route #30. A "game changer".

Some changes will necessarily wait to see what develops spontaneously. MTS had problematic experience with initial bus route changes when the east line Trolley began operation in 2005.

That the L J Community Plan addresses shuttle service to and from the extended Trolley is acknowledged.

SANDAG is working on the 2019 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

MTS's feeder bus planning will be based on no increase in overall bus funding. (Maybe this is an issue for the community to address; possibly through the RTP.) There will be some savings if the extended trolley supplants Route #150. Greater frequency of bus service than generally experienced now would not be expected.

Feeder service to and from the southern end of La Jolla would at first glance seem to use the Balboa & Morena trolley transit center. However, there is the huge problem of efficiently (as far as travel time) getting through the intersection of Garnet & Mission Bay Drive.

For northern La Jolla, including the village center, the most direct transfer to the Trolley using the existing Route #30 appears to be the V.A. stop. The closest as the crow flies will be the Nobel stop, which could be served by a re-routed #30. A problem is that the V.A. and Nobel stations are not transit centers. Their designs do not provide easy bus transfers. The alternative of transfer at the UTC transit center is that it sends the bus rider and the Trolley rider in out of the way directions, thus lengthening transit time for most trips.

Adjournment: 5:23 pm

Next Meeting: July 18, 2018

Respectfully Submitted: Donna Aprea, Secretary