

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday Nov 19, 2019 – 4:00 pm
La Jolla Recreation Center – 615 Prospect Street, Room 1
La Jolla, California

-
1. *Public comments are an opportunity to share your opinion with the committee members. Comments should not be directed at the applicant team*
 2. *Plans are available for in-depth review by contacting the project manager at the city's Development Services Department before the meeting.*
 3. *Public comments will be strictly limited to 2 minutes per person. Please review the following meeting minutes. If another member of the public has already said the same thing tonight or at a previous meeting, please move on to new information. It is not necessary to repeat previous comments.*
 4. **Applicants:** *Please present your project as succinctly as possible. Speak clearly and CONCISELY.*
-

Attendance: Collins, Costello, Fremdling, Gaenzle, Jackson, Leira, Welsh, Will
Absent: Kane

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

- Meeting Nov 12, 2019
-

3. FINAL REVIEW - 11/19/2019

Project Name: Pearl Mixed Use– 801 Pearl St
Permits: CDP
Project No.: 638970 DPM: Will Zounes
Zone: RM-1-1 Applicant: David Bourne
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/638970>

LA JOLLA- (Process 2)*AFFORDABLE HOUSING EXPEDITE PROGRAM* CDP to clear the site of a demolished service station, to construct a 20,595 SF 2 story mixed use building consists of 2 retail units, & 26 residential rental units with on grade garage. The project will include 2 affordable housing units, located at 801 Pearl Street. The 0.48-acre site is in Zone 4 of La Jolla Planned District, the RM-1-1 Zone & Coastal Overlay (non-appealable 2) of the La Jolla Community Plan Area. Council District 1.

11/12/2019 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION (Bourne, Murfey, Charles)

- Certain parts of LJ are less than attractive, intend to build something beautiful and LJ can be proud of. Assembled a top notch team to build something positive.
- Need: LJ rents are expensive and very few new units
- Why not build the previous 12 unit condo project? Current proposed is a better fit to needs in LJ, smaller total area, smaller commercial space, similar residential area.
- Result will be less traffic, attractive building.
- Walkable effective retail, Fewer inhabitants than previous 12 unit condos,
- Designed to accommodate future generations, young professionals, teachers, fireman, police can live in the community they serve.
- Some units will be partially subterranean
- At grade parking off Eads not visible
- Trash on Bishops Ln
- 4' grade differential
- 6 ground level units with basement in back (South)
- 18' from back of building to rear (South) PL
- 6 units at rear 400sf on grade, + 400 sf basement
- Entry to second floor NE corner, outdoor open to sky circulation between units.
- Upstairs 4 units over commercial on Pearl
- 2 2 - bedrooms along Eads and Bishops each
- 3 1- bedrooms open towards the interior of lot
- 6 studios along the rear property
- Balcony each 4 facing Pearl
- Stucco, split face CMU, Glass, Tile, Metal
- Two balconies on Bishop's Ln; Screened parking enclosure
- Eads St – Open garage entry; two balconies, plus outdoor BBQ common area at corner of Eads/Pearl
- 12-10 floor to floor, 14 floor to ceiling, just under 30' at upper limit
- SDGE easement at SE corner, 10' x 47' loading zone
- No back door to commercial
- Turnaround space in covered garage.
- ADA along streets and sidewalk, from parking, out to street. ADA only provided at ground floor units from ramp and back walkway – no elevator access anywhere
- 5 spaces for retail provided. 18 spaces for residential for 26 units.
- Applicant would like to see bus connection to trolley, willing to support, however will follow.

11/12/2019 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Orvis – density is too much, too many units, furnished implies transient in nature, we don't want that. Not family oriented. Eads is already a parking dilemma
- Amorosa – Any plan to change traffic on Pearl, new light? Other? (applicant does not know), seen many accidents, nearly hit daily. Incredibly concerning from safety standpoint. (Kane: what traffic improvements could be made?) Amorosa doesn't know either. Too much going on.
- Hammond: I was hit at this intersection, unprotected.
- Wolfgang: Need a project on this lot. Gas station is not it. Prior proposal was better. Too dense. Increased traffic on Eads will be substantial. Turning left out of that driveway will cause accidents. Trucks will impact Bishop's Ln. Been hit at this intersection. Will hurt property values. Eads already has small rental units and this project will affect those rates.

- Moranville: requests a traffic study, last study done on a Sunday. Need to see school day congestion.
- Anastazi: Speed on Eads is excessive, Racing to beat stop light, retail space abundance of vacancy in LJ. No parking good luck getting tenants. (Applicant must do retail, not by choice, but proposing smaller commercial footage than previous design)
- Hammond: Red curb on Pearl? Currently red between gas station curb cuts. Will they add parking on Pearl? (Applicant: closing curb cuts will increase safety.) Probably no parking there.
- Hammond: Biking on Pearl is very dangerous, please do not propose parking that would narrow Pearl further. Question about climate/green (Applicant: 2 EV charging stations, Meet/Exceed T24, San Diego CAP – Climate Action Plan, No solar currently proposed. Construction environmental sensitivity, diverted from landfill) How many bedrooms? (30 bedrooms total) Only 23 parking spaces.
- Wolfgang: How many parking spaces in previous project? (40)
- Moranville: Condition of soil with respect to contaminants (Applicant: Former tanks were relatively new, tanks removed, additional potential contaminants, County has Voluntary Action Plan, you have to build a project, county monitors soil excavation and removal, and then will provide clearance, overseen by county Health Department)
- Thompson: Why furnished? (App: Don't want overly large furniture brought in, damage and disruption. They will look better "staged". Young or young at heart walking residents, modern lifestyle.
- Anon: Concerned with short term rentals. (App.: There will NOT be short term rental.) Will there be a resident manager? (App. Yes. Higher sales prices – lower cap - for apartments than for hotel.)

11/12/2019 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Costello – PDO requires 600 sf loading zone.
- Costello – Bacteria likely degrades hydrocarbons over the past 10 years.
- Jackson –
 - Physical impact of building, but not out of character from Pearl
 - Logistics of use, parking, traffic, concerned about parking
 - Looks like a hotel, Short-term rental ... that's worrisome
- Jackson – Can applicant propose traffic safety ideas, if only as a proof of concept?
- Kane – Commercial is not so robust downtown. Anything DPR can do to increase housing? We need affordable housing, not more vacant retail. Can we assist with variance from PDO?
- Will – Comments about increased density, increased residents might improve LJ retail. Young people do not want single ownership cars. Ace parking is preparing for a paradigm shift.
- Kane – moderating a webinar regarding housing situation, need something new, up-zoning increasing density along transportation corridors. Why isn't it being built? This is a nice building, still need to see how it addresses the transition to SFR to the South. Thank you to the team to add density in an attractive manner.

11/12/2019 – DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION

- Bring full-size drawings
- Demonstrate how back of project interfaces/transitions with adjacent residential to South
- Demonstrate vehicular circulation and parking
- Satellite/Aerial photos
- Streetscape montage along Eads
- South elevation
- Traffic Study – and proposed solutions?

- Materials Board
- Landscape Plan
- Location of Bus Stops
- Cross section N/S showing building and adjacent residential to South
- Consider making a note on the project title sheet that you will not make short term rentals (less than 30 days)
- Streetscape montage (with your project along Pearl).
- Cross Sections to demonstrate relative massing
- Think about how we can help you to eliminate retail requirement.

11/19/2019 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION (Bourne, Murfey, Charles, McCullough)

- Bourne moved here 37 years ago. Always in real estate. Introduced team.
- Mixed Use by AVRPA architects, 26 units, 24 market rate plus 2 affordable (by city definition) units
- Mixed Use project in a mixed use commercial zone (not a residential zone).
- 3200sf of commercial, wish we could do less, but required by PDO. Previous project had 5400 sf of commercial, increasing parking demand and daily “trips”. Current project reduces the demand. 23 parking spaces on the site within the building envelope. Environmentally sensitive not to go underground parking. Strict parking will free all 23 spaces for residential dedicated parking after 6 pm.
- 2015 traffic study done by Chan/Ryan traffic engineers. Average daily trips when gas station was almost 600. Previous projects was about ½ that. Current project is similar ... approx. ½ the daily trips as gas station. No parking issue and no traffic issue ... net reduction when compared to gas station.
- Would like to promote diagonal parking on Eads to increase parking by as much as 10 spaces.
- Gas station currently has 5 curb cuts, proposed project will have 1. Creates parking increase and increasing safety ... no curb cuts on busy Pearl (1 on Eads).
- The project conforms with all regulations: land use, zoning, environmental (voluntary action plan to monitor and mitigate contamination from former gas station)
- Project is NOT a big Air BNB. Pride of ownership long term hold for Bourne’s family. 12 month leases. Desire 0 vacancy. Happy tenants reduce vacancy, minimize costs, increase profits. No interest in any kind of hotel/motel/AirBNB. Traditional apartment project. Profitability depends on good tenants (no partiers, no drug users, well vetted, evicted if problematic)
- Why build this and not previously approved, it didn’t pencil out, luxury condos on busy noisy street like Pearl. Desired high quality rental property. City of SD wants to increase small size units to help solve housing problem. (Bourne) read the LJ community plan ... (“additional density for more affordable units”, “promote public transit”, “promote ... low/moderate income housing”, SANDAG 2020 forecast LJ will have 3500 low paying retail jobs” “these people should have an opportunity to live in the community they serve ... reduce traffic congestion” “increase affordable housing density” “provide density bonus for affordability approved by housing commission” “seek to promote pedestrian orientation and mixed use development in all commercial areas” “promote at transportation nodes”.
- The city is encouraging this project, La Jolla needs this. We need appropriate rental housing. Luxury apartments, \$2000/mo studios, up to \$4000/mo multi-bedroom, these are going to be good neighbors
- (Ryan Murfey) streetscape montage. Massing sections along Pearl and along Eads
- (Russ Murfey) shared additional exhibits

- Pearl has been problematic, eliminating 4 curb cuts drastically improves safety
- Traffic statistics
- His company re-built LJ Blvd and Nautilus building to transform and rejuvenate that site
- Less commercial trips due to smaller commercial area compared to previously approved
- (David McCullough)
 - Currently 2 trees on property, Mexican Palm and Evergreen Pearl will remain
 - Adding 4 jacaranda along pearl, Adding 4 street trees on Eads,
 - trees on-site as well, goal to create separation from street to sidewalk, planter row along street
 - vertical (hedge) to south side of property between neighboring residences
- Charles Brighton (Architect)
 - Reviewed site massing sections
 - Reviewed floor plans, parking with turn-around, curb-cut further from intersection
 - 6 one bedroom units at grade with basement (accessible and adaptable units) – small light wells for each.
 - SDGE easement at SE corner, loading area and trash off Bishops Ln
 - 2nd floor residential, circulation is exterior open to the sky, 4 2-bedrooms, 10 1-bedrooms, 6 studios.
 - Elevations: description and identification of interior spaces behind each, plus materials pallet
 - Building sections: Building sinks in at lowest elevation on lot, vertical planting buffer at South, 18' setback at rear. (15' required) to improve transition to residential.
 - 3' planter (for tall screen), 3'6" walkway, 12' private patio
 - 6'-7' wide walkways on second floor.
 - 2 stairs from second floor (NE corner and SE corner)
 - Hoping for quasi-retail, keep office limited.
 - Not currently planning mechanical on roof.
 - No idea if PV panels. Not currently
 - Two full-size trash dumpsters
 - Loading zone is 420 sf, using an incentive approved by city to reduce the loading zone size
- Bourne
 - Accessible units are in the back, on the main level
 - No plans for condo conversion, low income units must stay affordable as rentals for 55 years
 - Affordable studio \$850/mo, 1 bedroom \$950/mo
 - Unknown if parking will be assigned or first come first served, have not determined rules
 - 5 required for commercial during the day will be assigned
 - Likely assigned for residential
 - We believe there are at least 24 people who want to live in La Jolla who have 1 or 0 cars
 - Goal is residents who live and work in the village, walk to work.
 - 2 affordable units, not 3 per cycle issue error.

11/19/2019 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- 2 emails
- Marandal – is the parking accurate? (applicant: redesigned to add additional so current 23 spaces is accurate), retaining wall is on subject property. 12 units on south side of property, not enough buffer
- Wolfgang – Are they all furnished? (app: currently considering this for aesthetic appeal, big furniture will make undesirable, subject to market demand) Height of South units? (approx. 28-29')

Is parking under residential units, is it covered (yes, on grade) Prefer that there be no left turn allowed out of driveway onto Eads. Believe traffic necessitates a change to traffic light at Pearl/Eads. Many accidents there. Not a fan of diagonal parking on Eads. (app: that was a suggestion as an option for the neighborhood, not part of this project)

- Penel – echo Wolfgang comments, Will this project go to T&T? (no), Dangerous intersection. Trucks park twice/day at liquor store. Trucks can't get down Bishops Ln with current construction. Left turn lane could be better. How can you discriminate against 2 car renters. Concerned about safety. T&T should weigh in. A lot has changed since last traffic study.
- Orvis – Concerned at lack of parking, no longer necessarily fully furnished, concerned fully furnished means transient/short-term rentals, will subletting be allowed?
- Brailean – 19 yr LJ'an, appreciate 2 affordable units, appreciate 50% median income affordability, encourage to work with housing commission and cooperate with her organization and help with homeless organization. Need to house them.
- Cannell – Will parking have gate (yes), Flooding on Pearl concern? (all have sump pumps)
- Moler – neighbor and echo support of first two emails, not a fan of first project, this team appears to care about this project. In support, live just down the street. Project has to have density. We have to accept common logic and want to support projects that can be profitable and benefit the community. (applicant: similar site at LJ Blvd and Gravilla and I'm in escrow to buy that site. It has been a disgrace to LJ for 25 years, if projects can't pencil out then they will never get built. Site on Pearl is a disgrace and this is the only project that pencils out)
- Ahern – Support micro-housing, Segal just finished a project downtown with no parking, this is coming to provide housing, this is a benefit to our community, a workforce that doesn't commute in on Torrey Pines. We need to have more people to increase energy, increase retail viable, revitalize this community. In support on this corridor
- Neal – 6 units have underground bedrooms, will they have sump pumps (yes)
- Douglas - Support the project, not a fan of furnished units, prefer to see year plus lease, would like to see fireman, teachers, police. They shouldn't have to commute from Temecula
- Wampler – Commend you for trying to do high density, Does affordable housing require 10% (app: 11% of base density) would prefer to see 4 affordable units. (smaller units are more affordable without necessarily being “affordable”.)
- Anon – Is it optional to present to T&T? (app: Very incremental increase to current and significant decrease from previous use. Streets have high capacity, the city decides if we have to go, decided against because of small impact to busy streets, cycle letter from city states it is not required)
- Mitchell – How much will market rate apartments (They will be market rate ... projecting in pro-forma that \$2000 for studios up to \$3800-4000 for 2-bedrooms) Concerns those rates are too high and may have to pursue other business options, air BnB. (applicant: on a similar property they made a lease agreement that no sublet will be allowed.) The Collins is lovely. (Similar rents are currently being achieved at The Collins)
- Merryweather – Wish these new project looked more like La Jolla. Red tile, cottages? Would like to see historic fabric. (app: majority of people appreciate the aesthetic)
- Hammond – Grew up here, appreciate locals on the team, Transportation study is not required. Is this based on a notion that tenants will have a less vehicle oriented lifestyle. (applicant: no, calculated per city standards, we expect far fewer, there is a whole generation coming up who don't want to be tied to a car. Environmentally sensitive.) Has the number changed since 2015 (app: no)
- Will trash truck block street or sidewalk? (app: no)

11/19/2019 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Leira – I like your project, very creative, some physical flaws like trash area inadequate and not called out. Like to consider these items. Pearl street can handle more density than zoning allows. Current proposal almost doubles number of units. What do we get back for this projects. Two low income units is too little. Increase in density should be mostly dedicated to 9 and 13 low income units. Cumulative impact on Pearl street, what if there are more of these. Agree we should shed the car but then we should also provide adequate pedestrian sidewalks. pearl is not adequate today more room for pedestrian should be given perhaps by setting the building ground floor back further. In the meantime we will have some headaches. We need to start making more room for pedestrians. 4' sidewalks are not adequate. Cities are too auto oriented, give more space for pedestrian. Creates a precedent to encourage future projects to do the same. the obvious cumulative impact should be analyzed
 - Applicant: Flaw in logic about doubling density, 2x units however significantly smaller units will generate significantly fewer tenants. Significantly less than previous project.
 - Leira – no problem with mass and building the problem is the doubling of units
 - Applicant: 9 affordable units would never pencil out, nothing will ever be built. Affordable units set at state level.

LEIRA - IF LAND IS TOO EXPENSIVE, THE PRESENT OWNER SHOULD BE SO ADVISED AND LOWER THE COST. THAT IS HOW THE MARKET IS SUPPOSED TO WORK.

- Gaenzle – If I and my husband wanted to rent with two cars would we be allowed? No. LJ had low income house on Beaumont, city sold it. Appreciate low-income, wish we had more. Giving up a lot for it. Used to be in-lieu fee. Building similar in college towns, pay extra for parking, but bus is every 15 minutes and a car is not necessary. These cities have public transportation. Sometimes it took 1.5 hours to get to Mesa from LJ by bus. We need buses and public transportation that works. This is not the place for this type of use. Can't support with this parking. Tenants will want to park on Eads.
- Welsh – Density is a big question. Consideration of tenants, how to get to your unit with a broken ankle or full groceries. Elevator would be helpful. Concerned about sub-terranean units. We all would like to see low income housing. Lots of small back cottages behind homes on Eads. Almost everyone has this in that block. Intrusive, but this is what our society needs.
- Collins – Project carefully thought about, few problems, in support of project. (then left the room)
- Costello – Do better by pulling away from Southern neighbors. Community Plan asks for transition. Can't forget about people who live there currently. Current cycles do not show reduced loading zone is approved. Would like to see that cleared. Traffic Plan in Bird Rock, businesses insisted no loading zones on LJ Blvd, then complained no loading zone. Loading zones are important. PDO probably has too much retail space. Did you reach out to Debra Marengo to discuss changing that requirement. (app: not yet, PDO needs to be changed) Received confirmation of loading zone reduction "Incentive 1" on Title Sheet. Withdraw that concern. Request for a commitment on Exhibit A not to allow short-term rental for less than 30 days.
 - Applicant: I will not put a restriction on my property "just because"
 - Costello: Will not vote for this project if you do not.
 - Applicant: if the question is will we conform with the law? yes we will. Hotel/motel is NOT currently allowed in PDO 4.)
 - Will: chair asked Costello if it was appropriate to make a requirement outside the scope of the Land Development Code or the Community Plan a condition of his vote.

- Costello: refused to withdraw condition.
- Fremdling – Commend the team on a handsome thought out project, I could live there. I would like to see elevator to second floor. Disgusted by vacant retail in LJ, would prefer to see common space too for units, gym, rec room, lounge, hope it passes. Applicant stated last week that building will have a resident manager, manager would know who is coming and going. Will law enforcement enforce short term requirements. (app: There is a common area in the NW corner)
- Jackson – Tension in LJ between constancy and viability of community moving forward, our role is to balance that tension. Do the parameters of this project advance the goals of keeping LJ vibrant moving forward. Historic Society has a beautiful exhibit on modern treasures in LJ. This project deals with these tensions in a creative way. There is a trust issue in LJ. “Hotels and AirBnB” The law doesn’t get enforced. All projects have consequences, but the project should not have to address them all. This intersection is a nightmare before or after this project. It is not a burden on this project. This is a really good project that does good things for LJ.
- Will – I am saddened to see the state of LJ. We used to have businesses that supported basic services. Now we have tourist T-shirt shops. We need to embrace a walkable future and one that is less dependent on automobiles. This project addresses both issues. By increasing residential density in the village you will create a demand for those basic services that we are losing. Burns drugs, Jergenson’s. We can’t wait for our dependence on automobiles to go away before we build the infrastructure that encourages walking. We need to build it now. This project should serve as a prototype for further residential housing in the commercial districts of LJ to improve energy and vitality. That provide housing for the people that work in our village so that the don’t have to commute in on Torrey Pines every morning and tie up even more parking. We are not talking about density in a residential part of La Jolla. This is on the busiest throughway in our entire community. Torrey Pines to Girard to Pearl to LJ Blvd is the only main artery that travels through LJ and a public transit corridor. There is no better place to increase density, provide needed low and mid-income housing and stimulate the revitalization of our community than here. I am sure there will be unanticipated hardships as we embrace new projects like this, but it is what we have to do to preserve a viable community into the future.

11/19/2019 – COMMITTEE MOTION

- Findings CAN be made (Jackson/Fremdling)
- In Favor: Jackson, Fremdling
- Opposed: Costello, Welsh, Gaenzle, Leira
- Abstain: Will (as chair)
- Did not vote: Collins (left the meeting prior to conclusion)
- Motion FAILS (2-4-1)

Applicant left the room to strategize: Applicant Returned:

11/19/2019 – DISCUSSION

- Applicant: Reiterated that we want good long term tenants, at the same time we are property owners and we will not give up rights over and above the law. How to show we are sincere with respect to short term rentals without indefinitely restricting property rights.
- Jackson: clarify that this isn’t an issue with current owner, but what IF conditions evolve that current owner must sell.
- Applicant: Is this appropriate? Committee need to vote per the rules.

11/19/2019 – COMMITTEE MOTION

- Findings CANNOT be made because intensification of density above the base zoning density is not appropriate to the level of affordable housing provided and does not achieved the desired benefit per the community plan. 2 units is not enough. Additionally the transition to lower density residential directly to the South is not adequate. (Leira/Costello)
- In Favor: Costello, Welsh, Gaenzle, Leira
- Opposed: Jackson, Fremdling
- Abstain: Will (as chair)
- Did not vote: Collins (left the meeting prior to conclusion)
- Motion PASSES (4-2-1)

4. FINAL REVIEW 11/19/2019

Project Name: La Jolla Mesa – 5911 La Jolla Mesa
Permits: CDP/SDP
Project No.: 639439 DPM: Xavier Del Valle
Zone: RS-1-2 Applicant: Tripp Bennett
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/639439>

LA JOLLA - (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for an addition to an existing 4,135 SF one-story single family residence over a basement at 5911 La Jolla Mesa Dr. The scope includes construction of a 1,175 SF master suite to the existing home, and a 907 SF companion unit over a basement. The 0.77-acre site contains ESL, and is in the RS-1-2 Zone and the Coastal (Non-APP. 1) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan Area, and Council District 1.

8/13/2019 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- The applicant requested to record this meeting. (no objection, applicant will share recording with Julie Hamilton)
- Building permit in place for existing one story, Active CCRs in place, CCRs don't allow second floor so project has to go out. Some back and forth with CCR jury, current clients have kids and want that extra footprint and accessory building. These were on the plans approved by CCR jury. They went back again to CCR jury and they were approved again.
- Site drops away from the street level.
- Addition at basement level. Single story at street level, then basement walk out and extends as single story at lower area where no floor above.
- FAR .21, 6,906 gross (includes all basement area), 33,815 lot size
- Roof deck from main street level, over extension of basement
- Detached companion unit even though no kitchen.
- Wood siding shingles and stone.
- Nothing proposed is taller than existing as viewed from neighborhood/street

8/13/2019 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Julie Hamilton:
 - Portion of these lots is designated parks and open space, need to see boundary before anything else.
 - Requested no roof deck of applicant, if done, requested cable or glass rail.
 - Companion unit is now 8' taller than previously reviewed
 - Serial permitting is a concern
 - Concerned about their private views being blocked.
 - Months of review and concerned if there are changes, would like more time to review.
 - Previously, there was good communication, recent activity has had less communication.
 - Serial permitting even if a CDP still requires excess burden on neighbors
- John Frangos
 - LLC has owned this property since April 2016
 - Hillside review zone across my lot (per existing plans) would like to know where that line continues on subject property
 - CCRs/HOA: original plans were reasonable, then some more, then some more. Feb 2018 approval letter from CCR review, some elements have shifted since then.
 - Request story poles for latest revision of cabana.
 - Pool has risen in height, requires massive earth movement. 11' higher?
 - Would like to know more about drainage
 - Concerned about roof deck

8/13/2019 – COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

- See deliverables only

8/13/2019 – DELIVER FOR NEXT TIME

- Land use open space designation boundary
- Hillside Review boundary
- Satellite image wider
- Cross section to demonstrate recent grading
- Section showing 6' solid front wall proposed
- Do not want to see HOA/CCR issues unless tied to staff cycles.
- Layman's exhibit on drainage

8/20/2019 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- Clients are here today.
- Reviewed requested Deliverables
 - Open space boundary (planners say to default to ESL, city will request a covenant of easement. "red" Overlay confirming line for ESL. Development within 5' proposed ESL line.
 - Hillside Review defers to "Steep Hillsides" based on 25% for 50 feet or taller or 200% slope 10' tall.
 - Reviewed satellite views
 - Site sections: towards street and each longitudinal with neighboring homes shaded in. nothing proposed taller than street level. All down hill.
 - 6' solid wall replaced with 3' solid rock and 2' open on top. This is new and needs to go through CCR committee although less than previous. Trying to mimic neighbor. Wall is 2' back from PL with 2' planting.
 - Drainage: Collect and route to rip rap dissipator. Discharging to landscaped area.

8/20/2019 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Julie Hamilton:
 - Development should minimize disturbance to hillside. Worried about natural features.
 - 10' between deck and edge of ESL. Building is further out than neighbor's buildings.
- Kiara O'Shea (owner): grade was going to hinder wishlist. Pool at grade would be 20'+ down from main house. Would not be used. Want to look for long-term livability.
- JohnFrangos: CCR approved plans have pool and cabana, it was fine with me. It was 5' lower. Disagrees with city determination of where open space line occurs.
- Stacy Kanaan: CCR juror and neighbor. Architect has been cooperative up until ... discussion of CCR approvals and private view concerns. Concerned about scale of project and harmony with neighbors. Will there be some way for neighbors to talk about it with applicant team?
- Ziegfried Reicht: what if everyone did that? No other structures go out that far
- Julie Hamilton: Began in 2016. Changes were being made and did not know until 11th hour. Would like to resolve this between neighbors.

8/20/2019 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Leira: consider less solid and more open front wall/fence.
- Leira: can you add pervious pavers around pool? (applicant's engineer: They are problematic)

8/20/2019 – DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION

- Discuss issues with neighbors
- Look at alternative to fit within slope like lowering the pool and cabana.

11/19/2019 – APPLICANT DID NOT PRESENT