



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board
APPROVED Meeting Minutes for May 18, 2022
Online Virtual Meeting

Board Member	Attendance	Board Member	Attendance
Jane Potter, Chair	Present	Herbert Lazerow	Present
Andrea Moser	Present	Suzanne Weissman	Present
Kathleen Neil	Present		

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Potter called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Potter welcomed new Board Member Kathleen Neil to the Advisory Board who was appointed by the Mayor and recently confirmed by the City Council.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Adoption of the May 18, 2022 agenda approved unanimously: 5-0-0. Motion approved.

3. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 20, 2022 MEETING MINUTES:

Chairman Potter indicated that written revisions to the April minutes were forwarded by Board Member Lazerow which were clarified by the Board Member. Chairman Potter added that the heading of the minutes to reflect that the meeting is an "online virtual meeting, similar to the agenda.

Motion: Board Member Weissman moved to approve minutes with changes, seconded by Board Member Moser: 4-0-1. Board Member Neil abstaining. Motion approved.

4. Non-agenda public comment:

Staff indicated that there was written public comment received from Angelina Reinecke and Taku Tokuyasu related to continued construction activity at 8289 La Jolla Scenic Drive North despite an existing code enforcement issue. Mr. Tokuyasu provided verbal comments expressing concerns over the property and what could be done to address the ongoing construction activity. Ms. Reinecke was not able to provide verbal comments, but her letter was read into the record by staff expressing similar concerns at 8289 La Scenic Drive North. The Advisory Board directed the residents to contact Neighborhood Code Compliance and the Council District 1 Office, as well as to request that the La Jolla Community Planning Association (LJCPA) send a letter to the Council Office on their behalf.

5. PROJECT REVIEW:

**ACTION ITEM A – PTS 689010 - Al Haja ADU and Addition
8458 Cliffridge Avenue**

Presentation on the project given by applicant Yoftahe Ghilia, which included the proposed site plan and 3-D renderings from various perspectives of the project.

Board Comment:

- It was noted that there is a considerable amount of retaining wall proposed with the project. The applicant mentioned that the highest point of the retaining wall would be approximately 7 feet, with the average being approximately 5 feet.
The applicant explained that the retaining walls support the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and provide access to it.
- The proposed ADU addition did not appear to be significantly impacting the nature trail since it's below grade.
- The applicant was asked if any contact was made with surrounding neighbors, to which the applicant indicated that the neighbors were informed and did not have any issue with the proposed project.
- It was indicated that the proposed ADU is located in a high fire severity zone, to which the Applicant mentioned that the ADU would meet the fire rating requirements in the building code and that no sprinklers were required.
- The proposed project demonstrated good utilization of the lot and that the 2nd floor deck placement would not be in an area that would look into another neighbor's property.
- The project appears big and involves a lot of changes.
- Reservations about the project were expressed and it was mentioned that although there was not a lot of additional square footage, a lot of work was involved.

- A concern was expressed regarding the project's effect (ADU and retaining wall) on the nearby nature trail.
- It was noted that the trail was located further up and away from the project and did not appear frequently used or that it may be closed.
- Questions were raised with regard to documenting community awareness of the project, to which the applicant mentioned that his project did go before the La Jolla Community Planning Association (LJCPA). Staff indicated per the LJCPA minutes, that the project went before the Project Review Committee (PRC) in March and then to the LJCPA in April where it was approved on consent. Based on this process, it appeared that the project did have sufficient notice despite being a Process 1.
- It was mentioned that the retaining walls included with the project could help with erosion and that the ADU was done in a low-profile design.

Public Comment: Staff indicated that no written public comment was been received on this project.

Motion: Board Member Neil moved that the project be considered minor as a Process 1 seconded by Board Member Weissman: 5-0-0. Motion approved.

**ACTION ITEM B – PTS 698729 – Dorado Court
7989 Dorado Court**

Presentation on the project given by applicant Katy Hamilton which included photos of existing conditions, renderings of the proposed addition, remodel of the exterior of the residence, and site plan.

Board Comment:

- It was questioned whether a Process 2 Coastal Development Permit (CDP) required notification to neighbors. The Applicant indicated yes and mentioned that a notification package was provided to the City.
- It was commented that the project appears to meet all requirements and that it was a "nice project".
- The southwest elevation was questioned with regard to whether neighbors had any problem with windows or a 2-story project. Also, that the elevation portrayed a fairly flat surface with some windows, and that the wall was 40 feet with no significant setback. Applicant mentioned they were not aware of any direct communications by the homeowner and adjacent neighbors.
- Project was sufficiently noticed despite being a Process 1.

- Since the project is considered a Major Project, it was questioned what impact the Advisory Board would have, however it was stated that this was an opportunity for the Advisory Board to weigh in on the project.

Public Comment: Staff indicated that no written public comment has been received.

Motion: Board Member Weissman moved that the project be supported as presented. Seconded by Chairman Potter: 5-0-0. Motion approved.

INFORMATION ITEM A – 3001 Cranbrook Addition

3001 Cranbrook Court

Presentation provided by applicant Anne Parizeau showing the proposed site plan, renderings, elevations, and an exhibit of setbacks of adjacent projects. Item was presented for input.

Board Input:

- The Board expressed that it would be important to get feedback from adjacent neighbors on the proposed project.
- It was explained that the general rule to be considered Minor, a renovation/addition had to be less than 10%, can't increase height or decrease setback, and not be visible from the street. As proposed, the project doesn't look like it is adhering to any of that.
- The project appears to be adding 40% more square footage.
- It was expressed that the project could not be considered Minor, since it would have a 2nd story and none of the houses on Cranbrook Court have a 2nd story. A 2nd story would be considered a significant change.
- An issue about privacy was raised concerning the adjacent neighbor to the rear who would lose screening vegetation. Since the project would propose a "big" window facing the neighbor at 8582 Sugarman Drive, it was suggested that the applicant discuss the project with the neighbor.
- There was consensus from the Board that the project could not be considered a Minor Project under Process 1 approval.
- A question was raised whether the Advisory Board could provide a recommendation to the applicant to save the applicant from having to return to the Advisory Board. Staff advised that the proposed project was not noticed as an action item, therefore the Advisory Board would not be able to take action on the project. However, it was suggested that the applicant could reduce the square footage associated with the project with the potential of being a ministerial project or considered a Minor Project by the

Advisory Board. The applicant replied that their client would not be interested in making any reductions to the project at this time.

6. NEXT MEETING

The next La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board Meeting will be on June 15, 2022. Board Member Weissman indicated that she would not be present at the June meeting. Board Member Moser indicated that she would not be present at the August meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Potter adjourned the meeting at: 11:39 a.m.

Minutes taken by Marlon Pangilinan, Senior Planner, Planning Department

BERT

Colleagues,

— I agree with all of Andrea's changes.

— Following may be the answers to some of her questions:

#5 item A board comment bulletpoint 1: add before "average" "with the"
bulletpoint 2 add before "since" "nature trail"

p. 3 3d bulletpoint last two lines, suggest they read "project was sufficiently noticed despite being a Process 1."

Bert

KATHLEEN

All,

Please note that my suggested revisions have not yet been informed by the comments from everyone else (so please forgive me if I cover points already discussed). Thank you, Kathleen

~~#1. Call to Order "...Neil to the Advisor Board who was appointed by the Mayor..." [NOTE: 'Advisor' should read 'Advisory']~~

~~#5. Action Item A. Second Bullet. The proposed ADU addition did not appear to be significantly impacting the since it's below grade [NOTE: incomplete sentence; btwn "the" and "since" needs another word or a re-write of the sentence]~~

~~#5. Eighth Bullet. "... however it was also stated that the nature of the review process does not allow for neighbors to react primarily on its impact to the community asset." [NOTE: I do not recall that statement, is there a record of who made it?]~~

#5. Tenth Bullet. "...it appeared that the project did have sufficient noticed despite being a Process" [NOTE: should the word "One" or number "1" come after the word "Process"?