



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board

DRAFT Meeting Minutes for March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019

615 Prospect Street

La Jolla, CA 92037

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

1. **Call to Order:** 11:00 a.m.
2. **Approval of the Agenda**  
Lazerow moved to approve the agenda. Potter seconded. Approved unanimous 5-0-0.
3. **Approval of the Minutes**  
Lazerow moved to approve, Weissman seconded, motion passed 5-0-0.
4. **Public Comment:**  
None.
5. **Project Review**

### **ACTION ITEM A**

**Project:** 629805 – Marouf Residence

**Location:** 2465 Hidden Valley Rd.

APN: 346-521-1100

**Presented by:** Claude-Anthony Marengo,  
[camarengo@marengomortonarchitects.com](mailto:camarengo@marengomortonarchitects.com) 619-417-1111

**Description:** Expansion of companion unit by enclosing existing covered deck. Existing structure is 4,412sf (0.35 FAR), proposed structure is 4,914sf (0.39 FAR). Height is 25 feet. Front yard setback is 20 feet, side yard setback is 8 feet. Rear yard setback is 25 feet. *See ATTACHMENT 1 for additional details.*

### **Presentation**

- Presenter summarized the project as a change of use to an existing guest quarters. The proposal would add windows and a kitchen to an existing deck above the guest quarters, enclosing and transforming it into habitable space to coincide with the living quarters of the existing guest quarters below.
- Accessory/companion unit is with the 1200sf allowed.
- Tandem parking is provided.
- A new door set, window and balcony are part of the plans.

**Comments**

- Goese asked about height of the residence to the north, a vacation rental. CA said it was about 2 feet lower in elevation.
- Weissman asked why the applicant is proposing a companion unit. CA said it was to provide a residence for the applicant’s son. CA said owner could rent the new companion unit out in response to Weissman.
- Weissman then asked if he could rent it out.
- Lazerow asked for verification of no increase in height or decrease in setback. CA responded in the negative except for the deck extending toward the back lawn.

**Motion:** Board member Lazerow moved to approve project as a Minor, Process 1. Potter seconded. Discussion followed whether to include Process in the motion. Motion passed 5-0-0.

**INFORMATION ITEM B**

**Project:** N/A – Price Remodel

**Location:** 8144 Paseo Del Ocaso

APN: 346-282-1200

**Presented by:** David Hall, [david@jacksondesignandremodeling.com](mailto:david@jacksondesignandremodeling.com) 619-442-6125, x 339

**Description:**

Whole home remodel and second level addition. Proposed demolishing and reconstruction of an existing 2,119sf residence plus construction of a second level totaling 3,528sf. Existing FAR 0.40. proposed FAR 0.67. *See ATTACHMENT 2 for additional details.*

**Presentation:**

- Presenter described property as including an existing companion unit in rear. Project proposed connecting structures and constructing a second floor. Proposal would maintain existing footprint/setback on both side yards. Front yard setback is 13 feet with 18-foot rear yard setback.
- Existing driveway is to be maintained, as is existing two-car garage.
- Multi-family units separate the project site from the ocean, so the proposal would not block any existing views.

**Comments:**

- Goese asked if applicant had done a survey of setbacks for neighboring homes, to which applicant replied affirmatively.
- Goese asked the length of the eave on an elevation with no step back on the upper story to indicate bulk and scale. Applicant replied it was 30 feet.
- Weissman said the second story was not stepped back on either side. The applicant verified. Weissman indicated some step back was desirable on the second story. The applicant said he did not see that as a code requirement but could possibly consider a modest step back.
- Goese said that the block was primarily low-profile in character and recommended stepping back the second story a little to preserve the low-profile character of the neighborhood.
- Moser said the proposal would change the character of the whole block.
- Moser asked if the applicant had contacted neighbors about the project. The applicant said they had and that all the neighbors were on board with the project.
- Weissman requested stepping back of the second story on the north elevation. Then Goese requested approval letters from neighbors to the north and south when the applicant returns as an action item.
- In response to Weissman applicant is retaining two parking spaces per code.
- Lazerow said he doubted whether a second story would be consistent with the neighborhood.
- Weissman questioned whether the proposed 0.67 would impact neighborhood character and Goese then requested an FAR study within 300 foot radius of the subject site. Weissman asked whether a notice would be mailed to neighbors within 300 feet and the applicant replied in the affirmative. Weissman requested a height reduction, saying 30 feet was out of neighborhood character.

6. **Next meeting date:** Monday, April 15, 2019. Potter suggested retracting her second on motion to approve the minutes due to paragraph relating to possible future meeting dates being outdated. Lazerow suggested removing the paragraph. Staff replied it would be removed.

**Discussion:** Goese proposed that, because of the small membership of the La Jolla Shores Advisory Board, that the chair vote on all action items and not abstain. Other members agreed.

**Motion:** Potter moved to accept the concept that the chair votes. Lazerow seconded. Motion passed 4-0-1.

Lazerow said the memo drafted by Marlon is clear regarding what information is required to agendize a project but that applicants frequently do either not understand or ignore the guidelines for submittal of projects. Lazerow suggested included more specific language regarding what exhibits the LJSAB utilizes in their review of projects. Staff suggested that the LJSAB should not demand more

information from applicants than what is required by Development Services, but can request it and applicant may comply, but only on a voluntary basis. Lazerow questioned whether the City would incorporate his specific suggestions for applicant information because the LJSAB is currently not getting what they need to make informed decisions based on the general questions currently being asked. Staff to review Lazerow's suggestions for more specificity in applications. Goese promised a draft incorporating recommendations for specificity.

Discussion continued regarding the necessity of the La Jolla Shores Advisory Board (LJSAB), given the overlap with the Project Review Committee of the community planning group, as they both review projects with the PDO. Potter noted that all other boards are elected but the LJSAB is appointed. The idea of combining the different entities was brought up and it was mentioned that the LJSAB worked with Scott Peters to combine/streamline the groups but was unsuccessful. Goese thought it unnecessary for an applicant to be required to present to two different boards for the same reason and amounted to duplicity. But Potter said more review was good and that LJSAB does not always agree with the Project Review Committee. Weissman said one of the major contributions the LJSAB performs is to recommend a project as either major (discretionary) or minor (ministerial) to the City. Goese summed up by saying, if a former congressman couldn't streamline the different groups, then it was unlikely to happen.

**7. Adjournment:** 12:25 p.m.

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