



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board
APPROVED Meeting Minutes for March 17, 2021
615 Prospect Street Jolla, CA 92037

Trustee	Attendance	Trustee	Attendance
Jane Potter	Present	Herbert Lazerow	Present
Andrea Moser	Present	Suzanne Weissman	Present

1. Call to Order: 10:00 a.m.

Potter called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda:

Lazerow moved to approve, Moser seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

3. Non-agenda public comment:

Staff reported no non-agenda public comment was received.

4. Approval of the minutes for February 17, 2021

Lazerow said Project 1 should be Project A. The Moser's comment on air conditioning should read air conditioning for living. Next line regarding articulation and following line are confusing. On page 3, under Board Comment, third and fourth bullets are redundant. On the 8405 Paseo del Ocaso property the motion should read the board's final recommendation was to approve as revised as long as there are no street trees on Camino del Oro.

5. Project Review:

ACTION ITEM A – PTS 672419 – 8553 La Jolla Shores Drive ADU SDP/CDP

Location: 8553 La Jolla Shores Drive

APN: 346-110-17-00

Description: Proposal for a new 1,200 sf detached Accessory Dwelling Unit with new 474 sf garage on a 0.44-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation of approval for a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

Presented by: Skip Reichenberg, skipr@marrokal.com, (619) 457-735

Presentation:

- Presenter described first floor having garage, two bedrooms and bath
- Second floor has great room, kitchen, dining room and deck, and master suite
- Board and batten with stucco exterior finish blends in with neighboring properties
- Windows face west for privacy of neighbors
- ADU is placed at south east of site to minimize views of the ADU
- Bamboo to be re-planted to screen project from neighbor

Comments and discussion from the Advisory Board included:

- ADU's are desirable and this project is attractive
- Question asked as to whether the property does not need to have windows. Presenter responded there are no windows, per fire regulations
- Configuration of ADU thought to be 'weird'. Chain link fence 50 feet from La Jolla Shores Dr. demarcates area that is not part of the subject property
- If the proposal is legal then the board should approve
- Closeness of proposal to both property lines and lack of second-story step back on proposed ADU are issues

Public Comment:

- Merten were received
- Concern over location, bordering neighbor's property, jammed against their property line with a solid two-story stucco wall
- Presenter said large portion of property is public Right-of-Way with access easements
- Lights, windows, doors, and bamboo removal are all privacy issues for neighbor and interfere with enjoyment of neighbor's garden
- Question raised as to whether applicant owns adjacent property to south. Response was "yes."
- The project's Location on property line is not considered a desirable design
- Project minimizes impact to neighbor's coastal views, per applicant
- Outreach to neighbors was made with no response
- Not all the bamboo is to be removed, per applicant

Motion:

Moser moved to approve project as presented. Potter seconded. Motion failed 3-1-0. No other motions were offered resulting in no recommendation from the Advisory Board as 4 affirmative votes are required to pass a motion by the Advisory Board.

6. ACTION ITEM B – PTS 670093– Barba/Lowther Residence SDP/CDP

Location: 8561 El Paseo Grande

APN: 346-090-20-00

Description: Proposal for the demolition of an existing 3,044 sf house and construction of a 5,804 sf two-story single family dwelling on a 0.15-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

Presented by: Claude-Anthony Marengo, CAMarengo@M2A.io, (619) 4417-1111

Presentation:

- Presenter reviewed changes to project, including lowering project below the existing grade to create lower overall height, by four feet, plus increase step back of two feet for second story
- Other changes included reduced rear setback with addition of planter
- Though FAR was unchanged, bulk and scale were reduced by lowering building into site, thus keeping project more in conformity with neighbors

Public Comment:

- Neighbor reported not being noticed of proposal. Presenter said they hired a third party and gave a list to the City for noticing
- Bulk and scale are not compatible with neighboring structures
- Drainage is a problem in area with nearby storm drain. Presenter said water was per City SD discharge regulations
- Earthquake fault runs down street
- Basement should be included in total FAR and CDP/SDP findings cannot be made

Comments and discussion from the Advisory Board included:

- Changes based on previous board comment have resulted in a good project
- Clarification requested whether reduced height would make project shorter than houses on either side. Presenter said the new design is 4 feet shorter than previous. Project is taller than building to left but equal to building on right

- Request for clarification on the reduced setback from street. Applicant responded that the setback was reduced approximately about 5 feet equal to neighboring properties
- Request for previous FAR. Applicant responded that the FAR was .65 with lot coverage of 45%
- Front would be 26 feet from property line
- Since most bulk is at rear of property inclination is to support

Motion:

Potter moved to approval as revised. Moser seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0

7. ACTION ITEM C – PTS 589178 – Lookout Lot – Lot 2 SDP/CDP

Location: 7729 Lookout Drive

APN: 352-012-17-00

Description: Proposal for a new 3,849 sf single-family dwelling, 507 sf garage, and 1,011 sf full basement of a 0.12-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

Presented by: Tony Crisafi/Nick Wilson, nwilson@islandarch.com, (858) 459-9291

Presentation:

- Design was reconfigured and lowered in height to address neighbor’s view issue
- Project is two stories
- Proposed landscaping between proposal and adjacent historic house
- Side elevations are articulated
- Small covered terrace on side yard
- Monterey style architecture with simple detailing, including rafter tails and wood posts with cedar front and garage doors
- Rear elevation steps back
- Thirty percent landscaping coverage
- Sixty percent lot coverage compliance
- Rear setback increased from 4 to 7.3 feet
- FAR decreased from .79 to .75

Public Comment:

- Staff said comment received for Lot 2 and Lot 5
- Susan McKean protested discussing Lot 5
- Presenter asked for point of order on why discussion being protested
- Chair opined more efficient to discuss both projects and then take public comment

8. Action Item D –PTS 482904 – Lookout Lot – Lot 5 SDP/CDP

Location: 7813 Lookout Drive

APN: 352-012-20-00

Description: Proposal for a new 4,900 sf single family dwelling which includes partial basement on a 0.12-acre site. Click [HERE](#) to view Attachment 4 on the City's website. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

Presented by: Tony Crisafi/Nick Wilson, nwilson@islandarch.com, (858) 459-9291

Presentation:

- Building pushed 5 feet into grade on sloping lot
- Two-car garage at street level
- Upper level of house also pushed into lot
- Flat red tiled sloping roof, rafter tail detail
- House, and kitchen tucked into site with entry set back
- Walls articulated
- FAR is .53
- Landscaping ratio is 35 percent
- Building coverage is 53 percent where 60 percent allowed

Public Comment:

- Staff cited several comments received, as well as commenters present at meeting
- Neighbor requested applicant return for future consideration

Board Comment:

- Member requested tabling project with request that applicant provide complete plans
- Presenter said applicant may forego consideration by the board, as the project has previously received extensive review as well as with neighbors. The applicant may just move ahead with a City review.
- Staff responded that is the applicant's right and that they would need to explain to the decision maker at the City
- Member asked if board could make a decision without applicant's presence. Staff responded in affirmative, but urged applicant's presence for inclusivity reasons
- Presenter said complete plans were provided on the City website

Motion:

Lazerow moved to table project with or without applicant. Weissman seconded.

Passed 4-0-0

Next meeting date: April 21, 2021.

Adjournment: 12:19 p.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department