THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board
APPROVED Meeting Minutes for September 15, 2021
Virtual Online Public Meeting

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

Ly

1. **Call to Order:** 10:00 a.m.
   Potter called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. **Agenda:**
   Lazerow moved to approve, Moser seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

3. **Non-agenda public comment:**
   None.

4. **Approval of the minutes for July 28, 2021**
   Potter commented that Spindrift was misspelled on Item 5. Lazerow suggested changing 'vermin growing' on Page 3 second bullet to inserting period after vermin. Moser suggested changing 'before it votes' to 'before a vote is taken' on last Page first bullet. Lazerow moved to approve, Moser seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

5. **Project Review:**

ACTION ITEM A – Reconsideration of Project PTS 670093 Barba/Lowther
Location: 8561 El Paseo Grande APN: 346-417-1111

Description: The Advisory Board will consider whether to rehear a proposal to demolish a 3,044 sf house and construct a new 5,530 sf 2-story single-family dwelling on a 0.15-acre lot due to new information and changes.

Presented by: CA Marengo**,** CAMarengeo@M2A.io (619) 417-1111

Presentation:

- Applicant CA Marengo said Phil Merten contacted the City and said the procedure was wrong, that LJSAB voted on the revised plan before CA forwarded the plans to the City
- Lazerow said the plan up for consideration should be the same plan the LJSAB and City receive. CA verified they were the same.
- Staff said LJSAB can either vote or take no action and any reconsideration would focus on changes since LJSAB last reviewed.
- CA said he showed all changes to LJSAB at last meeting, which they approved and plans submitted today are the same.

Public Comment:
None

Potter moved to not reconsider the project, Weissman seconded. Motion failed 3-1-0. Weissman moved to reconsider due to controversy over details, Moser seconded. Motion failed 3-1-0. Potter moved to continue with more updates to project regarding the rear setback issue. Lazerow seconded with amendment to present table on setbacks from adjacent houses within 300 feet of the subject site. Motion passed 4-0-0

ACTION ITEM B – PTS 695191 – Astalos Residence SDP/CDP
Location: 2989 Woodford Drive APN: 346-820-2000

Presented by: Leticia Bonnet, leticia@designlead.com (858) 459-1100

Presentation:

- Slide show of neighborhood properties within 300 feet.
- FAR study average .20
- Front yard setback average 20 feet, right setback 14 feet average, left setback 19 feet average.
- Proposed FAR of 0.29
- Second story stepped back, but not on all sides
- Architecture is Spanish, Santa Barbara style with red tile roof

- Applicant said neighbor to one side is a rehab facility and declined support or opposition.
- Neighbor to rear said they didn't want to see any outdoor furniture, cabana, etc. Another neighbor said she was concerned about her view, so no trees are planned adjacent to that property
- One neighbor wished proposal was one-story but didn't object. Applicant said building appears two-stories from street but one-story from the sides
- Applicant stated that the setbacks are greater than those of neighbors and compatible per PDO

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

INFORMATION ITEM C. Fromm Residence
Location: 7964 Lowry Terrace APN: 346-459-1100

Presented by: Timothy Martin, tim@martinarchitecture.com (858) 349-3474

Presentation:
- Seeking recommendation from project as a minor
- Two small additions and one ADU proposed. ADU (263 sf) is for family to replace unpermitted sauna
- Rear setback is 5 feet, compatible with neighbors
- Project has a 10% increase in gross floor area
- Forty-nine percent of the walls removed but coastal exemption still applies
- Spanish colonial style architecture
- Ridge in living room raised 1 foot

Board Comment:
- Chimneys look tall. Applicant said there was an addition of one chimney
- Question about noticing of neighbors raised. Applicant intends to contact neighbors, but they have just started the project
- It was expressed by the Board that the project seemed minor at first but increase in height, no setback reduction, visibility from street and neighbors, and 51% of walls to be retained plus pool at rear having a retaining wall make it look more major than minor
- Also, the Board mentioned that neighbor support would help in making a decision. Applicant said he is willing to get endorsement from neighbors and come back to the LJSAB but needs a minor vote. If applicant decreases height, square feet, gets neighbor support and returns to LJSAB would LJSAB approve as minor?

- Potter requested applicant to return to LJSAB with lower height, proof of neighbor support.

Next meeting date: October 20, 2021

Adjournment: 11:35 a.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department