



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes for June 18th, 2018

615 Prospect Street

La Jolla, CA 92037

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

1. **Call to Order:** 11:00 a.m.
2. **Approval of the Agenda**
Agenda approved. 5-0-0.
3. **Approval of the Minutes**
Minutes approved, 4-0-1
4. **Non-Agenda Public Comment:**
None.
5. **Project Review**

ACTION ITEM A – PTS 606221 – Wright Casita

Location: 2621 Costebelle Drive

APN: 356-590-0800

Presented by: Steve Wright, swright@n2.net, (858) 361-1556

Description: Construction of a new 979 sf companion unit with a 224 sf upper deck and 228 sf lower deck.

Presentation

- Wright said the main house was remodeled a year ago but, because the companion unit was new construction, put a hitch in the process. So, he delayed his application for the companion unit until now. The current proposal is for a two-story unit with the lower floor below grade on a slightly sloped 90 ft by 365 ft lot. The unit is intended to serve as a residence for the applicant's daughter, not as a rental.
- Goese mentioned that the PDO considers neighborhood cohesiveness, height and asked if the applicant could share any drawings that would help the committee address those issues.

- Applicant said the peak of the casita roof is eight feet below the peak of the applicant's one-story residence. Applicant said they didn't want a large structure within their line of sight
- Goese requested clarification on how much lower the slab for the casita was than the slab for the residence and reiterated the committee's responsibility to determine whether the project qualified as either a Process 1 (minor project) or 3 (major project) and whether it conforms to the PDO.
- Applicant said the sf of one floor of the casita was 450 and 2700 total sf for the main residence in response to Goese. Applicant mentioned the main residence has a four-car garage with off-street parking for five cars.
- The architecture is contemporary within a neighborhood of mixed architectural styles.
- Applicant showed views from neighboring properties across applicant's property and said he had letters of approval from same.

Comments

- Donovan requested, and received, verification that the top of the casita was below the top of the main residence and that this was to protect a neighbor's ocean view.
- Goese said this project was the first time the committee received a detached unit that could qualify as a minor project.
- Donovan said this application was the first detached unit that qualified as a minor project since the state legislation regarding accessory dwelling units passed and that the state's new regulations supersede what any determination of major or minor project could dictate.
- An attendee said a companion unit would require a Coastal Development Permit, but that is related to the project being in the coastal zone, not just that it is a companion unit. The attendee also asserted that a junior unit (room in a residence with a separate entrance) requires a coastal development permit, to which Goese and Donovan expressed surprise.
- Weissman questioned how the committee would verify whether a coastal development permit was required.
- Goese responded that, regardless of new state regulations for companion units, the committee was still within its purview to make the determination of whether a project is minor or major.
- Weissman responded that the project meets one requirement for being a minor, being that it is under 1200 sf. Also, the project does not appear to be within a public view corridor. Weissman agreed with the applicant's statement that the project conforms to neighborhood character.
- Applicant said the casita would be setback eight to ten feet from the property line. Donovan asked what the setback is for the main residence, to which the applicant replied eight to ten feet. Applicant said the closest setback in the neighborhood is eight feet for the property above his.

Motion: Recommend project as a Minor Project Process 1. Project, as presented, conforms to the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance. Though Lazerow said the project was large, Weissman and Goese noted that the project meets another PDO requirement regarding visibility of proposed addition from adjacent public R-O-W. Moser noted that the

project is not visible from R-O-W. Donovan/Weissman. 4-1-0. Donovan and Goese suggested it would be helpful to have City guidance/memo on how to use the new regulations in reviewing accessory dwelling units and if they affect the PDO. City staff offered to investigate and report back.

INFORMATION ITEM A

Project: Glenister Residence – Concept Review

Location: 7777 Lookout Drive

APN: 352-012-0100

Presented by: Trip Bennett, Bennett & Associates, (858) 454-4555

Description: Proposed 1,930 sf addition to an existing single story 3,300 sf residence, that includes a new second story and garage on a 10,050 sf lot.

Presentation

- Bennett described the recent demolition and proposed addition of less than 100 sf as a minor project with a flat roof and parapet walls. He then went on to describe the proposed 1,930 sf second story addition over a portion of the existing residence including over the garage. Existing 4-foot side setback would be preserved.
- Applicant is proposing .52 FAR where neighboring FAR's range from .54 to .62.
- Existing setback is 11 feet where applicant proposes 6 feet to have a larger garage.
- Applicant is replacing adobe with framed new construction, except for the garage.
- Height is 20 feet from grade to ridge of garage and 24 feet for top of gable for main residence. Five neighbors approved of the proposal, one opposed.

Board Comment

- Goese inquired as to whether the east elevation wall would impact a neighbor's view. Applicant responded that a portion of the neighbor's view could be impacted.
- Donovan requested FAR information for two neighbors identified in red on a photo. Applicant replied that the FAR for both was .62 with side setbacks of 4 feet.
- Weissman said that parking was an issue on the street.

Public Comment

- Brad Noble, an immediate neighbor, said his house was a legacy house of his father's and that the only ocean view is from the kitchen. Noble said the proposed project would result in a total loss of his view. He suggested some modification on the applicant's part to assure his view is retained. Goese interjected that the board's role is to advise on the PDO, which does not protect private views.
- Noble's husband said he only found out about the second floor on the garage on Friday and was misled from the beginning.
- He said that the loss of view would basically devalue his property.
- The applicant said he was willing to work with the neighbors.
- Lazerow said, while the board's charter does not protect private views, it does call for construction to be in conformity with the neighborhood. He asked if extension of the current one-story garage would still affect the neighbor's view. The neighbor replied that it would.

- Donovan requested a 360-degree analysis of height and setbacks for the neighborhood when the applicant returns to the committee.
- Another neighbor said she would lose her complete view and said parking would be an issue.
- Another neighbor referenced the La Jolla Shores Design Manual recommendation that careful siting in relation to topography could afford uphill residents a view over their downhill neighbors. She questioned how the board might utilize this guideline when applicants decide to add second and third stories, in lieu of private views not being protected by the PDO.
- In response Donovan said that the board could state that a project didn't meet the requirements of the Design Manual for bulk and scale and neighborhood character. Donovan said that concerns over FAR and setbacks reflect bulk, scale (height) and character issues as well, and that the enforceable issue is community character, not private views.
- The neighbor responded that when people lose their views their property value goes with it and, for that reason, views should be considered.
- Donovan responded that there was something in the PDO about protecting property values.
- Moser said that these issues will again be raised as the project goes forward through different review bodies. She said that the review bodies are responsible for preserving the character identified in the Design Manual and implemented through the PDO. She called for the parties to work out a mutually-agreeable solution.
- Goese reiterated that nothing in either the Design Manual or PDO guarantee an uninhibited ocean view. He advocated a wedding cake concept with step backs on successive stories to ensure some view will remain for uphill neighbors.
- A neighbor requested story poles be erected. The applicant said he would consider it.
- Weissman quoted the PDO, Public Health and Safety section, as protecting the open seascape orientation of the La Jolla Shores area, and that this section implemented the board's and neighbors' concern regarding "setting and character" without specifically mentioning views. She also said the proposed one-car garage was inadequate for such a large residence.
- Lazerow commented that it is unlikely that all parties will get everything they want and that mutual compromise is the only realistic outcome.

Motion: No action taken. Lazerow advocated for earlier meeting noticing.

6. **Next meeting date:** July 17, 2018.

7. **Adjournment:** 12:20 p.m.

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