



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes for November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2017

615 Prospect Street

La Jolla, CA 92037

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

- 
- 1. Call to Order:** 11:03 a.m.
  - 2. Approval of the Agenda**  
Approval of the agenda with Item B – Moel/Dubin Remodel continued at the applicant's request and changing Information Item D to Information Item A, since there is only one information item on the agenda. 4-0-0.
  - 3. Approval of the Minutes**  
October 16<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes approved 4-0-0. September 18<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes continued for lack of a majority of members present who were in attendance at the September meeting.
  - 4. Public Comment:**  
None.
  - 5. Project Review**

### **ACTION ITEMS**

The presenter for Action Item A – Greenberg Residence is not present. Item A is moved to the end of the Action Item agenda until they arrive. The Advisory Board proceeds with considering Item C.

### **ACTION ITEM C**

**Project:** PTS 583303 – Ostroff Residence

**Location:** 78955 La Jolla Vista Drive

**APN:** 346-741-3400

**Presented by:** Colin Hernstad

**Description:** Proposal for a 681 sf addition/remodel of an existing 4,726 sf single-family residence on a 21,988 sf lot.

**Presentation**

- Project proposes a 14.5% in additional floor area and also includes a whole house remodel
- 62.5% of walls are being maintained
- Maintaining a 4-bedroom house and modernizing the home style
- Existing home is nestled in an established landscaped area, providing privacy on all sides
- A light neutral palette would be used for the stucco
- Existing landscaping is staying and additional vegetation will be added

**Comments**

- Question asked about whether the northern setback has changed, as 5 feet seems small. Applicant indicates that the setback would be changed to 5 feet, but that it is associated with the garage side, located at a lower elevation, and would be concealed by vegetation.
- Concern over the possibility of the project being a minor project, but in the face of being a whole house remodel
- The existing lot is quite large, but does not double the size or add a 2<sup>nd</sup> story
- The new architecture represents a different aesthetic and an updated look
- Concern expressed by the Board over the decrease in setback along with the perceived fortress-like appearance from the street
- Comment from the public expresses concern that the process seems like an “end run” to preclude community input regarding the whole house remodel
- Comment from the public mentions that there are already two existing homes with 5-foot setbacks and expresses a growing concern over encroaching up on public views and neighbor proximity

**1<sup>st</sup> Motion:** Accept project as a Minor Project –Process 1 with the condition that letters of support from neighbors be provided. Weissman/Moser.

**Discussion on 1<sup>st</sup> Motion:**

- Concern expressed by the Board regarding relying on vegetation to obfuscate the proximity issues
- Concern expressed over how whole house remodels could affect a Minor Project reviews
- Concern expressed by Board Member Lazerow that the project does not appear to be a Minor Project and that it violates criteria and that he would not be supporting the motion
- The Board considers a potential motion for approving the project as a Major Project, Process 3 Site Development Permit to the conflict with Criterion D related to conformance of setbacks

**1<sup>st</sup> Motion is withdrawn.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Motion:** Accept as a Major Project – Process 3 Site Development Permit due to the decrease in setbacks to the north. Weissman/Lazerow

Applicant requests an opportunity to work with the neighborhoods to address setback issue.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Motion is withdrawn.**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Motion:** Continue item to January 2018 meeting. Weissman/Lazerow. 4-0-0

**INFORMATION ITEM A**

**Project: Goldstein Residence – Concept Only**

**Location:** 1953 Hypatia Way

**Presented by:** Tim Martin

**Presentation**

- Home built in the 1930's and has cleared the Historic Resources Board (HRB)
- Goal of the applicant is to be processed as a Minor Project
- Project is proposing facelift on the street side
- Applicant will be making an effort to obtain neighbor support
- Fault zone present

**Comments**

- Board Chair Goese mentioned that the Advisory Board is most interested in a compliance with the Planned District Ordinance (PDO) and that letters of support and hearing from neighbors help inform the Board's deliberations
- The Board expressed that the project could be considered as an improvement, that letters of support from neighbors would be helpful, and that at this time there isn't any issues that would preclude the project from being considered as a Minor Project

The Advisory Board hears Action Item A after the presenter/applicant arrives.

**ACTION ITEM A**

**Project: 556536 – Greenberg Residence SDP/CDP** (Continued from 10/16/17)

**Location:** 8276 Paseo Del Ocaso

**APN:** 346-180-1100

**Presented by:** Michael Morton

**Description:**

Demolish an existing 2,069 sf single-family residence and construct a new two-story 4,364 sf single-family residence with a new two car garage.

**Presentation**

- Mr. Morton mentions that the project's square footage has been reduced to 4,253 sf, the driveway is 20 feet, setbacks increased on the north and south sides of the project, and floor area of the 2<sup>nd</sup> story has been reduced
- Second story has been stepped back by 9 feet and roofing has been added to the north side of the building to allow a transition
- Landscaping coverage is 35%
- Pool equipment has been relocated to address concerns and additional vegetation has been added to maintain neighbor's privacy

- There is a 6-foot easement in the rear. No water will be transferring onto adjacent properties. All site drainage will be off-property.

#### **Comments**

- Ms. Winner – Major concern is over privacy. She states that the second story will overlook her property and pool water overflow will kill her vegetation.
- Mr. Edwards – Major concern is over size and scope. Applicant is using size precedent set by the applicant's previous project – misleading a basis for comparison. The PDO does provide for diversity and there are a huge houses in the area already. Despite bulk, scale, and the issue with the 2<sup>nd</sup> story setback, the design is beautiful
- Ms. Davis – concerned over the project affecting the water table
- Ms. Little – concerned over height of the roof deck

**Motion:** Recommend project as a Major Project – Process 3 in compliance with the PDO. Donovan/Weisman.

#### **Discussion of Motion:**

- Board Member Weissman expressed difficulty in supporting the motion due concerns over bulk, scale, and the existing character of the neighborhood.

**Vote on the motion:** 2-2-0. No action. No other motions were offered.

- 6. Next meeting date:** The next meeting in January 2018 will be determined at a later date as the typical meeting day in January falls on a holiday. An alternative meeting date in January will be determined and the agenda will distributed accordingly.
- 7. Adjournment:** 1:05 p.m.

Minutes taken by Marlon I. Pangilinan, Senior Planner, City of San Diego