



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board**  
**APPROVED** Meeting Minutes for January 25, 2021  
615 Prospect Street Jolla, CA 92037

<b>Trustee</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Trustee</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
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, Weissman seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

**3. Non-agenda public comment:**

Weissman said a project approved last year is being appealed and the appellant has asked Weissman several questions. The applicant has asked Weissman several technical questions that she does not feel comfortable responding to. Staff advised Weissman to refer the applicant to the project manager, or the Report to Planning Commission.

Lazerow questioned if the La Jolla Shores Advisory Board could reconsider a project if they had received fraudulent information. Staff said a determination would need to be made that information was in fact fraudulent.

**4. Approval of the minutes for August 26, 2020, November 23, 2020.**

Lazerow requested substituting the following paragraph he authored for page three, paragraph five of the minutes. "Comment from the board mentioned that the proposed front setback would be considerably smaller than any of the setbacks on neighboring properties on that side of Paseo del Ocaso, destroying the uniformity of the street's setbacks; that the second story step backs along Calle del Oro were good at some points but non-existent at others and some board members expressed a different interpretation of the view corridor than the applicant; and that the garage should be set back two feet from the property line along Calle del Oro." Moser said that a typo in the November 23

minutes reading "it's" with an apostrophe should be "its." Lazerow moved to approve, Potter seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

## 5. Project Review:

### **ACTION ITEM A – PTS 678156 – Pendleton Addition**

**Location:** 8636 Cliffridge Avenue

APN: 344-230-52-00

**Presented by:** Maximilian Brandt, [maximilian@andmck.com](mailto:maximilian@andmck.com) (831) 325-6892

**Description:** Proposal to remodel and expand an existing single-family residence to include a new kitchen, master bath, additional powder room/bath, enclosure of a portion of the front patio, expansion of the existing garage, an inclusion of a new 311 sf Accessory Dwelling Unit on a 0.20-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation from the Advisory Board that the proposed project is Minor in Scope (Process 1).

#### **Presentation:**

- Additions include garage, covered entry and ADU in rear of property
- Additions amount to 600 sf
- ADU will feature a flat roof
- ADU won't be visible from street with the 6-foot fence
- ADU is setback from property line with height of 8 feet
- Roof of entry porch extends out from original

#### **Comments and discussion from the Advisory Board included:**

- Presenter clarified that "conditioned" space referred to air conditioned for living
- Extension of garage for ADU was questioned, as additional parking for ADU not a requirement. Presenter clarified that the garage expansion will serve as parking for the ADU
- Concern expressed for the proximity of neighboring property to ADU. As to how close building on other property was, applicant had no information
- Applicant asked if letters from neighbors supported project. Applicant replied they had not contacted neighbors
- Applicant was asked if setback study was prepared. Applicant said setbacks were similar, but no study was prepared
- Applicant was asked whether other ADU's were present on Cliffridge Ave. Applicant had no knowledge
- Some members expressed confusion regarding the location of the project
- The 311 sf ADU was thought more a guest quarters than a dwelling unit to increase housing stock

- Sentiment expressed to continue project so applicant could respond to questions relating to setbacks, other ADU's. One member disagreed that information on other ADU's was needed

**Public Comment:** None

**Motion:**

Lazerow moved to recommend continuing project to obtain setback information on all four sides and letters from neighbors. Weissman seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

**ACTION ITEM B – PTS 670715– Gallagher Residence SDP**

**Location:** 7946 Paseo Del Ocaso

APN: 346-503-11-00

**Description:** This project proposes a remodel of an existing single-family residence consisting of a second story master suite addition with 2 story addition at the rear of the property that includes guest quarters on a 0.12-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit.

**Presented by:** Joshua Kordasiewicz, [Josh@axonarch.com](mailto:Josh@axonarch.com) (619) 208-3222

**Presentation:**

- Request is for SDP approval to add second story and 388 sf guest quarters in rear to existing single story house and extend front bedroom by 42 sf for a new entry
- Second story to be stepped back 25.6 feet from front of first story
- All existing trees to remain
- Existing setbacks to be retained
- Front setback reduced by approximately 4 feet
- Existing garage extends to rear property line
- Neighboring properties have 4-foot setbacks
- Street trees to be included per request of City staff
- Outreach conducted to neighbors with no objections noted

**Comments and discussion from the Advisory Board included:**

- Field visits noted bright exterior colors of project somewhat of a departure from existing earth tones of neighboring dwellings, but eye catching
- Total sf to be 3,605 in response to inquiry
- Thirty-two percent landscaping in response to inquiry
- No views impacted in response to inquiry
- Request to verify that neighboring properties are mostly one-story. Applicant replied that a mix of two and one-story dwelling exist in neighborhood
- Applicant replied that rear and side will not be stepped back
- To prevent a boxy appearance one comment was that roofs over 24 feet in

- height should be angled back. Applicant said the height is less than 24 feet in the front due to a sloped lot but suggested lowering the parapet on the front side. Other comment suggested stepping back on all sides. Applicant said they would require consultation with owner before agreeing

**Motion:**

Lazerow moved to continue consideration of project to next meeting. Potter seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0

**ACTION ITEM C – PTS 670093 – Barba-Lowther Residence SDP/CDP**

**Location:** 8561 El Paseo Grande

APN: 346-090-20-00

**Description:** Proposal to demolish a 3,044 sf residence and to construct a 5,946 sf two-story single-family dwelling unit on a 0.15-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit.

**Presented by:** Claude-Anthony Marengo, [CAMarengo@Ma.io](mailto:CAMarengo@Ma.io)

**Presentation:**

- Total lot coverage is 57% where 60% allowed
- Whole site scraped to construct new dwelling
- Car collection will be accommodated in basement in addition to a conventional garage
- Setbacks are 5' rear, 7' side, 15' in front, 10.6' side
- Project proposes to widen alley for fire access
- Second story stepped back
- Height is 30 feet from existing grade
- FAR is .94 on a 6,330 sf lot
- Landscape coverage is 32 sf where 30 is required
- Bulk and scale consistent with neighborhood

**Public Comment:**

- Bulk and scale are not compatible with other properties
- Excavation of basement area would be detrimental to neighbors  
Storm drain is only 150 feet from project and this area has problems with underground water, presenting a potential issue for the excavated basement and problems for neighbors. Also, an earthquake fault runs through the area. Applicant responded that all ground water is to be collected and the fault is not active

**Comments and discussion from the Advisory Board included:**

- Subterranean issues are outside of board's jurisdiction. The issue for the board is thought to be whether the proposal conforms to the neighborhood. In particular, a question was whether the front setback in relation to the building would be aligned with current neighboring buildings, as is presently the case. Applicant responded in affirmative, and even further in some cases
- Step backs on second story above garage questioned and that the north side is not articulated, but south and east sides stepped back 5 feet
- Bulk and scale thought too big for neighborhood, especially with .94 FAR. Applicant asked what FAR would be acceptable but said step backs create a wedding cake effect
- Added sentiment expressed regarding need to reduce bulk and scale. Applicant suggested removing courtyard area on the west elevation to reduce FAR. Another suggestion was to delete balconies. Applicant then asked for a suggested step back to reduce bulk and scale.
- Perception of bulk more an issue rather than the FAR of .94. Moving back the highest places was a suggestion
- Applicant indicated that there would be follow-up with the client to consider potential revisions to the project to address Advisory Board concerns should the project not be approved at the meeting

**Motion:**

Lazerow moved that findings could not be made because the project was not in conformity with the neighborhood. Weissman seconded. Passed 4-0-0.

**Next meeting date:** February 17, 2021.

**Adjournment:** 12:16 p.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department