



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board**  
**APPROVED** Meeting Minutes for October 20, 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

<b>City Staff</b>
Marlon Pangilinan, Senior Planner, Planning Department
Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department

- 
- 1. Call to Order:** 10:00 a.m.  
Potter called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Weissman recused for Item C-Harper residence.
  - 2. Agenda:**  
Potter said the second Item B should be Item C. Lazerow moved to approve, Weissman seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.
  - 3. Approval of September 15, 2021 minutes:**  
Lazerow stated that page 2 under Public Comment should read that Potter suggested removing sentence altogether. In last line Lazerow suggested, adjacent houses with 300 feet should read within 300 feet. C.A. Marengo said minutes should reflect that he followed the process instead of he did not know how to proceed. Potter and C.A. suggested just removing it. Lazerow moved to approve Minutes for September 15th, 2021 with revisions, Potter seconded. Approved 4-0-0.
  - 4. Non-agenda public comment:**  
None.

## 5. Project Review:

### **ACTION ITEM A – PTS 670093 Barba/Lowther**

Location: 8561 EL Paseo Grande

APN: 346-417-1111

**Description:** Reconsideration of 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](mailto:CAMarengeo@M2A.io) (619) 417-1111

#### **Presentation:**

- Presenter submitted alternative to meet client's request to City and LJSAB and also compared revised plan with earlier submittal at this meeting
- Basement no longer with project
- Project set back on different levels
- Height raised 1' 10" to see over building in front
- Presenter asked Board to approve as presented

#### **Board Comment:**

- A question was raised regarding whether the garage was on the rear property line. Presenter said due to dedication of alley, setback is reduced.
- A question was asked as to whether the front set back was consistent with other properties? Presenter said it was reduced to 30' from property line to building
- Deck is closer to street than building
- Stepping back effect evident as the building goes back from street

#### **Public Comment:**

- Phil Merten said changes were put forward to PDO
- Merten said setbacks should be in conformed with those in vicinity. He asked members to consider if they are. He suggested the project's setbacks are not and are too close to the alley.
- Merten said FAR is unclear. Member asked CA to clarify. FAR clarified as 0.87
- Board Member said one member of LJSAB participated on PDO committee, which is not part of LJSAB
- Presenter said committee recommendations will need to be vetted by CCC, so it will take a long time for them to be in effect
- Merten just asked LJSAB to consider if proposal is consistent with current PDO, not whether changes by committee are consistent

- Merten said LDC says when a pool is more than 3' above grade it is not allowed in the street yard, due to noise. CA disagreed and said the pool is recessed to mitigate bulk and scale. CA said properties across street are closer to property line than his project
- Merten disagreed with CA and quoted LDC regarding; pools that project more than 3 feet above grade are not permitted in street yard

**Board Comment:**

Weissman said LJSAB needs to rule on what is before them now. Weissman said proposal appears to comply with PDO.

**Motion:**

Weissman moved to approve prior motion to approve. Lazerow felt that the proposal would be beneficial to neighbors on either side and the general public. He said it would be less intrusive than the existing house. Lazerow seconded subject to a finding that the pool does not violate the LDC Merten quoted. Motion passed 4-0-0.

**Action Item B – Action Item B – PTS 694243 – Nachassis’s Residence SDP/CDP**

Location: 2810 Sugarman Court

APN: 346-701-1800

Description: Addition/remodel to existing single-family residence, new roof deck patio covers and attached Accessory Dwelling Unit on a 0.27-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation that the proposed project is minor in scope (Process 1) from the Advisory Board.

**Presented by:** Fernando Gonzalez, [fernygn1.6@gmail.com](mailto:fernygn1.6@gmail.com), (619) 739-1492

**Presentation:** Presenter absent, item continued to November 17, 2021

**Action Item C – PTS 665412 – Harper Residence SDP/CDP**

Location: 8455 El Paseo Grande

APN: 346-050-1000

**Description:** Demolition of an existing 2-story single family residence and Construction of a new 4,967 sf two-story, single-family residence on a 0.14-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:** Leticia Bonnet, [leticia@designlead.com](mailto:leticia@designlead.com) (858) 459-1100

Board Member Weissman recused on this item due to a conflict of interest. The applicant was advised by the Board that the project would need four affirmative

votes to pass a motion. Despite this, the applicant provided a presentation on the project as an information item.

**Presentation:**

- House has basement garage below grade and doesn't contribute to FAR
- Neighborhood character is eclectic, not consistent theme
- Set-backs consistent with average for vicinity
- FAR study done and is .8, not largest in area
- Proposal features stepped back stories, not a box
- Neighbors were contacted. No opposition received, only positive feedback

**Public comment:**

- Staff said one comment was received from Peggy Davis. Staff read comment based on excavation underground for a massive garage. No grading of natural terrain should be permitted; grading filling will not result in erosion, silting
- Neighbors are concerned that there are surface drainage problems with this property. Geologic hazards include liquefaction hazard. Foundation should be as mat foundation, as soil is clay. Landscaping does not include pavers
- Phil Merten said it would be helpful to review exterior elevations to compare with properties to the north of site. Not enough information in presentation to make an informed decision

**Board Comment:**

- No unifying architectural style for neighborhood. Similar to another project LJSAB approved
- PDO requires review projects in context. The context for this project is too big, as property is adjacent to ocean. Most properties have significant 2<sup>nd</sup> story step back. This proposal doesn't have a large step back on north side in particular
- Other houses are not aligned with street, making setbacks an issue for consistency. Existing house has subterranean basement, so are Peggy Davis comments of concern?
- Presenter said the project is replacement of existing house. There is a geo technical consultant to ensure compliance with water treatment/drainage, etc. Civil Engineering said proposal is in compliance with existing house regarding drainage
- Storm water compliance is to be in conformance with regulations. All water will be captured on property and treated before discharge – no increase in stormwater discharge

**Motion:**

Potter offered no recommendation due to lack of quorum from recusal of Weissman

**Next meeting date:** November 17, 2021

**Adjournment:** 11:47 a.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department