



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board (LJSPDAB)**  
**FINAL** Meeting Minutes for February 16, 2022  
Virtual Online Meeting

<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:**

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. Approval of November 17, 2021 minutes:**

Potter requested minutes to say "online meeting" not to list the 615 Prospect Street address as the location for the La Jolla Shores Advisory Board meeting. Potter requested to change page 3 to reflect that the chair opined that the project was minor in scope. Lazerow moved to approve. Moser seconded. Approved by vote of 4-0-0.

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

Staff reported that no non-agenda comment was received. Weissman said LJSPDAB should consider updates to the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance (LJSPDO), including to loosen the requirement for candidates to reside in La Jolla Shores. Moser said the La Jolla Light reported people can self-nominate to the LJSPDAB to get a broader geographical base. Potter said several applications have been

submitted to the Mayor's office, who is checking qualifications. Potter said the ordinance would provide guidelines for membership to the board. Moser asked if the board members want to continue. Lazerow agreed but said today's full agenda would prevent discussion today. Potter suggested adding the discussion to the March agenda as March 31, 2022 is the deadline for suggested changes.

## 5. Project Review:

### Action Item A – PTS 693529 – 1851 Spindrift Drive SDP/CDP

**Location:** 1851 Spindrift Drive

APN: 346-451-1000

**Description:** Demolition of an Existing SFR & Garage, and Construction of a New 2,677 sf (GFA) Single Family Residence with 458 sf Garage and 380 sf Accessory Dwelling Unit, and related site improvements on a 0.10-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

### Applicant/Project Contact:

Haley Duke, Island Architects, (858) 459-929. [hduke@islandarch.com](mailto:hduke@islandarch.com)

### Presentation:

- Project first reviewed in July of 2021
- Overall project FAR reduced from 0.84 to 0.79
- Upper level steps back
- Project is a primary dwelling unit and accessory dwelling unit (ADU)
- Garage moved from rear property line to 14" set back
- Blue and red lines show proposed and existing footprint
- Front set back increased from 9 ft to 12 ft
- 3-D renderings show massing related to other structures in area
- Spanish style arch with articulation
- House has been pulled back along alley
- Material palette includes stucco, iron windows, clay tile roof
- From July meeting design has been revised to comply with requested increase in front set back from 9 feet to 12 feet. Garage setback increased to 14 ~~inches~~ feet
- Three-hundred-foot survey included with this submittal
- Architecture differs from neighboring dwelling unit

### Board Clarifications

- Roof line does not follow setback indicated by blue line of proposed footprint
- Concern expressed over small setback and that the wall rises two stories with no break on alley side.

- Front setback on alley side increased, but not by much. Larger setback should be on Spindrift side
- Board questioned whether the design conforms to the new floor area ratio (FAR) rules. Presenter questioned whether design incorporated FAR considerations in the proposal, but presenter said project should observe current FAR requirements. Staff said changes to PDO still must be approved by the California Coastal Commission before going into effect
- Overall FAR computation questioned, though ADU should not be an issue with this application, as density is encouraged. Presenter said that because ADU is included with the house modification that it should not prohibit approval
- Bulk and scale of proposal troubling. Other member agreed and added small setbacks are a problem and bulk and scale of ADU is excessive and overrides need for housing.

**Board Comment:**

- The Board wanted neighbors' input. Presenter said open house happened after their July presentation, but no letters of support were offered by presenter
- Presenter said she would ask neighbor with view concerns for a letter of support
- ADU square footage had been increased from the July meeting. Presenter agreed it had been increased to ~~by~~ 380 sf from 302 sf because it is intended to support multi-generational occupancy
- FAR of dwelling unit was reduced by 0.06 FAR
- Concern expressed over basement sf contributing to FAR

**Public Comment**

- Staff mentioned that written comment was received from Phil Merten. Staff asked Chair Potter to allow Merten to speak. Merten said two board members had served on a committee to propose revisions to the PDO. One revision accepted by the City Council was to provide that FAR limits in the shores area PDO should comport with those citywide. Merten asked the board to apply the same standard to this project

**Motion:**

Lazerow moved to recommend denial due to excess bulk and scale, insufficient setbacks and insufficient stepback. Potter seconded. Ayes: 2, Nays: 2. Motion failed. No subsequent motions were made, resulting in no action taken by the board.

**Action Item B – PTS 691672 – Baylor Residence**

**Location:** 7951 Paseo Del Ocaso

APN: 346-512-0700

**Description:** The project consists of removing an existing two-story residence, garage, pool, site work, and shed and constructing a new two-story single-family residence with roof access and attached 2-car garage. Additional scope includes landscaping of the existing yard, construction of the new pool, spa, and perimeter fence on a 0.17-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

**Applicant/Project Contact:**

Chandra Slaven, (619) 316-7645, [chandraslaven@gmail.com](mailto:chandraslaven@gmail.com)

**Presentation:**

- Project proposes a 4,178-dwelling unit at 0.56 FAR
- Dwelling unit is harmonious with neighboring dwelling units
- Project consistent with La Jolla PDO and City regulations
- The dwelling unit is two stories with the garage setback 25' from street
- Side setback consistent with existing dwelling unit
- Four-foot setback on north side, 2'6" setback on south side
- Bulk and scale lauded by City
- Dwelling within 30' height limit
- House transparent overall
- Bedrooms on second level
- Stair on side with roof access

**Board Comment:**

- Northside of dwelling unit was closer to street than garage
- Photos of area requested. Architecture of dwelling unit alleged to be different from neighbors
- The Bulk and scale not in keeping with neighborhood. Could be precursor of entire street following this example of big bulk and scale. Presenter said other contemporary houses are in area
- Objection voiced over description of removing a two-story house, presenter said it is a one-story house existing
- Dwelling unit would shade a neighboring property. Presenter said they did outreach to neighbors but have received no response
- Objection voiced over south straight up down wall, the mass on the north side and its effect on neighborhood. Member suggested applicant come back in March with pics of other dwelling units on street

- Presenter said he could share pics of other dwelling units on street. Another applicant said project fits in
- Objection voiced over metal cladding, and covered staircase to roof is massive
- Applicant requested to return with information regarding comparison with neighboring development and suggested design changes to make it less jarring
- Support voiced for a continuance of the proposal
- Request made to soften concrete and metal elements, though appl said they already did, though board did not see previous design. Also, second story cantilevered over first story. Presenter said Planning approved the design and doesn't have any intentions of making any revisions.
- Presenter stated that they could accept a vote of denial so that the project can move forward.

**Public Comment**

- Guest Merten made the following comments:
- Other elevations need to be considered to make an informed decision and if it fits in with neighborhood. Merten said 2.5' side set back not in character with neighbors, particularly with metal cladding on the wall.
- The PDO states originality in architecture is encouraged but that no structure should be approved that is so different in form, material as to disrupt the architectural unity of the area. Presenter said that there are other dwelling units with same type of materials. Member said that the metal used made the dwelling unit look industrial.
- All elevations should be considered to decide if it fits in.

**Motion:**

Lazerow moved to recommend continuing the project to next month. Applicant said they had met with previous committee three times and made changes based on their suggestions. Moser moved to recommend denial for excess bulk and scale, lack of articulation on the sides, solid metal wall on north and south sides, and not compatible with neighborhood. Lazerow seconded. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion to deny passed 4-0-0.

**Action Item C – PTS 695001 – Lohkemper Residence**

**Location:** 7736 Moonridge Place

APN: 346-650-0300

**Description:** Addition to the main house and an audio suite connected by a catwalk to the main house on a 0.54-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation that the proposed project is minor in scope (Process 1) from the Advisory Board.

**Applicant/Project Contact:**

Jesse Leon, (619) 733-8134, [jesseleon@hotmail.com](mailto:jesseleon@hotmail.com)

**Presentation:**

- Addition of a gym to existing dwelling unit with rooftop deck above
- Applicant is seeking minor decision
- Project not visible from street
- Proposal to add 914 sf to existing 2-story dwelling unit
- North setback of 2'
- Upper level is at grade level with street
- Dwelling unit Height of 26'
- Gym not visible from street or either side of dwelling unit
- Fenestration limited to respect neighbor privacy
- Neighbors support proposal
- Audio room will be soundproofed to avoid noise complaints

**Motion:**

Lazerow moved to recommend approval as a minor project, Moser seconded.  
Ayes: 4, Nays: 0. Motion passed 4-0-0.

**Action Item D – PTS 696766 – Vines SDP/CDP**

**Location:** 8457 Prestwick Drive

APN: 346-151-0500

**Description:** Remodel and addition to an existing two-story single-family residence on a 0.46-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

**Applicant/Project Contact:**

Shani Sparks, EOS Architecture, (858) 459-0575, [shani@eosarc.com](mailto:shani@eosarc.com)

**Presentation:**

- Proposal to add 1800 sf to existing single-family 2-story residence
- Total sf of 6,700
- Maintaining front yard setback
- Modernizing design
- Side setbacks of 12' and 14'
- Not extending development into canyon in rear of property and not visible from canyon
- Proposed setbacks are consistent with setbacks in the neighborhood
- Small roof deck added for ocean view

- Pitched metal roof design
- 30' height limit observed at ridge of roof
- Exterior material palette includes wood siding, stone, decorative garage door

**Board Comment:**

- Question raised over what setback is on second level over garage. Presenter said setback on second level was 27'. Setback for garage 30'
- No step back on second story of north side alleged, though it is 15' setback from side. Member suggested stepping back second story 2'. Presenter requested to maintain design as is
- Lack of second story step back has implications for shade to neighbor
- This design is an improvement over old design

**Motion:**

Moser moved to recommend approval. Weissman seconded. Ayes: 4, Nays: 0.  
Motion passed 4-0-0.

**Next meeting date:** March 16, 2022

**Adjournment:** 12:10 p.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department