

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

### Report to the Hearing Officer

DATE ISSUED: February 12, 2020

REPORT NO. HO-20-007

HEARING DATE: February 19, 2020

SUBJECT: SUGARMAN SDP, Process Three Decision

PROJECT NUMBER: <u>625569</u>

OWNER/APPLICANT: Cosabella Estates LLC, Owner / Marengo Morton Architects, Applicant

#### **SUMMARY**

<u>Issue</u>: Should the Hearing Officer approve an application to construct a two-story, 5,077 square-foot single family residence with a 3,279 square-foot basement garage on a vacant lot located at 8356 Sugarman Drive within the La Jolla Community Plan area?

Staff Recommendation: Approve Site Development Permit No. 2247675.

<u>Community Planning Group Recommendation</u>: On June 6, 2019, the La Jolla Community Planning Association voted 10-3-0 to recommend approval of the project (Attachment 7).

<u>La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board Recommendation</u>: On June 24, 2019, the La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board voted 4-0-0 to recommend approval of the project (Attachment 8).

<u>Environmental Review</u>: The project was determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 (New Construction). The environmental exemption determination for this project was made on January 29, 2020, and the opportunity to appeal the determination ended on February 12, 2020. There were no appeals to the environmental determination.

#### BACKGROUND

The project site is a vacant lot located at 8356 Sugarman Drive within the La Jolla Community Plan area (Attachment 1). The surrounding properties are fully developed in a well-established single family residential neighborhood (Attachment 3). The 0.25-acre site is in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Single Family Zone. Pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 1510.0201, a Process Three, Site Development Permit is required for the construction of the project within the La Jolla Shores Planned District. The project site is located outside of the Coastal Overlay Zone.

#### DISCUSSION

The project includes the construction of a two-story, 5,077 square-foot, single family residence with a 3,279 square-foot basement garage. The site is designated by the La Jolla Community Plan (Community Plan) for very low density residential uses (0-5 dwelling units/acre). The project is consistent with the prescribed land use and density since the project includes one dwelling unit at a density of approximately four dwelling units per acre. There are no public view corridors, vantage points, or physical access routes from the project site.

The Community Plan's Residential Land Use Element for development recommends that "structures with front and side yard facades that exceed one story should slope or step back additional stories, up to the 30-foot height limit, to allow flexibility while maintaining the integrity of the streetscape and providing adequate amounts of light and air." The project complies with this recommendation by stepping back after the garage from the main structure and including a variety of features (i.e., large windows and skylights) that provides for natural light. In addition, the Community Plan recommends residential projects to consider the structure's site design and solar orientation to maximize energy efficiency. The project complies with this recommendation by orienting the front of the property east and adding features that allow for natural light. For example, nearly half of the front facade is covered with windows, as well as other transparent surfaces. In addition, there are several skylights on the second floor.

The project complies with all the development standards required by the La Jolla Shores Plan District Single Family Zone, including height, density, building setbacks, lot coverage, and parking. No deviations or variances are required. In addition, the project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. The project permit contains specific requirements to ensure compliance with the regulations of the Land Development Code. Permit requirements include installing a new 12-foot wide City standard driveway along Sugarman Drive, implementing storm water construction best management practices, entering into an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement for the existing wall located within the City's right-of-way, and requiring maintenance of all landscape improvements. In addition, the project site does not contain any sensitive biological resources or environmentally sensitive lands, and is not located within a coastal bluff, beach, or special flood area.

City staff has reviewed the proposal, including all the issues identified through the review process, and has determined that all project issues have been addressed. The project conforms with the Community Plan, and the adopted City Council policies and regulations of the Land Development Code. Therefore, draft findings and conditions to support project approval are presented to the Hearing Officer for consideration. Staff recommends that the Hearing Officer approve Site Development Permit No. 2247675 for the project.

#### **ALTERNATIVES**

- 1. Approve Site Development Permit No. 2247675, with modifications.
- 2. Deny Site Development Permit No. 2247675, if the findings required to approve the project cannot be affirmed.

Page 3

Respectfully submitted,

·22

Xavier Del Valle, Development Project Manager

#### Attachments:

- 1. Project Location Map
- 2. Community Plan Land Use Map
- 3. Aerial Photograph
- 4. Draft Resolution with Findings
- 5. Draft Permit with Conditions
- 6. NORA Environmental Determination
- 7. Community Planning Association Recommendation
- 8. La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board Recommendation
- 9. Ownership Disclosure Statement
- 10. Project Plans





## **Project Location Map**

<u>Sugarman SDP</u> Project No. 625569 – 8356 Sugarman Drive









## **Aerial Photograph**

<u>Sugarman SDP</u> Project No. 625569 – 8356 Sugarman Drive



#### HEARING OFFICER RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_ SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 2247675 SUGARMAN SDP - PROJECT NO. 625569

WHEREAS, COSABELLA ESTATES LLC, a Nebraska Limited Liability Company,

Owner/Permittee, filed an application with the City of San Diego for a permit to construct a twostory, single-family residence (as described in and by reference to the approved Exhibits "A" and corresponding conditions of approval for the associated Site Development Permit No. 2247675), on portions of a 0.25-acre site;

WHEREAS, the project site is located at 8356 Sugarman Drive and is within the La Jolla Shores Planned District Single Family Zone and the La Jolla Community Plan area;

WHEREAS, the project site is legally described as Lots 56 and 57 of La Jolla Scenic Heights, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 4382, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, October 29, 1959;

WHEREAS, on January 29, 2020, the City of San Diego, as Lead Agency, through the Development Services Department, made and issued an Environmental Determination that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) under CEQA Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction) and there was no appeal of the Environmental Determination filed within the time period provided by San Diego Municipal Code Section 112.0520;

WHEREAS, on February 19, 2020 the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego considered Site Development Permit No. 2247675 pursuant to the Land Development Code of the City of San Diego; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego, that it adopts the following findings with respect to Site Development Permit No. 2247675:

#### A. <u>SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT [SDMC Section 126.0505]</u>

#### 1. <u>Findings for all Site Development Permits:</u>

# a. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan.

The project is located at 8356 Sugarman Drive and is a vacant lot within an established single-family residential neighborhood in the La Jolla Community Plan (Community Plan) area. The project includes the construction of a two-story, 5,077 square-foot, single family residence with a 3,279 square-foot basement garage. The 0.25-acre site is designated by the Community Plan for very low density residential uses (0-5 dwelling units/acre). The project is consistent with the prescribed land use and density since the project includes one dwelling unit at a density of approximately four dwelling units per acre. There are no public view corridors, vantage points, or physical access routes from the project site.

The project will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan. The Residential Land Use Element of the Community Plan recommends that "structures with front and side yard facades that exceed one story should slope or step back additional stories, up to the 30-foot height limit, to allow flexibility while maintaining the integrity of the streetscape and providing adequate amounts of light and air." The project complies with this recommendation by stepping back after the garage from the main structure and including a variety of features (i.e., large windows and skylights) that provides for natural light.

In addition, the Community Plan recommends residential projects to consider the structure's site design and solar orientation to maximize energy efficiency. The project complies with this recommendation by orienting the front of the property east and adding features that allow natural light. For example, nearly half of the front facade is covered with windows, as well as other transparent surfaces. In addition, there are several skylights on the second floor. Therefore, the project will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan.

# b. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public, health, safety, and welfare.

The project is located at 8356 Sugarman Drive and is a vacant lot within an established single-family residential neighborhood in the La Jolla community. The project includes the construction of a two-story, 5,077 square-foot, single family residence with a 3,279 square-foot basement garage.

The project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare. The project permit contains specific requirements to ensure compliance with the regulations of the Land Development Code. Permit requirements include installing a new 12-foot wide City standard driveway along Sugarman Drive, implementing storm water construction best management practices, entering into an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement for the existing wall located within the City's right-

of-way, and requiring maintenance of all landscape improvements. In addition, the project site does not contain any sensitive biological resources or environmentally sensitive lands, and is not located within a coastal bluff, beach, or special flood area. Therefore, the project will not be detrimental to the public, health, safety, and welfare.

#### c. The proposed development will comply with the regulations of the Land Development Code including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code.

The project is located at 8356 Sugarman Drive and is a vacant lot within an established single-family residential neighborhood in the La Jolla community. The project includes the construction of a two-story, 5,077 square-foot, single family residence with a 3,279 square-foot basement garage. There are no public view corridors, vantage points, or physical access routes from the project site. In addition, the project complies with all the development standards required by the La Jolla Shores Plan District Single Family Zone, including height, density, building setbacks, lot coverage, and parking. No deviations or variances are required. Therefore, the project will comply with the regulations of the Land Development Code.

The above findings are supported by the minutes, maps and exhibits, all of which are

incorporated herein by this reference.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, based on the findings hereinbefore adopted by the Hearing

Officer, Site Development Permit No. 2247675 is hereby GRANTED by the Hearing Officer to the

referenced Owner/Permittee, in the form, exhibits, terms and conditions as set forth in Site

Development Permit No. 2247675, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Xavier Del Valle Development Project Manager Development Services

Adopted on: February 19, 2020

IO#: 24008133

RECORDING REQUESTED BY CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES PERMIT INTAKE

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERMIT CLERK MAIL STATION ASH-16

INTERNAL ORDER NUMBER: 24008133

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE

#### SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 2247675 SUGARMAN SDP - PROJECT NO. 625569 HEARING OFFICER

This Site Development Permit No. 2247675 is granted by the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego to COSABELLA ESTATES LLC, a Nebraska Limited Liability Company, Owner and Permittee, pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code [SDMC] section 126.0505. The 0.25-acre site is located at 8356 Sugarman Drive and is in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Single Family Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. The project site is legally described as Lots 56 and 57 of La Jolla Scenic Heights, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 4382, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, October 29, 1959.

Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit, permission is granted to Owner/Permittee to construct a two-story single-family residence described and identified by size, dimension, quantity, type, and location on the approved exhibits [Exhibit "A"] dated February 19, 2020, on file in the Development Services Department.

The project shall include:

- a. Construction of a two-story, 5,077 square-foot, single family residence with a 3,279 square-foot basement garage on a vacant lot; and
- b. Public and private accessory improvements determined by the Development Services Department to be consistent with the land use and development standards for this site in accordance with the adopted community plan, the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] and the CEQA Guidelines, the City Engineer's requirements, zoning regulations, conditions of this Permit, and any other applicable regulations of the SDMC.

#### **STANDARD REQUIREMENTS:**

1. This permit must be utilized within thirty-six (36) months after the date on which all rights of appeal have expired. If this permit is not utilized in accordance with Chapter 12, Article 6, Division 1 of the SDMC within the 36-month period, this permit shall be void unless an Extension of Time has been granted. Any such Extension of Time must meet all SDMC requirements and applicable

guidelines in effect at the time the extension is considered by the appropriate decision maker. This permit must be utilized by March 4, 2023.

2. No permit for the construction, occupancy, or operation of any facility or improvement described herein shall be granted, nor shall any activity authorized by this Permit be conducted on the premises until the Owner/Permittee signs and returns the Permit to the Development Services Department, and the Permit is recorded in the Office of the San Diego County Recorder.

3. While this Permit is in effect, the subject property shall be used only for the purposes and under the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate City decision maker.

4. This Permit is a covenant running with the subject property and all of the requirements and conditions of this Permit and related documents shall be binding upon the Owner/Permittee and any successor(s) in interest.

5. The continued use of this Permit shall be subject to the regulations of this and any other applicable governmental agency.

6. Issuance of this Permit by the City of San Diego does not authorize the Owner/Permittee for this Permit to violate any Federal, State or City laws, ordinances, regulations or policies including, but not limited to, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [ESA] and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.).

7. The Owner/Permittee shall secure all necessary building permits. The Owner/Permittee is informed that to secure these permits, substantial building modifications and site improvements may be required to comply with applicable building, fire, mechanical, and plumbing codes, and State and Federal disability access laws.

8. Construction plans shall be in substantial conformity to Exhibit "A." Changes, modifications, or alterations to the construction plans are prohibited unless appropriate application(s) or amendment(s) to this Permit have been granted.

9. All of the conditions contained in this Permit have been considered and were determined necessary to make the findings required for approval of this Permit. The Permit holder is required to comply with each and every condition in order to maintain the entitlements that are granted by this Permit.

If any condition of this Permit, on a legal challenge by the Owner/Permittee of this Permit, is found or held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, unenforceable, or unreasonable, this Permit shall be void. However, in such an event, the Owner/Permittee shall have the right, by paying applicable processing fees, to bring a request for a new permit without the "invalid" conditions(s) back to the discretionary body which approved the Permit for a determination by that body as to whether all of the findings necessary for the issuance of the proposed permit can still be made in the absence of the "invalid" condition(s). Such hearing shall be a hearing de novo, and the discretionary body shall have the absolute right to approve, disapprove, or modify the proposed permit and the condition(s) contained therein.

The Owner/Permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its agents, officers, 10. and employees from any and all claims, actions, proceedings, damages, judgments, or costs, including attorney's fees, against the City or its agents, officers, or employees, relating to the issuance of this permit including, but not limited to, any action to attack, set aside, void, challenge, or annul this development approval and any environmental document or decision. The City will promptly notify Owner/Permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and, if the City should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the Owner/Permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or its agents, officers, and employees. The City may elect to conduct its own defense, participate in its own defense, or obtain independent legal counsel in defense of any claim related to this indemnification. In the event of such election, Owner/Permittee shall pay all of the costs related thereto, including without limitation reasonable attorney's fees and costs. In the event of a disagreement between the City and Owner/Permittee regarding litigation issues, the City shall have the authority to control the litigation and make litigation related decisions, including, but not limited to, settlement or other disposition of the matter. However, the Owner/Permittee shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement unless such settlement is approved by Owner/Permittee.

#### **CLIMATE ACTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS:**

11. Owner/Permittee shall comply with the Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist stamped as Exhibit "A." Prior to issuance of any construction permit, all CAP strategies shall be noted within the first three (3) sheets of the construction plans under the heading "Climate Action Plan Requirements" and shall be enforced and implemented to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department.

#### ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS:

12. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure by permit and bond the closure of the existing driveway and the installation of a new 12-foot wide City standard driveway along Sugarman Drive, in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.

13. The drainage system proposed for this development, and as shown on the site plan, is private and subject to approval by the City Engineer.

14. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain a bonded grading permit for the grading proposed for the project. All grading shall conform to the requirements of the City of San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.

15. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the site, in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.

16. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall incorporate any construction BMPs into the construction plans or specifications to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the SDMC.

17. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Part 2 Construction BMP Standards Chapter 4 of the City's Storm Water Standards.

18. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement for the existing wall located within the City's ROW, in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.

19. The project proposes to export 2,619 cubic yards of material from the project site. All excavated materials listed to be exported, shall be exported to a legal disposal site in accordance with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (the "Green Book"), 2015 edition and the Regional Supplemental Amendments adopted by Regional Standards Committee.

#### LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS:

20. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall submit complete construction documents for the revegetation and hydroseeding of all disturbed land in accordance with the City of San Diego Landscape Standards, the Stormwater Design Manual, and to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department. All plans shall be in substantial conformance to this permit and Exhibit A on file with the Development Services Department.

21. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall submit complete landscape construction documents for right-of-way improvements to the Development Services Department for approval. Improvement plans shall show, label, and dimension a 40 square-foot area around each tree which is unencumbered by utilities. Driveways, utilities, drains, water and sewer laterals shall be designed to not to prohibit the placement of street trees.

22. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall submit complete landscape and irrigation construction documents to the Development Services Department for approval. The construction documents shall be consistent with approved Exhibit A, the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, the La Jolla Community Plan, and the Land Development Manual - Landscape Standards.

23. The Owner/Permittee shall be responsible for the maintenance of all landscape improvements shown on the approved plans, including in the right-of-way, unless long-term maintenance of said landscaping will be the responsibility of a Landscape Maintenance District or other approved entity. All required landscape shall be maintained consistent with the Landscape Standards in a disease, weed, and litter free condition at all times. Severe pruning or "topping" of trees is not permitted.

24. If any required landscape (including existing or new plantings, hardscape, landscape features, etc.) as shown on the approved construction document plans is damaged or removed, it shall be

repaired and/or replaced in kind and in an equivalent size within 30 days, per the approved documents to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department. (New Issue)

#### PLANNING/DESIGN REQUIREMENTS:

25. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall submit a Lot Line Adjustment for Lots 56 and 57. The Lot Line Adjustment shall be reviewed for adequacy by the Planning Section of the Development Services Department.

26. A topographical survey conforming to the provisions of the SDMC may be required if it is determined, during construction, that there may be a conflict between the building(s) under construction and a condition of this Permit or a regulation of the underlying zone. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the Owner/Permittee.

27. All private outdoor lighting shall be shaded and adjusted to fall on the same premises where such lights are located and in accordance with the applicable regulations in the SDMC.

#### **GEOLOGY REQUIREMENTS:**

28. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall submit a geotechnical investigation report prepared in accordance with the City's "Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports" that specifically addresses the proposed construction plans. The geotechnical investigation report shall be reviewed for adequacy by the Geology Section of the Development Services Department prior to the issuance of any construction permit.

#### **INFORMATION ONLY:**

- The issuance of this discretionary permit alone does not allow the immediate commencement or continued operation of the proposed use on site. Any operation allowed by this discretionary permit may only begin or recommence after all conditions listed on this permit are fully completed and all required ministerial permits have been issued and received final inspection.
- Any party on whom fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions have been imposed as conditions of approval of this Permit, may protest the imposition within ninety days of the approval of this development permit by filing a written protest with the City Clerk pursuant to California Government Code-section 66020.
- This development may be subject to impact fees at the time of construction permit issuance.

APPROVED by the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego on February 19, 2020, and [Approved Resolution Number].

Permit Type/PTS Approval No.: Site Development Permit No. 2247675 Date of Approval: February 19, 2020

AUTHENTICATED BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Xavier Del Valle Development Project Manager

NOTE: Notary acknowledgment must be attached per Civil Code section 1189 et seq.

**The undersigned Owner/Permittee**, by execution hereof, agrees to each and every condition of this Permit and promises to perform each and every obligation of Owner/Permittee hereunder.

#### **COSABELLA ESTATES LLC** Owner/Permittee

Ву

Rick Schrager Property Owner

NOTE: Notary acknowledgments must be attached per Civil Code section 1189 et seq.



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## Date of Notice January 29, 2020 NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT** 

SAP No. 24008133

PROJECT NAME/NUMBER: Sugarman SDP/625569

COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: La Jolla Community Planning Area

**COUNCIL DISTRICTS:** 1

LOCATION: 8356 Sugarman Drive, La Jolla CA 92037

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Site Development Permit (SDP) for the construction of a two-story 5,077-square-foot single family residence with a 3,279-square-foot basement garage on a vacant lot located at 8356 Sugarman Drive. The 0.25-acre site is located in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Single Family Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1. The project site is currently vacant; however, the lot had been previously developed so no sensitive resources exist on site. The proposed project complies with all height and bulk regulations and can accommodate the public utilities to serve the new residence.

ENTITY CONSIDERING PROJECT APPROVAL: City of San Diego, Hearing Officer

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Section 15303 (New Construction)

**ENTITY MAKING ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** City of San Diego, Development Services Department

**STATEMENT SUPPORTING REASON FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** The City of San Diego conducted an environmental review and determined that the project would qualify to be exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Section 15303. The section applies to projects that consist of the construction of a limited number of new small facilities or structures; installation of small new equipment and facilities in small structures; and the conversion of existing small structures from one use to another where only minor modifications are made in the exterior of the of the structure. Since the project would construct one single dwelling unit on a previously developed site lacking sensitive resources it was determined that the CEQA exemption was appropriate and the exceptions listed in CEQA Section 15300.2 would not apply.

Xavier Del Valle 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101-4153 (619) 557-7941/ xdelvalle@sandiego.gov

On January 29, 2020 the City of San Diego made the above-referenced environmental determination pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This determination is appealable to the City Council. If you have any questions about this determination, contact the City Development Project Manager listed above.

Applications to appeal CEQA determination made by staff (including the City Manager) to the City Council must be filed in the office of the City Clerk within 10 business days from the date of the posting of this Notice and therefore the appeal would end on February 12, 2020. The appeal application can be obtained from the City Clerk, 202 'C' Street, Second Floor, San Diego, CA 92101.

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request.

# La Jolla Community Planning Association Attachment 7

Regular Meetings: 1st Thursday of the Month | La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street

Contact Us: Mail: PO Box 889, La Jolla, CA 92038 Web: www.lajollacpa.org Email: info@lajollacpa.org President: Tony Crisafi Vice President: Matt Mangano 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President: David Gordon Secretary: Suzanne Weissman Treasurer: Michael Costello

### **FINAL Minutes –**

#### Regular Meeting | Thursday, 6 June 2019 – 6 p.m.

#### 1.0 Welcome and Call to Order: Tony Crisafi, President, 6: 04 pm

Please turn off or silence mobile devices Meeting is being recorded

Quorum present: Brady, Costello, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will

#### 2.0 Adopt the Agenda:

Motion: Adopt agenda with modifications (Gordon/Will) Vote:12-0-0 Motion Carries

In Favor: Brady, Costello, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Neil,

Rasmussen, Will

Opossed: 0

Abstain: 0

3.0 Meeting Minutes Review and Approval: Draft minutes not included in trustee packet.

Motion: Postpone approval of May draft LJCPA minutes until next meeting (Neil/Kane) Vote: 11-0-1: Motion Carries

In Favor: Brady, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will Opposed: 0

Abstain: 1 (Chair)

4.0 Officer Reports:

#### 4.1 Treasurer

Beginning Balance as of 4/30/19	\$765.66
Income <ul> <li>Collections</li> <li>CD Sales</li> </ul>	\$ 163.00 \$ <u>0</u>
Total Income Expenses	\$ 163 .00
<ul><li>Agenda printing</li><li>AT&amp;T telephone Final Bill</li></ul>	\$   63.06 <u>\$   17.92</u>
Total Expenses Net Income/(Loss)	<u>\$ 80.98</u> \$ 82.02
Ending Balance of 5/31/19	\$ 847.68

4.2 Secretary- Secretary absent. Per Crisafi and Gordon: Everyone is requested to sign in on the sheets

in the back of the room to have attendance recorded. To become a member, fill in the membership forms available in the back. A member must attend at least one meeting per year to be eligible to vote, 3 meetings to be eligible to be a trustee.

Courtney arrives; reflected in vote counts.

#### 5.0 Elected Officials – Information Only

**5.1** Council District 1: Councilmember Barbara Bry.

Rep: **Mauricio Medina**, 619-236-6611, <u>mauriciom@sandiego.gov</u> (he arrived late and spoke after items 5.2 and 5.3)

Medina passed out June Bry Bulletin noting page 3 with schedule for remaining work on Torrey Pines Road. The most labor intensive work will be done overnight. To resurface Torrey Pines Rd. they ground the asphalt down to the concrete, took out all bad patches and put a clean layer of asphalt there. Thanks to all for your patience. Road work will continue later this month for restriping and median work. One lane will remain open during striping.

**Courtney**: When will they re-patch the other streets torn up by the work? **Reply**: He is trying to get more clarification on how they are coordinating scheduling.

**Kane**: requested that Hillside Dr. be prioritized. Where is that on budget process, how to track. Reply: This is a learning process on how to get a street paved, how to elevate a street to city staff to get them to come out to access it and get it on the schedule. Different streets require different treatment. Needs to coordinate with many different processes. He has tried to prioritize Hillside. **Kane**: the committee will be happy to have anything done to improve Hillside Dr. before it fails completely.

**Public comment**: Are you aware that the intersection of Hillside Dr. and Torrey Pines Road is worse than before? **Reply**: They replaced the cross gutter with new concrete. It was never their goal to change the grade so trucks wouldn't get stuck. As part of new repaving process, they plan to raise the level of asphalt to provide smoother transition. Mauricio has elevated this issue within the city bureaucracy. The Deputy Chief Operating Officer is looking at this issue.

**Other comments**: Allocation of property taxes? Problem with trucks getting stuck is with wording on signage such as terms like "kingpin" and "feet between axels" that are not understood by drivers. Need more understandable language and graphics and ability to ticket drivers. **Reply**: agreed. Crews from traffic engineering were there looking at better signage that can lead to ticketing. Some wording is regulated by state driving manuals.

**Dockless scooterss:** The City of San Diego has proposed regulations for dockless scooter parking. They proposed corrals, 10 x 6 painted on the street to dock the scooters. He has the list of proposed suggestions for corrals within the village of La Jolla. He will be giving greater detailed presentations to the LJ Town Council, the LJ Village Merchants' Association, the LJ Shores Association and the LJ T & T. Four meetings for the public to attend to share concerns and give feedback to city staff. Also please reach out to him for more information.

Costello: Please, more effective enforcement!

5.2 78th Assembly District: Assembly member Todd Gloria

Rep: Mathew Gordon 619-645-3090 mathew.gordon@asm.ca.gov

Following bills of note made it out of the assembly to state senate: AB 893, Del Mar Gunshow bill would prohibit sale of guns and firearms at Del Mar Fairgrounds property beginning 2021; AB 262 which clarifies authority of local health officers to report to health officials in event of communicable disease outbreak; AB 43, increases the transparency of governmental spending on health services to address issues of mental health; AB 1588, promotes good jobs for vets in CA giving credit for time served in military. **Kane:** Any update on the bills addressing affordable housing? **Reply:** Nothing with regard to SB 50. Chevelle from Toni Atkin's office will know more.

Costello: California has something like 25% of the nation's homeless, but only 12% of the nation's

#### Attachment 7

population. Why such a large homeless population? **Reply**: don't have an answer. The issue of homelessness is complicated issue which the legislature is trying to address. Please reach out anytime with further questions anytime and I will respond.

**Gordon:** SB 330 and 50 are an attempt to rectify affordable housing issues from the state level by telling local communities they no longer have control. Taxes, expenses, the cost of living is out of reach of too many people; it is unaffordable for normal people to live in CA. Way too many regulations that need to be addressed. Housing in La Jolla will never be affordable. **Reply:** I will pass these comments on. Todd Gloria does champion local control.

**Kane:** Does Todd Gloria have any position on these bills? **Reply:** No. **Kane**: Is he doing anything behind the scenes to shape legislation to conform to constituent's desires? **Reply**: He is asking for planning groups to share feedback; he is here to listen, write down and take back to his assembly member all comments. He has heard La Jolla's concerns.

#### 5.3 39<sup>th</sup> Senate District: State Senator Toni Atkins, Senate President pro Tem Rep: Chevelle Newell Tate, 619-645-3133, Chevelle.Tate@sen.ca.gov

**Chevelle Tate for Toni Atkins**: She has represented this community for 5 years. Every year we do a donation drive in partnership with Veterans Villages of San Diego. This is an opportunity to donate this year new and clean underwear for homeless vets and their families. A donation box is in the La Jolla library and will be there through 6/24. They have enough socks; they need underwear.

SB 330 is still active this year. It did pass out of the senate to the assembly. It will go through many more amendments. The bill is offered by Nancy Skinner. <u>This bill does not suspend the height limit in the coastal regions.</u> Should a local government implement new legislation to decrease the height limit, that government will be prohibited from doing that. The 30 ft. height limit stays in place. We have a letter from the maker's office saying that SB 330 does not affect San Diego's 30 ft. height limit. The letter is in the packet. Any development in coastal region is exempt. The premise of this bill is "do not make it more difficult to build more housing." City of SD has already implemented a policy for parking requirements that is more restrictive than required by this bill, so SD is not affected. This bill also has anti-displacement provisions to protect people in affordable housing from being displaced by new development. A new project cannot make a net loss in affordable units, it provides relocation assistance, it prohibits zoning to less intensive use, reduction in height or density, floor area ratio, or open space requirements. **Public:** how is coastal zone defined? **Reply:** West of 15.

**Gordon:** According to Jim LaMatery at Community Planners meeting, SB 330 and 50 are moving targets. One thing not mentioned according to Jim La Matery is that SB 330 takes away local community's right to have ballot provisions to change zoning. It all needs more discussion. Please check raisetheballoon.org. SB 50 has become a 2 year bill. One other issue is that this bill lifts required parking minimums in LJ Shores within ½ mile of a transit corridor. LJ Shores parking requirements are different from rest of city of San Diego. **Reply:** General definition of transit corridor is ¼ mile radius of a transit stop that runs every 10 minutes M through F. Route 30 does not meet requirements for transit corridor.

SB 50 has more specific height limit provisions, but any development in coastal region is exempt. The bill was introduced by Senator Scott Weiner of San Francisco area. Keeping up with the amendments has been difficult. It was shelved in the Senate appropriations committee which means that between now and January there will be committee meetings about it to offer amendments. The bill creates a streamlined ministerial approval process for neighborhood multi family residential properties. It would, upon request to local government, give an equitable community incentive – a density bonus. The project would have to meet criteria, mainly it must be within ¼ mile radius of a high quality transit area and a ¼ mile radius of a job rich area. Coastal zones, high fire hazard areas and cities that have under 50,000 population are exempt. San Diego meets two of these requirements. Another amendment is ability to convert an existing single family structure into a 4 plex.

**Kane:** this bonus could override existing zoning which I find threatening. **Reply:** It doesn't override existing zoning; it increases maximum allowable density for that area. **Kane:** zoning is local issue; it should

La Jolla Community Planning Association June 2019 Regular Meeting Final Minutes Page 3 of 18 not be legislated at state level. **Reply:** we hear this concern as well. We need regulations to de-regulate. Years of increasing regulations have contributed to this housing crisis and increased cost of living. State is trying reverse this cycle.

**Kane:** Any discussion about upgrading infrastructure in concert with increased density. We are stuffing more things into neighborhoods with no way to accommodate them. Housing, transportation as well as infrastructure need to be timed together. **Reply:** SB 1 the gas tax bill sends funds to local governments for infrastructure. We are looking to see that these funds are being used to benefit our local communities.

**14.0 7:00** P.M. Time Certain - Preliminary review La Jolla Children's Pool retaining wall - Project No. 627990 (Process CIP-2 SCR CST-App WBS S-00644.07.01 – Fund 400002) to determine if an already constructed 30-inch high retaining wall is consistent with CDP/SDP/CUP(PTS No. 154844), LJ Children's Pool Lifeguard Station. The retaining wall, 1) provides additional support for the gate posts, 2), retains about a foot of soil and 3) is a safety barrier for the newly constructed ramp. The CBC Section requires "guards" or barriers along open- sided walking surfaces. SCR request was prompted by CCC.

## DPR Motion: Findings cannot be made for construction change consistent with the CDP and is denied 5-0-1

#### Presentation by Jason Grani and James Arnhart, Public works engineers:

The Children's Pool lifeguard tower was finished 2 years ago. We put in a new ADA access ramp to the lower level restrooms. To do this we put in a 30 inch retaining wall and as part of that we got a building permit for the construction change. Coastal Commission asked for a Substantial Conformance Review with DSD. The project was approved originally with an SDP and a CDP. During the design/build phase a construction change was needed in 2015. That was approved. Coastal Commission wasn't happy and asked for a SCR for the change. Construction was completed in 2017. Now we are doing the SCR in 2019. The wall has been there for the last 2 years. To complete the project and appease the CC we are here to seek approval of this SCR. We are open to questions:

**Neil:** Is SCR appropriate in this situation? **Reply:** In light of information bulletin 500, DSD reviewed the construction change and found it did meet the consistency requirements. **Neil:** I'm sure they did the review appropriately, I'm not sure it was the appropriate approach; it does bypass any of us (the public) being able to say anything. **Reply:** At that time it went to DSD because it was in construction for a construction change. If there had been another process, that was the time for them to tell us. **Neil:** I cannot vote to approve the SCR. It was not appropriate at that time and is not now.

**Costello:** At the time the project that appeared before us, it was going to leave that ramp open. **Reply:** To meet grade requirements for ADA, the whole ramp had to be lowered, to that was what created the difference. Further discussion ensued with photos to explain how the ramp had to be modified to meet ADA requirements to meet the height difference between the sidewalk and the restrooms. The current retaining wall blocks access to the beach.

**Kane:** Not only am I befuddled by the use of SCR to review this project, I'm befuddled by the fact that you didn't do an appropriate environmental review. You have blocked an access to the beach that is in our Community Plan. That is a huge impact to the public. You would have to get a community plan amendment to close that beach access. It is an environmental impact that was never addressed. Either the wrong review process was used or it is incomplete. Discussion continued about how long the ramp has been there and whether it is called out in the community plan as a beach access.

**Mangano:** Are there any other solutions to modify the ramp to provide access to the beach? **Reply:** Previous studies were done and it was concluded nothing else would work.

**Grani:** The project is appealable to the Coastal Commission meeting next week and the public is invited to provide input.

Public Comment: Ken Hunrichs with power point presentation.

• He has been following the lifeguard tower construction project since its inception.

La Jolla Community Planning Association June 2019 Regular Meeting Final Minutes Page 4 of 18

- City has been aware since 2015 that the grade needed to install a ramp to ADA restroom was going to cause problems.
- The Coastal Development Permit called for a ramp to be functional for emergency beach access. This appears to be an attempt to change the ramp from public use to emergency use only.
- Jihad Sliman, the project engineer at the time, assured him that this problem would be corrected. This could have been fixed during the construction of the life guard tower.
- April, 2017, Hunrichs filed a formal complaint with the Coastal Commission for a coastal act violation resulting in this SCR.
- A Coastal Development permit is needed to change the coastal access route and the intensity of use to a California beach. These changes have not been permitted.
- When the CCC voted 5 years ago to establish the beach closure during harbor seal pupping season, one commissioner recommended that the City explore ways to improve handicapped access to the beach. This wall does not improve access and the concrete stairs called for in the permit have not been built.
- Several slides and historic photos followed showing how the retaining wall does not conform to the original Coastal Development permit and has taken away public access that had been established long ago.
- Asks CPA to reject notion that this SCR is in compliance with the CDP and if need be appeal it to the City Council.

**Reply:** Lifeguards are not using the ramp for access. The City cannot allow people to use a ramp that is not safe.

### Motion: Confirm DPR motion to deny approval of the SCR. (Costello/Brady) Vote: 12-0-1 Motion Carries

In Favor: Brady, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 1 (chair)

**Costello:** Tomorrow is last day to appeal to the City. He has prepared an appeal with only a few modifications to the DPR Report.

Motion: Add filing appeal of SCR to agenda as action item due to time restraint. (Neil/Kane) Vote: 12-0-1 Motion Carries

**In Favor:** Brady, Costello Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 1 (chair)

Motion: File appeal to City of denial of approval of SCR (Neil/Kane) Vote: 12-0-1, Motion Carries

**In Favor:** Brady, Costello Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 1 (chair)

**Public Comment:** This whole issue emphasizes the importance of community review. What seemed like a minor change when the project was being designed that bypassed community review could have been resolved much differently early on in the process.

7.0 Public Comment (moved ahead out of order to hear large group in audience.)

*Opportunity for public to speak on matters <u>not</u> on the agenda, 2 minutes or less.* 

#### 7.3 Public Comment:

La Jolla Community Planning Association June 2019 Regular Meeting Final Minutes Page 5 of 18 Mike Pallomary, licensed surveyor and geomatic engineer: He represents several neighbors regarding the project at 7830 E. Roseland Dr. proposing a second story remodel of a single family unit. It was approved 8-0-0 by PRC, approved on consent. Issues raised by Mr. Pallomary:

- Project plans included a number of violations of La Jolla Shores PDO and state laws. The plans that were reviewed were misrepresented.
- Neighbors were never notified as was stated during the review and in the newspaper
- City staff advised applicant to sanitize plans and violate state laws
- Mr. Pallomary showed how submitted plans were misleading.
- Mr. Pallomary and neighbors submitted 4 public records requests and forced a meeting with city staff
- City staff ignored the neighbors' statements of violations stating that the plans reviewed are just preliminary.
- Now they are doing extensive grading and demolition on the site that is not shown on plans. Photos were provided.
- Mr. Pallomary filed complaint with code compliance. The complaint was closed denying that grading or demolition is being done.
- Project violates La Jolla Shores PDO and city is not going to make effort to correct it.
- Applicant's consultant told city they dug a trench 90 ft. long, 11 ft. deep, 5ft wide at rear of property. There is no evidence of this trench.
- Documented Rose Canyon earthquake fault running through property.
- City ignored evidence and will do nothing.
- Project has been appealed to Planning Commission meeting next week. Urges public to attend.

**Gordon:** Of whom from city staff are you speaking? **Reply:** high level staff; he has list. Gordon chairs the La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee who reviewed these plans. Before any project is reviewed Gordon confirms that the requirements have been fulfilled, one of which is neighbor notification. This was verified with Pancho Mendosa by letter dated Aug. 19. Also received copy of posted notice. We did our due diligence. Replies from neighbors in audience saying no notice received.

**Crisafi:** This information is unclear. Notice would have been the Notice of Application for review of development plans. This project looks like it is under construction. If it is being appealed there must have been a Hearing Officer hearing or a Notice of Decision that was appealed. **Reply**: grading and demolition is going on now.

**Crisafi:** He will ask someone from the CPA to attend the hearing and someone from the Permit Review Committee to review the plans that were reviewed. This is the most the CPA can do to help the situation.

**Gordon:** The plans the PRC reviewed did not include demolition, so there is something fishy going on.

# 7.1 City of San Diego – Community Planner: Marlon Pangilinan, mpangilinan@sandiego.gov No Report

#### 7.2 UCSD - Planner: Anu Delouri, adelouri@ucsd.edu, http://commplan.ucsd.edu/ or Robert Brown

Anu Delouri: UCSD Community group updates are in the back of the room

All are invited to the Community Open House on Wednesday, June 19, at the Faculty

#### Attachment 7

Club from 5 to 7 PM. It is a capital projects open house to share with the community our recently approved 2018 Long Range Development Plan and to explain our housing strategy to become a residential campus with 65% of our students living on campus. Other projects in the pipeline are a future Living and Learning neighborhood in the initial planning stage now. Other minor projects are the restoration and revitalization of pedestrian and bicycle paths which includes landscaping and replacing the railing on the SIO Pier. The railing is 30 years old. We have applied for a CDP from the Coastal Commission which should be approved next week. We will present a similar program at the La Jolla Shores Association.

#### 7.3 General Public: (see above)

#### 6.0 President's Report - Information only unless otherwise noted

6.1 New City wireless guidelines from City DSD: <u>Wireless Communication Facilities Webpage</u> | <u>Information Bulletin 536</u> | <u>WCF</u> <u>Questionnaire/Checklist (DS-420)</u> <u>Wireless Ordinance</u> (see Page 29) <u>WCF Guidelines</u> | <u>Information Bulletin 545 (Small Cells)</u> | <u>Submittal Manual</u>

6.2 Appointments for community groups, sub and joint committees – for ratification by Trustees – action item. Ratify the following appointees of the La Jolla Community Planning Association and the other parent organizations (La Jolla Town Council, La Jolla Shores Association, La Jolla Business Improvement District, Bird Rock Community Council) to the Joint Committees and Boards for 2019 – 2020.

#### I. La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee

- LJCPA Appointees: LJTC (Town Council) Appointees: **Brian Will Bob Collins Mike Costello Diane Kane** John Fremdling **Angeles Leira** Eamon Callahan Matthew Welsh Lawrence Zynda **Gregory Jackson** П. La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee LJCPA Appointees: LJSA (Shores Association) Appointees: Andy Fotsch Janie Emerson **David Mandelbaum** Myrna Naegle Dave Gordon **Angie Preisendorfer** Matt Edwards Ted Haas
- III. <u>Traffic & Transportation</u> <u>LJCPA Appointees:</u> Dave Abrams Tom Brady

BRCC (Birdrock Comm Council Appointees: Erik Gaenzle Patrick Ryan

La Jolla Community Planning Association June 2019 Regular Meeting Final Minutes Page 7 of 18

LISA (La Jolla Shores Assoc.) Appointees: Brian Earley Ross Rudolph

IV. <u>La Jolla Planned District Ordinance</u> <u>LJCPA Appointees</u>: Joe Parker Deborah Marengo

LJTC (Town Council) Appointees:

LJBID (La Jolla Bus Improvement District:

- V. <u>Community Planners Committee</u> Representative – Dave Gordon Alternates – Matt Mangano Tony Crisafi
- VI. <u>UCSD Liason Subcommittee</u> Dave Gordon Tony Crisafi Lisa Kriedeman - Alternate

#### VII. Coastal Access & Coastal Parking Board

Deborah Marengo Ray Weiss Tom Brady

#### Discussion:

**Courtney:** Objects to all or nothing approach. He questions whether trustees were contacted. Request to modify to appoint by each committee or individually.

**Costello:** would rather have a selection committee review each committee's needs and make selections. One person on this list is deceased, one person is controversial, another who has been a stellar member of DPR was not included. There needs to be a better way to do this.

**Brady:** I assume you (Crisafi) received emails with requests; we will be tied up forever if we have individual appointments.

**Crisafi:** The motion should be to not ratify the whole list or approve the list with the exceptions of ?.

**Pangilinan:** Changing the process of selection would require bylaw change. Existing bylaws state standing committees and ad hoc committees are appointed by CPA chair and trustees ratify. The joint boards are appointed by outside groups and do not need ratification by CPA trustees. It would be possible to ratify appointees from the other organizations; they are already appointed. Then work on the CPA chair's appointees.

Costello: The reason for ratification is for members to be indemnified.

**Gordon, Pangilinan**: Confirmed that bylaws state that LJCPA appointments are made by chair and ratified by trustees.

**Neil**: Could we do this with two votes; one to ratify outside group appointees, one to ratify CPA chair's appointees?

#### Public Comment:

**Merten:** I never have spoken out about appointees before, but this time is different. I would urge the association not to ratify the full component of the LJ Shores Permit Review Committee. That appointee has not only demonstrated that he is not familiar with the rules and regulations that apply in LJ Shores; because he currently has a project within the Shores. His actions have demonstrated that he has no intention to comply with the La Jolla Shores regulations and has disdain for those members who have questioned the project. Merton asks chair to reconsider this appointment and come back next month with a new slate.

**Desiree Kellogg.** I oppose the nomination of David Mandelbaum to the Permit Review Committee. He has harassed and terrified our neighborhood. Do not discount the women who are here tonight to talk. She continued with several examples of this harassment. Two further public comments about David Mandelbaum's conflict of interest if he were on the PRC.

**Motion**: Approve appointees on joint committees appointed by groups outside the LJCPA (Kane/Courtney) **Vote: 11-0-2, Motion Carries** 

**In Favor**: Brady, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will

**Opposed:** 0

Abstain: 2 (Chair), Gordon

**Motion:** (as amended) Approve appointees of LJCPA with exception of David Mandelbaum and Eamon Callahan. (Jackson/Fitzgerald) **Vote: 11-1-1 Motion Carries** 

**In Favor:** Brady, Costello Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Rasmussen, Will

**Opposed:** Neil

Abstain: 1 (chair)

**Costello:** Mrs. Gaenzle should be included on DPR. Mrs. Gaenzle confirmed she wants to be on DPR committee.

Kane: Could we move Eamon Callahan to PRC?

**Crisafi:** I will not move anyone to the list. I will agree to remove Callahan from DPR. I was not notified of Mrs. Gaenzle's wish until the list was finished.

Neil: I will vote "no"; the whole proceeding is irregular.

**Crisafi:** we need to do this tonight. Sub-committees are important. I will fill the vacancy next month.

Motion amended as shown above.

Motion: Appoint Elizabeth Gaenzle to DPR. (Costello/Mangano) Vote: 12-0-1, Motion Carries.
 In Favor: Brady, Costello Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will
 Opposed: 0

Abstain: 1(chair)

### La Jolla Community Planning Association Sub-Committee Appointments

### Ratified on June 6, 2019

#### **Development Permit Review Committee:**

Appointed by LJCPA:	Appointed by La Jolla Town Council:
Brian Will	Bob Collins
Mike Costello	Diane Kane
John Fremdling	Angeles Leira
Gregory Jackson	Matthew Welsh
Elizabeth Gaenzle	Lawrence Zynda

#### La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee:

Appointed by LJCPA:	Appointed by La Jolla Shores Association:
Andy Fotsch	Janie Emerson
Dave Gordon	Myrna Naegle
	Angie Preisendorfer
	Matt Edwards
	Ted Haas

#### La Jolla Traffic & Transportation Committee:

Appointed by LJCPA:	Appointed by Birdrock Community Council:
Dave Abrams	Erik Gaenzle
Tom Brady	Patrick Ryan
	Appointed by La Jolla Shores Association:
	Brian Earley

#### **Ross Rudolph**

La Jolla Planned District Ordinance	
<u>Committee:</u>	
Appointed by LJCPA:	Appointed by La Jolla Town Council:
Joe Parker	Appointed by La Jolla Business Improvement
Deborah Marengo	District:

#### Appointed by LJCPA:

#### Community Planners Committee:

Dave Gordon

Matt Mangano - alternate

Tony Crisaft - alternate

#### UCSD Liason Committee:

Dave Gordon

Tony Crisafi

Lisa Kriedeman - alternate

#### **Coastal Access & Coastal Parking Board:**

Deborah Marengo

**Ray Weiss** 

Tom Brady

6.3 Community orientation workshop (COW) is available online at <u>www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/resources</u> Work must be completed & form

#### submitted to LJCPA Secretary by July 31, 2019

**6.3 Report May 15, 2019 Bonair Townhouses action–applicant offered to compromise –** Hearing represented by Diane Kane. Applicant offered to discuss a compromise. Item was removed from the agenda. No further information.

Hershfield CDP/SDP appeal filed today. Please send any information you have regarding that project.

6.4 Transit Zone height limit SB50 – Information request not approved by Senate

6.5 Herschfield CDP/SDP approved on HOH consent May 28, 2019. Applicant has contacted LJCPA President to work toward a design resolution. (noted at end of meeting)

#### 8.0 Non-Agenda Trustee Comment

*Opportunity for trustees to comment on matters <u>not</u> on the agenda, 2 minutes or less. Costello: Several hearings at Planning Commission and one at the Coastal Commission next Thursday. 5251 Chelsea, could we ask to continue so someone can be there? Hope many of you will attend these hearing.* 

**Neil:** Could someone send the dates and place of these meetings to all the trustees? Crisafi: Secretary will do when she returns.

**Emerson:** La Jolla Shores Association Community forum will be held on June 12. Future development at the University and updates on the La Jolla Shores undergrounding project will be discussed. Lisa from Cooper's will host the reception so please come to show your support.

**Courtney:** Hopes murals will be on the agenda next month. He is referring to the murals – art or advertising -- not the banners which can be confusing.

**Gordon:** We need to be open and fair in our discussions. It is not appropriate for people to do things behind the scenes. It came to my attention that a member of our community spoke to several trustees about whom to vote for as officers. Please do not talk to anyone about CPA business outside of the meeting. This can be a violation of city council policy called collective concurrence.

**Jackson:** Our website needs work; your comments are welcome. More discussion next time. We are not going to have a group discussion online, but I will bring back more sample next time.

**Ish:** I cannot represent the CPA on the Ryan lot consolidation next Thursday at Planning Commission because it is within 500 feet of where I live. I need a trustee to fill in for me. He has all necessary information. Also I would like to be on the agenda next meeting regarding issues of serial permits and garage/carports.

**Crisafi:** I have a letter prepared by Melinda Merryweather requesting Pottery Canyon maintenance and improvement which I will send on to Park & Recreation if no objections. Hearing no objections, I will send it.

#### 10.0 Consent Agenda - 10.1 - 10.9

The Consent Agenda allows the LJCPA to <u>ratify recommendations of the community joint</u> <u>committees and boards</u> in a single vote with no presentation or debate. It is not a decision

regarding the item but a decision whether to accept the recommendation of the committee/board as the recommendation of the LJCPA. The public may comment on consent items.

**10.1 – NAU Companion Unit – 441 Palomar Ave. Project No. 618029** (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit for the construction of a 540 square foot one story companion unit on a lot with an existing single-family residence at 441 Palomar Avenue. The 0.11- acre site is located in the RM-1-1 base zone, Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan Area. Council District 1.

DPR Motion: Findings can be made and motion passes 5-0-1

**10.2** – Lillian/Lentell Cottage-7762 Bishop's Lane Project No: 560771 (Process 4) Site Development Permit, Neighborhood Dev Permit and Coastal Development Permit for relocation of designated historic resource (HRB no.1062), at 461-square feet, from site at 7762 Bishops Ln to 817 Silverado St Lane, construct new garage addition with study above for 841 square feet and deviate from Tandem Parking Regs. The 0.04-acre site is located in the LJPD-5 Base Zone within the Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay Zone in the La Jolla Community Plan area. In CD 1. DPR Motion: Findings can be made and motion passes 5-0-1

10.3 - Ngala Residence -1550 Via Corona Project No. 542954 Extension of time to project no.
524954 / CDP approval no. 1611273 / PDP approval no. 1611271
DPR Motion: Findings can be made and motion passes 5-0-1

**10.4 – Kornberg CEP 2605 Ellentown Rd. Project No. 624979 (Process 3)** CDP for the demolition of existing single dwelling and construction of 3,449-sf, one-story single-dwelling unit with 462-sf attached garage, and a 701-sf companion unit located at 2605 Ellentown Rd. The 0.3-acre site is in the RS-1-4 zone and Coastal (Appealable) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area and CD1.

DPR Motion: Findings can be made and motion passes 4-1-1

**10.5 – Kelman 1264 La Jolla Rancho Rd. Project No. 627119 (Process 2)** Coastal Development Permit for an addition to an existing 1,802 SDU, and the construction of a 500-SF attached companion unit at a site located at 1264 La Jolla Rancho Road. In addition to the companion unit, the scope of work includes a 154-SF dining room addition and a 382-SF bedroom and bath addition. The 0.23-acre site is located in the RS-1-4 zone and Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area, and Council District 1.

DPR Motion: Findings can be made and motion passes 5-0-1

**10.6 – Grossman SDP (1<sup>st</sup> review) Project No. 629308 (Process 3)** ) Site Development Permit (SDP) for a renovation and two story addition to an existing single family dwelling unit for a total of 1,384 square feet of construction at a site at 8914 Nottingham Place for a completed structure of 3,752 square feet and FAR of 0.47. The 0.18 acre site is located in the La Jolla Shores Planned District (LJSPD-SF) base zone of the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1.

LJPRC Motion: Findings can be made and motion passes 6-0-1 in addition to proposed and the following: the project is designed to mitigate the second story massing by incorporating vertical articulation and setting the addition behind the existing house, thus meeting the intent of the La Jolla Shores Planned Development Ordinance and the La Jolla Design Manual. Motion by Tony Crisafi, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Andy Fotsch.

10.7 – Resident request to eliminate parking spaces south side of Torrey Pines Rd. east of Park Row (Robby Robinson)

T&T motion passes to contact the City Traffic Engineers and request they investigate the accident history from the parking spaces on Torrey Pines Rd between Exchange Place and Park Row, with the feasibility of realigning the road to eliminate the three parking spaces on the North side of Torrey Pines Rd: 9-0-0

**10.8 – La Jolla Presbyterian Church Harvest Festival** - Request for Temporary Street Closure and No Parking on Draper Ave between Kline and Silverado Streets for the 6<sup>th</sup> annual event on Sunday November 3, 2019 (Erika Hill)

T&T motion to approve La Jolla Presbyterian Church Harvest Festival request for Temporary Street Closure and No Parking on Draper Ave between Kline and Silverado Street for the 6<sup>th</sup> annual event on Sunday November 3, 2019: 10-0-0

**10.9 - Taste of the Cove**- Request by San Diego Sports Medicine Foundation for Temporary No
 Parking on Coast Blvd adjacent to Scripps Park for the 18<sup>th</sup> annual event on Thursday September 5, 2019

T&T motion to Approve Taste of the Cove request by San Diego Sports Medicine Foundation for Temporary No Parking on Coast Blvd adjacent to Scripps Park for the 18<sup>th</sup> annual event on Thursday September 5, 2019: 10-0-0

See Committee minutes and/or agenda for description of projects, deliberations, and vote. Anyone may request a consent item be pulled for full discussion by the LJCPA.

Crisafi: request to pull item 10.4, Kornberg – issue with parking

Motion: Approve consent agenda with the exception of item 10.4. (Will/Gordon) Vote: 12-0-1 Motion Carries

In Favor: Brady, Costello Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will Opposed: 0 Abstain: 1(chair)

The following agenda items, are ACTION ITEMS unless otherwise noted, and may be *de novo* considerations. Prior actions by committees/boards are listed for information only.

#### 11.0 – 15.0 LJCPA Action Items

**11.0** <u>Panorama Homes</u> – **1188** Muirlands Dr. Project No.: **620974** (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit for the construction of 2 new SFDUs on 2 vacant lots. The West House at 1188 Muirlands Drive totals 8,451 square feet and the East house at 1200 Muirlands Drive totals 8,510 square feet. The vacant lots total .56 acres and .61 acres, respectively. The site is located in the RS-1-2 Base Zone and Coastal (Non-Appealable) overlay zone within the La Jolla

Community Plan area and Council District 1. Code Case CE-0502994.

#### DPR Motion: That findings CAN be made for a CDP as presented (Kane/Leira) Passes 4-1-1. Pulled from April 4, 2019 consent agenda.

**Presentation by Tim Golba, Project architect:** This is the lot known as 1136 Muirlands Dr. on old maps. There is a wide house on the property that crossed the property lines. The new owner removed part of the house to free up all 3 lots. The contractor doing the demolition grubbed the site. Code compliance cited the owner for "grubbing." Grubbing is grading that pulls plants out with roots attached. An erosion control plan was submitted to the city to correct that situation. The erosion control was approved and installed. The city also required that when coastal permits come in you will be required to get a grading permit. That permit has now been submitted.

**Merten:** As of June of last year, the site has been 95% grubbed and also has been graded. Showed photos. The City issued a demolition permit to demolish two structures. Under Municipal Code, demolition is considered development and a CDP required. When I asked City staff why no CDP obtained, response from city was that improvements to existing buildings are exempt from CDP. How is complete demolition of a building an improvement and therefore exempt from a CDP? Couldn't get an answer. Finally the City issued the Code Compliance citation for illegal grading/grubbing.

Your responsibility is two things: to review a project for compliance with regulations and the Community Plan and to review the environmental document produced. This site was so completely denuded of all vegetation including large trees that it changed the character of the site making it different from the rest of the community. The Community Plan says that development should preserve and enhance the environment and maintain community character. The Muirlands are characterized by large, mature trees. Also the removal of large trees affects the habitat of various species.

Please hold off on any decision on this project until you are aware of the full environmental impact of the grubbing, and if an environmental impact report is required. Applicant has not obtained the required grading permits by the date required. The City has not enforced any penalties.

**Golba:** The house was cleared of any historicity. There are two grading permits active now. One for the lot for sale and one for the two lots being developed. The photo shown was 12 years old. It does not represent the current state of the site; it is green now. Newer photo shown. The structures demolished were accessory structures. A Coastal permit is not required to get an accessory structure built; why would you need one to tear one down? Structures demolished were shanties, falling down, illegally built.

Motion: Support DPR findings to approve the project. (Gordon/Kane) Vote: 10-2-1, Motion Carries Courtney: What was DPR's view?

Will: You can't get a grading permit without this process to get CDP.

#### Vote: 10-2-1: Motion Carries

**In Favor:** Brady, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Rasmussen, Will

La Jolla Community Planning Association June 2019 Regular Meeting Final Minutes Page 15 of 18 **Opposed:** Costello, Neil **Abstain:** 1 (chair)

#### 12.0 Sugarman - SDP

(2<sup>nd</sup> review) Project #625569 Project manager Xavier Del Valle (619) 557-7941 <u>xdelvalle@sandiego.gov</u>.

**Project description:** (Process 3) Site Development Permit (SDP) for the construction of a two story 5,694 SF family house with 1.217 SF basement garage on a vacant lot at 8356 Sugarman Drive. The .25 acre site is located in the La Jolla Shores Planned District-Single Family Zone of the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1.

**LJSPRC Motion:** Findings cannot be made for Project #625569 (Process 3) Site Development Permit (SDP) for construction of a two story 5,694 square foot single family house with 1,217 square feet of basement garage on a vacant lot at 8356 Sugarman Drive based on character of the neighborhood and bulk and scale. **VOTE: 5-0-1.** 

#### Presentation by Claude Anthony Marengo, Project Architect:

Original house built over two lots. His client purchased the lots with the intent of building a 2<sup>nd</sup> home. An existing house with empty lot next to it. Showed original plans for home. He then presented a new plan with some modifications to the PRC at the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting addressing some of their comments, but it still didn't satisfy the committee and the plan was denied. 2<sup>nd</sup> story was the issue. Homes in this area are single level about 13 ft.6 in in height. Marengo asked the committee: what could be done to achieve a larger size home and be viable in this neighborhood? The possibility of pushing the house further down the slope was discussed. Marengo presented further revised plans showing how the house has been pushed down.

- A lot line adjustment was provided to free up the site
- Home placed with 20 ft front setback, 7 ft. 8 in on one side, 11 ft. 8 in to 8 ft. 10 in. on the other side
- Added space from top level to the basement level to reduce bulk and scale.
- Pulled the 2nd story to the back and recessed the windows.
- The majority of the building viewed from the front will be similar in height to adjacent houses.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> story has been pushed into the slope. No one will see the rear view.
- Overall height is 23 ft., well below height limits.
- All drainage is handled on site.

Detailed plans were shown to demonstrate changes made and how the home now fits into the neighborhood.

**Costello**: Why not go back to the PRC? **Reply**: Trying not to delay process; I was not able to attend the last PRC meeting so decided to come here.

**Gordon**: The real issue at PRC was bulk and scale and relation to other houses. Marengo has done a lot to make the house fit in.

**Rosanna, a neighbor on Sugarman:** This is a vast improvement. What is size now: **Reply**: 4665 Sq. ft. not including 3355 sq. ft. basement. Marengo then answered several more of her questions explaining the changes made to meet her concerns.

Gordon: Main issue was how it fit into the neighborhood

**Crisafi:** Looks like a significant improvement. Views between yards are private issues and owners seem willing to work with you. It would be best to work this out on your own.

**Fitzgerald:** You have made a lot of changes especially moving the bulk back into the slope. We can't continue to build houses the sizes of those built in the 60's and 70's.

**Rosanna:** This is a vast improvement, but still too large the neighborhood. Other remodels don't overpower. She fears more giant homes.

**Courtney:** How big is the basement? Reply: 3355 sq. ft. It includes a 3 car garage, pool equipment, storage and bedrooms. The total is 8010 sq. ft.

**Crisafi:** It is truly not visible from the street.

**Will:** We are tasked with assessing bulk and scale as it appears from the public right of way. That 2<sup>nd</sup> floor will be invisible from the street. The house doesn't appear to be significantly wider or closer to the street than others on the street. Not perceptively larger. Private views, privacy in your back yard are not within our purview. Our concern is community character from the public right of way.

**Crisafi:** Also there is more articulation in the front from building setbacks.

Motion: Support PRC denial (Courtney/Neil) Vote: 3-10-0: Motion Fails

In Favor: Courtney, Neil, Costello

**Opposed:** Brady, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Rasmussen, Will

Abstain: 0

Motion: Approve revised design (Will/Kane) Vote: 10-3-0: Motion Carries

In Favor: Brady, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Rasmussen, Will

**Opposed:** Courtney, Neil, Costello **Abstain:** 0

# 13.0 Ratify appeal of 5/15/2019 Hearing Officer Hearing decision of Project No. 579587, Bonair Residence 744/746 Bonair St. Filed on May 28, 2019

Motion: Ratify appeal of Hearing Officer decision of Bonair Project. (Kane/Brady) Vote: 12-0-1
 Motion Carries.
 In Favor: Brady, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Neil, Rasmussen, Will
 Opposed: 0
 Abstain: 1 (chair)

15.0 City response from Bill Harris in response to our request for a decision on Black's Beach Overlook Fence Sent on 5/29/19 is that no changes will be made to the current fence. Information only

La Jolla Community Planning Association June 2019 Regular Meeting Final Minutes Page 17 of 18

#### Attachment 7

<u>Action Item</u>: Whether to demand review and action at the LJPDO regular June 2019 meeting to determine if the McLaren/Coach and The Conrad billboards are murals or advertisements. The decision will be forwarded to the LJCPA for consideration and action at the regular July meeting. Motion: Demand response from LJPDO committee regarding McLaren/Coach and The Conrad

In Favor: Brady, Costello, Courtney, Crisafi, Gordon, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Rasmussen, Will Opposed: 0 Abstain: 1 (chair)

Adjourn: 9:55 PM



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

### La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board

DRAFT Meeting Minutes for June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019 615 Prospect Street La Jolla, CA 92037

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

#### **1. Call to Order:** 11:00 a.m.

Potter called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

#### 2. Approval of the Agenda

Lazerow moved to approve the agenda with a change to add election of a chair. Moser seconded. Motion approved 4-0-0. Lazerow nominated Jane Potter as chair. Moser seconded. Approved 4-0-0.

#### 3. Approval of the Minutes

Lazerow cited page 2 of April minutes where bulletin is misspelled and the g on the end should be deleted. Motion by Lazerow to approve, second by Moser, passed 4-0-0.

#### 4. Public Comment: None.

#### 5. **Project Review**

#### **ACTION ITEM A**

Project: 633498 – Crisafulli Addition/Remodel

Location:2695 Hidden Valley RoadAFPresented by:Aaron Borja, <u>aaronb@architectslocal.com</u> (619) 535-1200

APN: 346-580-0600

**Description:** Interior remodel and addition to an existing 4 bedroom, 4 bathroom single family house with an attached 3-car garage. Third level to be added over existing footprint. Second story master bed and bath. *See ATTACHMENT 1 for additional details.*
## Presentation

- Presenter said the existing lot is 41,587 sf, lot coverage is to remain at 11% and the project proposes increasing the building footprint by 42 sf. A new level is proposed on top of the entry level,
- Presenter said total gross floor area to be added is 2,043 and the addition will not increase the building footprint, except for the 42 sf at ground level. This would represent more than a 50% increase in sf.
- Height will increase by 8' 4 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>", below the maximum 30-foot height limit.
- Main concerns were potential view blockage. Site sections verify that some adjacent residences behind the subject property would have views impacted while others would not.
- Applicant showed a 3-D representation of the house and explained that second story dormer windows would be removed to accommodate the proposed addition.
- Applicant presented assessor information de said demonstrated that their residence would be compatible in terms of size and scale with neighboring properties, though it would be the second largest within 300 feet.
- Presenter described very small changes in building profile.
- Lazerow asked if the building upper story would be stepped back on all sides. The presenter replied that it would be stepped back on the front and sides but cantilevered on the rear with approximately 100 feet distance between the rear façade and the neighboring property.

## Board Comment

- Moser asked if anyone from the neighborhood was present. The presenter said the neighbor to the rear gave the applicant a letter of support. The owner said she spoke to all the neighbors who were generally in support but did not write letters, except for the neighbor to the rear.
- Weissman said the house was hardly visible from the street and didn't see any problem with the proposal. Weissman asked if the project required a coastal development permit. Presenter said that they were anticipating a ministerial permit without a Site Development Permit.
- Lazerow asked if the presenter thought the project was minor. Presenter replied affirmatively. Lazerow said the increased FAR was greater than 10% and that height was being increased and questioned whether the project qualified as minor under Bulleting 621 guidelines.
- Moser said that the proposed increases in sf and height constitutes a major project. Owner responded that any slight increase could then be construed as a major project. Weissman said that projects are considered on a case-by-case basis, as, for example, if a project increase in sf is 12% but is not visible, that would be taken into consideration.

**Motion:** Lazerow moved to approve proposal, as presented, as a major, Process 3. Potter seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

## **ACTION ITEM B**

Project: N/A - Price RemodelLocation: 8144 Paseo Del OcasoAPN: 346-282-1200Presented by: David Hall, david@jacksondesignandremodeling.com (619) 442-6125 ext. 339

## **Description:**

Whole home remodel and second level addition. Proposed demolishing and reconstruction of an existing 2,119sf residence plus construction of a second level totaling 3,528sf. Existing FAR 0.40. proposed FAR 0.67. *See ATTACHMENT 2 for additional details.* 

## Presentation

- Presenter mentioned previous meeting where he was requested to step back on all sides of the proposed residence. He offered a re-cap of the project, describing it as a whole house remodel with a second floor addition. There would be a small addition between the main house and an existing accessory dwelling unit on the lot.
- Moser asked how the project changed since the last presentation. The
  presenter said that they considered the suggestions for pulling the walls back
  but had significant challenges with that, locating stair in an unfavorable
  location. Since the house is small there were limitations to where the stairs
  could be located. Pulling in the left side would make the master suite
  considerably smaller. Moser again asked if there were changes to which the
  presenter replied in the negative but said there were other residences in the
  neighborhood that had second stories at 4' off the property line. Plus there
  are other multi-family, three-story residences nearby.
- The owner said he received positive feedback from neighbors, including a number of letters.

## **Board Comment**

- Weissman said the project looked compatible with the neighborhood.
- Lazerow commented that an immediate neighbor did not write a letter.

**Motion:** Moser moved to approve as presented as a Process 3 (major project). Weissman seconded. Motion fails 3-1-0. Lazerow reconsidered without another motion and changed his vote to aye. Motion passed 4-0-0.

## ACTION ITEM C Project:634819 – Kuntal Addition

Location: 7710 Via Capri APN: 363-150-0100 Presented by: Daniel Hruby, DHruby@VisualizeItBuilt.com (510) 205-7876

**Description:** Complete interior/exterior remodel and addition to 3,222 sf SFR (Circa 1972) including: 280 sf 2 story lateral addition; 813 sf second floor addition over existing garage; 916 sf new roof deck; 1136 sf penthouse with 12 sf elevator and stairs for roof deck access; 450 sf pedestrian bridge and security gate to Via Capri.

## Presentation

- Presenter displayed the elevation from Via Capri. Owner provided some personal background. Owner said the proposal would keep the existing footprint except for a 3-foot lateral increase and an increase on top of the existing structure. A pedestrian bridge to the second level was proposed. Presenter said that vegetation along the street would act as a screen for the proposed additional square feet, which includes a roof deck.
- An elevator through all three stories was proposed and the master suite-over the existing garage.
- The owner said he had letters of support from neighbors and the FAR would increase from .15 to .23.

## **Board Comment**

• Lazerow questioned if the letters of support were from immediate neighbors. The owner said his wife had a verbal OK from an immediate neighbor.

**Motion:** Lazerow moved to approve as presented as a Major (Process 3) project only because he is less concerned about stepping back upper stories due to the distance between houses in this area. Weissman opined that it is a toss-up as to whether the proposal is Major or Minor. Lazerow said the project, at a 40% increase in sf, would have to be considered a Major. No second. Weissman then moved to approve as presented as a Minor (Process 1) project. Moser seconded. Motion failed. Potter announced the board has no recommendation and deferred to the City. Weissman then moved that the project design conforms to the PDO but the board cannot conclude whether the proposal is Minor or Major. Lazerow seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

## ACTION ITEM D

Project: 634880 – Bush Residence Location: 7914 St. Louis Terrace

Presented by: Mark D. Lyon, info@mdla.net (858) 459-1171

APN: 346-454-0600

**Description:** Proposed 499 sf to 2nd floor. Proposed 342 sf 3rd floor roof deck. Proposed 1st floor interior remodel of 1,247 sf. is 2,673 sf.

## Presentation

- Presenter gave some background on this proposed summer home. The main focus is the new master bedroom suite at the rear of the property.
- Existing house has historical designation.
- Setbacks to remain with the chimney high point at 29 feet and the roof is currently at 27 feet where 28 feet is proposed.
- Presenter said the addition is not visible from the street.
- Increase in additional sf is 18.5%.
- All neighbors directly adjacent to property were notified. Neighbor to the south has a view over the subject site but signed a letter of endorsement.

**Motion:** Weissman moved to approve project as presented conforms to PDO as a Minor (Process 1) project. Lazerow Seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

## ACTION ITEM E

Project: 825569 - Schrager residenceLocation: 8356 Sugarman DriveAPNPresented by: Claude Anthony Marengo,camarengo@marengomortonarchitects.com (858) 459-3769

APN: 376-791-1000

**Description:** Proposed 4,565 sf two-story single-family residence with a 3,355 sf basement and garage below grade on a newly established vacant lot from a lot line adjustment to create two 11,833 sf lots.

## Presentation

- Presenter explained a lot line adjustment to create two lots.
- Project will feature a motor court allowing vehicles to turn around and exit head first instead of backing out.
- Setbacks are consistent with neighborhood averages.
- Project would be set back into the hill at rear of property and 80% of it would not be visible from the street.
- Project went to project review at the La Jolla Community Planning Association (LJCPA) and 5 neighbors were present and said the project would be the largest on the street. Presenter response was that all the new homes are going up two stories. The project review committee denied the project. Applicant then deleted most of the second story and went directly to the LJCPA, which approved the project.
- Presenter said project is the same height and bulk and scale as neighboring structures and affords similar views.
- Project proposes a swale to collect water on the steeply sloped lot and put it in a bio-retention basin in the basement to prevent neighbors from being impacted.

**Motion:** Lazerow moved to approve as presented as a Major (Process 3) project. Moser seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

- **6. Next meeting date:** Inquiry of availability for next meeting resulted in a tentative date of August 26, 2019.
- **7. Adjournment:** 12:52 p.m.

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

SD	City of San Diego Development Servic 1222 First Ave., MS 30	17		closure ement	FORM DS-318
300	San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 446-5000		Stat	ement	
	1979 C 1979		_		October 2017
Neighborhood Devel	opment Permit 🗅 Site Deve	pproval(s) requested: U Neighborhood Use lopment Permit U Planned Development Waiver U Land Use Plan Amendment	t Permit		
Project Title:Sugarmar	n Residence	P	roject No.	For City Use Only:	625569
Project Address: 8356	Sugarman Dr. La Jolla CA 92037		A. 1998, 1999	and the second second	
[] 김 영화 그 김 요즘은 영영 관람이 있는 것이 없다.	rship/Legal Status (please ed Liability -or- 🗅 General		entification	No	
D Partnership D Indivi	dual				
individual, firm, co-part with a financial interest individuals owning mor officers. (A separate pa <u>ANY</u> person serving a: A signature is required	thership, joint venture, asso t in the application. If the re than 10% of the shares, age may be attached if nece s an officer or director of of at least one of the pro	ted persons of the above referenced pro ociation, social club, fraternal organization applicant includes a corporation or partn If a publicly-owned corporation, include ssary.) If any person is a nonprofit organ the nonprofit organization or as truste perty owners. Attach additional pages in ownership during the time the application	n, corporation ership, income ization or is e or bene f needed.	tion, estate, trust, ro- clude the names, tit s, titles, and address a trust, list the nam ficiary of the nonp Note: The applicar processed or cons	eceiver or syndicate les, addresses of all ses of the corporate es and addresses of profit organization. ht is responsible for idered. Changes in
ownership are to be give	ven to the Project Manager	at least thirty days prior to any public he result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t	he subject property	. Failure to provide
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could	at least thirty days prior to any public he result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t	he subject property	<ol> <li>Failure to provide</li> </ol>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates,	at least thirty days prior to any public he result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>D Successor Agency</li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates,	at least thirty days prior to any public he result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>D Successor Agency</li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates,	at least thirty days prior to any public he result in a delay in the hearing process. LLC, a Nebreska Limited Liability 2	Paring on t	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>D Successor Agency</li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates,	at least thirty days prior to any public he result in a delay in the hearing process.	Baring on t	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, igarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public he result in a delay in the hearing process.	Baring on t	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: Ric Street Address: <u>8356 Su</u> City: <u>La Jolla</u> Phone No.: Signature: <u>Nock</u> Additional pages Attach	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, igarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public he result in a delay in the hearing process.	Baring on t	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: Ric Street Address: 8356 Su City: La Jolla Phone No.: Signature: Additional pages Attach Additional pages Attach	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, igarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	Baring on t	he subject property □ Tenant/Lessee State: <u>CA</u> /2-/8-/8	Zip: 92037
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: Ric Street Address: <u>8356 St</u> City: <u>La Jolla</u> Phone No.: Signature: <u>Hork</u> Additional pages Attach Applicant Name of Individual: <u>Ma</u>	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, ugarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	Baring on t	he subject property □ Tenant/Lessee State: <u>CA</u> /2-/8-/8	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: Ric Street Address: 8356 St City: La Jolla Phone No.: Signature: Additional pages Attach Additional pages Attach Applicant Name of Individual: Ma Street Address: 7724 G	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, ugarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	Baring on t	□ Tenant/Lessee State: <u>CA / 2 - / 8 - / 8</u> □ Tenant/Lessee	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, agarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	Baring on t	he subject property	Failure to provide     Successor Agency     Zip: _92037     Successor Agency
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: Ric Street Address: 8356 Su City: La Jolla Phone No.: Signature: Additional pages Attach Additional pages Attach Applicant Name of Individual: Ma Street Address: 7724 G	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, agarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	Paring on t Paring on t Paring Owner Comparison Compar	Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> State: <u>CA</u>	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, agarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	Paring on t Paring on t Paring Owner Comparison Compar	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, igarman Drive Advagey ied: Ves arengo Morton/Claude-Anthony irard Avenue, 2nd. floor.	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	Paring on t Paring on t Paring Owner Comparison Compar	Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> State: <u>CA</u>	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: Ric Street Address: 8356 St City: La Jolla Phone No.: Additional pages Attach Applicant Name of Individual: Ma Street Address: 7724 Giv City: La Jolla Phone No.: 858-459-376 Signature:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, igarman Drive Advagey ied: Ves arengo Morton/Claude-Anthony irard Avenue, 2nd. floor.	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	Paring on t Paring on t Paring Owner Comparison Compar	Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> State: <u>CA</u>	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, igarman Drive Advagey ied: Ves arengo Morton/Claude-Anthony irard Avenue, 2nd. floor.	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t  Owner  mail: Date: Email: Date:	Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> State: <u>CA</u>	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, igarman Drive Advagey ied: Yes arengo Morton/Claude-Anthony irard Avenue, 2nd. floor.	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t  Owner  mail: Date: Email: Date:	Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> Tenant/Lessee     State: <u>CA</u> State: <u>CA</u>	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, igarman Drive Advagey led: UYes arengo Morton/Claude-Anthony irard Avenue, 2nd. floor.	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t  Owner  mail: Date: Email: Date:	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, agarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t earing on t g Owner Cmail: Date: Date: Date: Date:	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> </ul>
ownership are to be giv accurate and current or Property Owner Name of Individual: _Ric Street Address: _8356 Su City: _La Jolla Phone No.:	ven to the Project Manager wnership information could k Schrager / Cosabella Estates, agarman Drive	at least thirty days prior to any public here result in a delay in the hearing process.	earing on t earing on t g Owner Email: Date: Date: Date: Date: Date: Email: Email:	he subject property	<ul> <li>Failure to provide</li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> <li>Successor Agency</li> <li>Zip: <u>92037</u></li> </ul>

()\$ 318 (10 17)





SCHRAGER RESIDENCE

8356 SUGARMAN DRIVE, LA JOLLA, CA 92037 COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

OPE OF WORK	SHEET INDEX	PR	OJECT DA	TA	
EQUESTING A COASTAL ERMIT OF A PROPOSED SINGLE CE CONSISTING OF A 4,565 S.F. DING WITH 3,355 S.F. GE ON A VACANT LOT. LSO PROPOSING A LOT LINE CREATE 2 LOTS OF 11,756 SQ. FT.	T-1.0       TITLE SHEET         T-1.1       CAP CHECKLIST         T-1.2       FORMS -4 AND I-5         1       TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY         ARCHITECTURAL         A-1.0       LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT/ DEMOLITION         A-1.1       SITE PLAN         A-1.2       EXCAVATION PLAN         A-2.1       BASEMENT PLAN	PROJECT INFORMATION PROJECT ADDRESS: ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER: LEGAL DESCRIPTION: BUILDING CODE:	8356 SUGARMAN LA JOLLA, CA 92 346-791-10-00 (LC MAP REF: 4382 L LOT:56 CITY:S2 CALIFORNIA RE EDITION & ASSO CALIFORNIA BL NATIONAL ELEO CALIFORNIA ME CALIFORNIA PL	N DRIVE 2037 OT 56) A JOLLA SCE AN DIEGO SIDENTIAL C OCIATED AMI DG CODE (CE CTRICAL COE ECH. CODE (C UMBING COE	
	<ul> <li>A-2.2 FIRST FLOOR PLAN</li> <li>A-2.3 SECOND FLOOR PLAN</li> <li>A-4.1 ROOF PLAN</li> <li>A-5.1A EAST ELEVATION</li> <li>A-5.1B EAST ELEVATION</li> <li>A-5.2 NORTH ELEVATION</li> <li>A-5.3 WEST ELEVATION</li> <li>A-5.4 SOUTH ELEVATION</li> </ul>	OCCUPANCY TYPE: NUMBER OF DWELLINGS: CONSTRUCTION TYPE: NUMBER OF STORIES: EXISTING USE: PROPOSED USE: LOT 56: LOT 57:	R-1 1 TYPE V 2 STORIES WITH VACANT LOT RESIDENTIAL EXISTING LOT A 11,160 SQ FT 12,352 SQ FT	REA F	GARAGE PROPOSED LOT AREA 11,756 SQ FT 11,756 SQ FT
	<ul> <li>A-5.4 SOUTH ELEVATION</li> <li>A-6.2 PROPOSED SECTION</li> <li>A-6.3 PROPOSED SECTION</li> <li>A-6.4 PROPOSED SECTION</li> <li>L-1 PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN</li> <li>L-2 WATER CONSERVATION PLAN</li> </ul>	ZONING INFORMATION ZONE:	LJSPD-SF LA JOLLA SHORES PLANNED DISTRICT SF.		DISTRICT SF.
		OVERLAY ZONE:	LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLAN 0-5 DU/AC AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY OVERLA ZONE (MCAS MIRAMAR), AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA (REVIEW AREA 2), COASTAL HEIGHT LIMITATION OVERLAY ZONE AND PARKING IMPACT OVERLAY ZONE		
		GEO HAZARD ZONE:			RABLE GEOLOGICAL
		SETBACKS FRONT (STREET FRONTAGE): SOUTH SIDE: NORTH SIDE: REAR: BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITATIONS	20'-0" 22'- 7'-0" 7'-8 7'-0" 8'- N/A 35'	-7" 8" 10" '-9"	PROPOSED MAX 52'-7" 38'-3" 44'-5" 35'-9" 21'-10"
		HOUSE LOT COVERAG		PROPOSED	
		LANDSCAPE AREA: 6,405 SQ. FT.			
		PARKING SPACES: PROPOSED BUILDING AREAS: BASEMENT / GARAGE FIRST FLOOR SECOND FLOOR	REQUIRED: 2       PROPOSED: 3         3,279 S.F. (NOT COUNTED IN F.A.R.)         3,441 S.F.         1,094 S.F. (EXCLUDING 542 S.F. FOR DECKS)		
		TOTAL BUILDING AREA (EXCLUDING DECKS): TOTAL BUILDING AREA (INCLUDING DECKS):	4,535 S.F. 		
		PROPOSED F.A.R.	4,535 SQ FT / 11,7	756 SQ FT = .3	9

Attachment 10
Marango
Marengo Morton
Architects 7724 Girard Ave. Second Floor La Jolla, CA 92037 Tel. (858) 459-3769 Fax. (858) 459-3768
Claude Anthony Marengo Desa Claude Anthony Marengo Desa $ \begin{array}{c}                                     $
All design, ideas and arrangements as indicated on these drawings are the legal property of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated and the specific project for which they were prepared as indicated on the project title block. Reproduction, publication or re-use by any method, in whole or part, without the express written consent of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated is prohibited. There shall be no changes, substitutions, modifications or deviations from these drawings or accompanying specifications without the consent of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated. Visual, physical, or electronic contact or use of these drawings and attached specifications shall constitute the acceptance of all these restrictions.
SCHRAGER RESIDENCE 8356 SUGARMAN DRIVE LA JOLLA. CA, 92037
8/15/2018 SINGLE PRELIM REVIEW 12/19/2018 FIRST SUBMITTAL 01/24/2019 COMPLETENESS CHECK 05/02/2019 COMMUNITY HEARING 08/07/2019 COASTAL RESUBMITTAL 09/20/2019 COASTAL RESUBMITTAL
PHASE COASTAL
PROJECT NO. 2018-19
REVIEWED BY CAM
DRAWN BY CC
DATE 01/27/2020 Marengo Morton Architects, Inc. is providing, by agreement with certain parties, materials stored electronically. The parties recognize that data, plans, specifications, reports, documents, or other information recorded on or transmitted as electronic media (including but not necessarily limited to "CAD documents") are subject to undetectable alteration, either intentional or unintentional, due to, among other causes, transmission, conversion, media degradation, software error, or human alteration. Accordingly, all such documents are provided to the parties for informational purposes only and not as an end product nor as a record document. Any reliance thereon is deemed to be unreasonable and unenforceable. The signed and stamped hard copies with the wet signature of the Architect of Record are the Architect's Instruments of Service and are the only true contract documents of record. SHEET TITLE <b>TITLE SHEEET</b>
T-1.0

sD	CLIMATE AC
In Desember	2015 the City of a stad

## TION PLAN CY CHECKLIST INTRODUCTION

In December 2015, the City adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) that outlines the actions that City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of State greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions. The purpose of the Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist (Checklist) is to, in conjunction with the CAP, provide a streamlined review process for proposed new development projects that are subject to discretionary review and trigger environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).1

Analysis of GHG emissions and potential climate change impacts from new development is required under CEQA. The CAP is a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(3), 15130(d), and 15183(b), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative GHG emissions effect may be determined not to be cumulatively considerable if it complies with the requirements of the CAP.

This Checklist is part of the CAP and contains measures that are required to be implemented on a project-by-project basis to ensure that the specified emissions targets identified in the CAP are achieved. Implementation of these measures would ensure that new development is consistent with the CAP's assumptions for relevant CAP strategies toward achieving the identified GHG reduction targets. Projects that are consistent with the CAP as determined through the use of this Checklist may rely on the CAP for the cumulative impacts analysis of GHG emissions. Projects that are not consistent with the CAP must prepare a comprehensive project-specific analysis of GHG emissions, including quantification of existing and projected GHG emissions and incorporation of the measures in this Checklist to the extent feasible. Cumulative GHG impacts would be significant for any project that is not consistent with the CAP.

The Checklist may be updated to incorporate new GHG reduction techniques or to comply with later amendments to the CAP or local, State, or federal law.

<sup>1</sup> Certain projects seeking ministerial approval may be required to complete the Checklist. For example, projects in a Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone may be required to use the Checklist to qualify for ministerial level review. See Supplemental Development Regulations in the project's community plan to determine applicability. City Council Approved July 12, 2016

Revised June 2017

Revised June 2017

Plumbing fixtures and fittings		
With respect to plumbing fixtures or fittings provided as part of the project, would those low-flow fixtures/appliances be consistent with each of the following:		
Residential buildings:		
<ul> <li>Kitchen faucets: maximum flow rate not to exceed 1.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi;</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Standard dishwashers: 4.25 gallons per cycle;</li> <li>Compact dishwashers: 3.5 gallons per cycle; and</li> <li>Clothes washers: water factor of 6 gallons per cubic feet of drum capacity?</li> </ul>		
Nonresidential buildings:		
<ul> <li>Plumbing fixtures and fittings that do not exceed the maximum flow rate specified in <u>Table A5,303,2,3,1 (voluntary measures) of the California Green</u> <u>Building Standards Code</u> (See Attachment A); and</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Appliances and fixtures for commercial applications that meet the provisions of Section A5.303.3 (voluntary measures) of the California Green Building Standards Code (See Attachment A)?</li> </ul>	V	
Check "N/A" only if the project does not include any plumbing fixtures or fittings.		
The proposed project will be consistent with:	1	
kitchen faucets - max. flow rate not to exceed 1.5 gpm at 60 psi std dishwasher- 4.25 gallons per cycle compact dishwasher - 3.5 gallons per cycle clothes washers - water factor of 6 gallons per cubic feet of		
drum capacity		

6

This page intentionally left blank

3.				
	<ul> <li>Electric Vehicle Charging</li> <li>Multiple-family projects of 17 dwelling units or less: Would 3% of the total parking spaces required, or a minimum of one space, whichever is greater, be provided with a listed cabinet, box or enclosure connected to a conduit linking the parking spaces with the electrical service, in a manner approved by the building and safety official, to allow for the future installation of electric vehicle supply equipment to provide electric vehicle charging stations at such time as it is needed for use by residents?</li> <li>Multiple-family projects of more than 17 dwelling units: Of the total required listed cabinets, boxes or enclosures, would 50% have the necessary electric vehicle supply equipment installed to provide active electric vehicle charging stations ready for use by residents?</li> <li>Non-residential projects: Of the total required listed cabinets, boxes or enclosures, would 50% have the necessary electric vehicle supply equipment installed to provide active electric vehicle supply equipment installed to provide active electric vehicle charging stations ready for use?</li> <li>Check "N/A" only if the project is a single-family project or would not require the provision of listed cabinets, boxes, or enclosures connected to a conduit linking the parking spaces with electrical service, e.g., projects requiring fewer than 10 parking spaces.</li> <li>N/A, single family residential project</li> </ul>			
St	trategy 3: Bicycling, Walking, Transit & Land Use (Complete this section if project includes non-residential or mixed uses)			
r (	Bicycle Parking Spaces Nould the project provide more short- and long-term bicycle parking spaces than required in the City's Municipal Code ( <u>Chapter 14. Article 2, Division 5</u> )? <sup>6</sup> Check "N/A" only if the project is a residential project. N/A, single family residential project			V
Th op inc	<sup>6</sup> Non-portable bicycle corrals within 600 feet of project frontage can be counted towards th 7 <u>rep 3: Project CAP Conformance Evaluation (if a</u> e third step of the CAP consistency review only applies if Step 1 is an: tion B. The purpose of this step is to determine whether a project that cludes a land use plan and/or zoning designation amendment is neve sumptions in the CAP because it would implement CAP Strategy 3 act	City Cou applicab swered in t at is located ertheless co	ncil Approved Revis le) he affirmation l in a TPA bunsistent wit	i July 12, 20 sed June 20 ve under ut that h the
Th op inc as: wc qu	The project CAP Conformance Evaluation (if a set third step of the CAP consistency review only applies if Step 1 is and the purpose of this step is to determine whether a project that cludes a land use plan and/or zoning designation amendment is never sumptions in the CAP because it would implement CAP Strategy 3 act build result in a reduction in density inside a TPA would not be consist testions must each be answered in the affirmative and fully explained. Would the proposed project implement the General Plan's City of Villages strategy in an ide result in an increase in the capacity for transit-supportive residential and/or employment of Considerations for this question: • Does the proposed land use and zoning designation associated with the project provide cawithin the TPA? • Is the project site suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development, as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development, as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development, as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development, as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development, as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as defined in the the suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development as the suitable to accommodate mix	City Cou swered in t at is located ertheless co tions. In gen tent with St d. entified Transit densities? apacity for transi the General Plan,	Incil Approved Revis Revis I in a TPA bunsistent witheral, a projurategy 3.The Priority Area (TP tsupportive resid within the TPA?	ye under ut that h the ect that e followin; PA) that will lential densiti
Th op inc as: wo qu <b>1.</b>	The project CAP Conformance Evaluation (if a set third step of the CAP consistency review only applies if Step 1 is and the purpose of this step is to determine whether a project the cludes a land use plan and/or zoning designation amendment is never sumptions in the CAP because it would implement CAP Strategy 3 act build result in a reduction in density inside a TPA would not be consist testions must each be answered in the affirmative and fully explained. Would the proposed project implement the General Plan's City of Villages strategy in an ide result in an increase in the capacity for transit-supportive residential and/or employment of Considerations for this question: • Does the proposed land use and zoning designation associated with the project provide car within the TPA?	City Cou applicab swered in t at is located ertheless co tions. In gen tent with St d. entified Transit densities? apacity for transit the General Plan, supportive empl rity Areas to inc	he affirmative revision of the affirmative he affirmative hin a TPA bunsistent with neral, a proju- rategy 3.The <b>Priority Area (TP</b> t-supportive reside within the TPA? oyment intensitie	ye under ut that h the ect that e followin <b>(A) that will</b> lential densiti
Th op inc as: wc qu <b>1.</b>	The project CAP Conformance Evaluation (if a set the proposed project implement the General Plan's City of Villages strategy in an ide result in an increase in the capacity for transit-supportive residential and/or employment of the capacity for transit-supportive residential and/or employment of the proposed project implement the General Plan's City of Villages strategy in an ide result in an increase in the capacity for transit-supportive residential and/or employment of the proposed land use and zoning designation associated with the project provide car within the TPA?  I sthe project site suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transit-support increase the capacity for transit-support increase the capacity for transited-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transited-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transited-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transited-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transited-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transited-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transited-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transited-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transited-use village development capacity for transited-use village development capacity for transited-use village de	City Cou applicab swered in t at is located ertheless co tions. In ger tent with St d. apacity for transit he General Plan, supportive empl rity Areas to inc s? to increase wal ections and acce	Incil Approved Revis Revis A manufacture in a TPA bunsistent with neral, a projurategy 3.The Priority Area (TP comportive resid within the TPA? oyment intensitie rease the use of king opportunit ssibility to local a	I July 12, 2 sed June 2 ve under ut that h the ect that followin A) that will lential densit s within the 1 transit?
Th op inc as: wo qu <b>1.</b> <b>2.</b> <b>3.</b>	Example 2: Project CAP Conformance Evaluation (if a step 3: Project CAP consistency review only applies if Step 1 is any tion B. The purpose of this step is to determine whether a project the cludes a land use plan and/or zoning designation amendment is never sumptions in the CAP because it would implement CAP Strategy 3 act build result in a reduction in density inside a TPA would not be consist testions must each be answered in the affirmative and fully explained. Would the proposed project implement the General Plan's City of Villages strategy in an ide result in an increase in the capacity for transit-supportive residential and/or employment of Considerations for this question: <ul> <li>Does the proposed land use and zoning designation associated with the project provide cawithin the TPA?</li> <li>Is the project site suitable to accommodate mixed-use village development, as defined in the Does the land use and zoning associated with the project increase the capacity for transits.</li> <li>Would the proposed project implement the General Plan's Mobility Element in Transit Prior Considerations for this question:</li> <li>Does the proposed project implement the General Plan's Mobility Element in Transit Prior Considerations for this question:</li> <li>Does the proposed project implement the General Plan's Mobility Element in Transit Prior Considerations for this question:</li> <li>Does the proposed project implement the General Plan's Mobility Element in Transit Prior Considerations for this question:</li> <li>Does the proposed project implement pedestrian improvements in Transit Priority Areas Considerations for this question:</li> <li>Does the proposed project circulation system provide multiple and direct pedestrian conversion at the proposed project circulation system provide multiple and direct pedestrian conversion at the area stops, shopping centers, and libraries)?</li> </ul>	City Cou applicab swered in t at is located ertheless co tions. In ger tent with St d. entified Transit densities? apacity for transi the General Plan, supportive empl rity Areas to inc s? to increase wal ections and acce sit supportive er ase bicycling op	Incil Approved Revis Revis A propertion Revis Priority Area (TP rategy 3. The Priority Area (TP t-supportive resid within the TPA? oyment intensitie rease the use of king opportunit ssibility to local a wironment? portunities? ster Plan?	I July 12, 21 sed June 21 ve under ut that that the ect that followin A) that will lential densit s within the s within the transit? ites? ctivity center
Thop incas: qu 1. 2. 3.	Example 2: Project CAP Conformance Evaluation (if a set of the construction of the consthe proposed project circulation system provide multiple	City Cou applicab swered in t at is located ertheless co tions. In gen tent with St d. apacity for transit densities? apacity for transi he General Plan, supportive empl rity Areas to inc s? to increase wal ections and acce sit supportive er ase bicycling op th the Bicycle Ma ets" approach to for jobs within ti e efficient use of	Incil Approved Revis Revis I a projunction Revision a TPA bunsistent with areral, a projunction rategy 3. The Priority Area (TP riority Area (TP riority Area (TP riority Area (TP rease the use of within the TPA? oyment intensitie rease the use of king opportunit ssibility to local a wironment? portunities? ster Plan? accommodate n lopment? urban greens in the TPA? parking through 1	ye under ut that h the ect that ect that followin; A) that will dential densiti s within the T f transit? des? ctivity centers nobility needs he TPA?

		<ul> <li>If required, the procedures can</li> <li>The requiremer</li> <li>The applicant m</li> </ul>	required only for projects subject to Checklist must be included in the pro be found in <u>Chapter 11: Land Develo</u> hts in the Checklist will be included in hust provide an explanation of how th n to the satisfaction of the Planning D	ject submittal pack present Procedures the project's condi- ne proposed project	of the Cit	y's Municipal ( oproval.	lode.	Step 1: Land Use Consistency The first step in determining CAP consistency for discretionary development projects is to assess projections used in the development of the CAP. This section allows the City to determine a pro- assumptions used in the CAP.
			Application l	nformation			Ī	Step 1: Land Use Consistency Checklist Item (Check the appropriate box and provide explanation and supporting documentation for your a
		Contact Informatio						(check the appropriate box and provide explanation and supporting documentation for your a
		Project No./Name: Property Address:	Schrager Residence 8356 Sugarman Dr., La Jolla C/	A 92037				A. Is the proposed project consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan lan zoning designations?, <sup>3</sup> <u>OR</u> ,
			Marengo Morton Architects, Inc 858-459-3769		cmare	ngo@san.rr	com	B. If the proposed project is not consistent with the existing land use plan and zoning design includes a land use plan and/or zoning designation amendment, would the proposed ame result in an increased density within a Transit Priority Area (TPA) <sup>4</sup> and implement CAP Stra
		Was a consultant re	tained to complete this checklist?	🗆 Yes 🔳 No	If Yes,	complete the		<ul> <li>actions, as determined in Step 3 to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department.</li> <li>C. If the proposed project is not consistent with the existing land use plan and zoning design the project include a land use plan and/or zoning designation amendment that would rest</li> </ul>
		Consultant Name: Company Name:		Contact Phone: Contact Email:				the project include a land use plan and/or zoning designation amendment that would rest equivalent or less GHG-intensive project when compared to the existing designations?
		Project Information	n of the project (acres)?	lot size .27 ad	res			If " <b>Yes</b> ," proceed to Step 2 of the Checklist. For question B above, complete Step 3. For question emissions under both existing and proposed designation(s) for comparison. Compare the max and the maximum buildout of the proposed designation.
		2. Identify all applica Residentia	able proposed land uses: al (indicate # of single family units):	<u>1</u>				If "No," in accordance with the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, the project's GHG i nonetheless incorporate each of the measures identified in Step 2 to mitigate cumulative GHG maker finds that a measure is infeasible in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. Pr
		Commerce	al (indicate # of multi-family units): ial (total square footage): (total square footage): scribe):					The proposed project is consistent with the existing General Plan and zoning designations.
City Cour	 July 12, 2016 ed June 2017	story, 4,565 sq adjustment to d <sup>2</sup> Certain projects seeking r Implementation Overlay	a coastal development permit of , ft. and 3,355 sq. ft. basement/g create two equal lots. ministerial approval may be required to com Zone may be required to use the Checklist t s in the project's community plan to determin 3	plete the Checklist. F	or example, al level revie	m a propose projects in a Co w. See Suppler buncil Approved	d lot line	<sup>3</sup> This question may also be answered in the affirmative if the project is consistent with SANDAG Series 12 growth projections as determined by the Planning Department. <sup>4</sup> This category applies to all projects that answered in the affirmative to question 3 on the previous page: Is the project or a p
		5. Shower facilities		modeto e ver 10				6. Designated Parking Spaces
		tenarit occupants (emplo accordance with the volu <u>Code</u> as shown in the tab Number of Tr Occupan (Employed 0-10 11-50 51-100 Over 200 Check "N/A" only if the p nonresidential developm (employees).	Shower/Changing Facilities Required         Two-Tier (12" X 72") Personal E Lockers Required           0         0           1 shower stall         2           1 shower stall         3           1 shower stall         4           1 shower stall         1	iower facilities in Building Standards				If the project includes a nonresidential use in a TPA, would the project provide designated parking for a combination of low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/vanpool vehicles in accordance with the following table?         Image: Imag

City Council Approved July 12, 2016

Revised June 2017



e project's bicycle parking requirements. City Council Approved July 12, 2016 Revised June 2017

## pplicable)

swered in the affirmative under nat is located in a TPA but that ertheless consistent with the tions. In general, a project that tent with Strategy 3.The following

## ntified Transit Priority Area (TPA) that will ensities?

pacity for transit-supportive residential densities he General Plan, within the TPA? supportive employment intensities within the TPA? ity Areas to increase the use of transit?

ase bicycling opportunities? h the Bicycle Master Plan? ets" approach to accommodate mobility needs of

# CLIMATE ACTION PLAN CONSISTENCY ATTACHMENT A

This attachment provides performance standards for applicable Climate Action Pan (CAP) Consistency Checklist measures.

8

Land Use Type	Roof Slope	Minimum 3-Year Aged Solar Reflectance	Thermal Emittance	Solar Reflective Inde
Lew Diss Desidential	≤2:12	0.55	0.75	64
Low-Rise Residential	> 2:12	0.20	0.75	16
High-Rise Residential Buildings,	≤2:12	0.55	0.75	64
Hotels and Motels	> 2:12	0.20	0.75	16
Nex Desidential	≤2:12	0.55	0.75	64
Non-Residential	> 2:12	0.20	0.75	16
Source: Adapted from the California Green A4.106.5.1 and A5.106.11.2.2, respectiv CALGreen does not include recommended	ely. Roof installation and veri	fication shall occur in accordance v	with the CALGreen Code.	

Table 2	Fixture Flow Rates for Non-Residential Bu Fittings supporting Strategy 1: Energy & V	
1	Fixture Type	Maximum Flo
	Showerheads	1.8 gpm @
	Lavatory Faucets	0.35 gpm @
	Kitchen Faucets	1.6 gpm @
	Wash Fountains	1.6 [rim space(in.)/20
	Metering Faucets	0.18 gallons
	Metering Faucets for Wash Fountains	0.18 [rim space(in.)/2
	Gravity Tank-type Water Closets	1.12 gallons
	Flushometer Tank Water Closets	1.12 gallons
	Flushometer Valve Water Closets	1.12 gallons
	Electromechanical Hydraulic Water Closets	1.12 gallons
	Urinals	0.5 gallons
A5.106.11.2.2,	from the <u>California Green Building Standards Code</u> (CALGreen) Tie respectively. See the <u>California Plumbing Code</u> for definitions of ea	ch fixture type.
Acronyms: gpm = gallons pe	f faucets are unavailable, aerators rated at 0.35 gpm or other mean or minute square inch (unit of pressure)	ns may be used to achieve reduction.

9

ESTIONS



not be applicable.

## Step 2: CAP Strategies Consistency

The second step of the CAP consistency review is to review and evaluate a project's consistency with the applicable strategies and actions of the CAP. Step 2 only applies to development projects that involve permits that would require a certificate of occupancy from the Building Official or projects comprised of one and two family dwellings or townhouses as defined in the California Residential Code and their accessory structures.<sup>5</sup> All other development projects that would not require a certificate of occupancy from the Building Official shall implement Best Management Practices for construction activities as set forth in the <u>Greenbook</u> (for public projects).

су		
Yes	No	N/A
n		
	n	Yes No

## <sup>5</sup> Actions that are not subject to Step 2 would include, for example: 1) discretionary map actions that do not propose specific development, 2) permits allowing wireless communication facilities, 3) special events permits, 4) use permits or other permits that do not result in the expansion or enlargement of a building (e.g., decks, garages, etc.), and 5) non-building infrastructure projects such as roads and pipelines. Because such actions would not result in new occupancy buildings from which GHG emissions reductions could be achieved, the items contained in Step 2 would

5

7. Transportation Demand Management Program If the project would accommodate over 50 tenant-occupants (employees), would it include a transportation demand management program that would be applicable to existing tenants and future tenants that includes: At least one of the following components: Parking cash out program Parking management plan that includes charging employees market-rate for single-occupancy vehicle parking and providing reserved, discounted, or free spaces for registered carpools or vanpools Unbundled parking whereby parking spaces would be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for the development for the life of the development And at least three of the following components: Commitment to maintaining an employer network in the SANDAG iCommute program and promoting its RideMatcher service to tenants/employees On-site carsharing vehicle(s) or bikesharing Flexible or alternative work hours Telework program Transit, carpool, and vanpool subsidies Pre-tax deduction for transit or vanpool fares and bicycle commute costs  $\Box^{\mathbf{X}}$ Access to services that reduce the need to drive, such as cafes, commercial

stores, banks, post offices, restaurants, gyms, or childcare, either onsite or within 1,320 feet (1/4 mile) of the structure/use? Check "N/A" only if the project is a residential project or if it would not accommodate over 50 tenant-occupants (employees). N/A, single family residential project

> City Council Approved July 12, 2016 Revised June 2017

City Council Approved July 12, 2016

Revised June 2017

1

@60 psl @ 60 psi '20 gpm @ 60 psi] ons/cycle /20 gpm @ 60 psi] ons/flush ons/flush ons/flush ons/flush ns/flush hown in Tables A5.303.2.3.1 and

City Council Approved July 12, 2016

Revised June 2017

The second s	es and Fixtures for Commercial Applicati Tittings supporting Strategy 1: Energy & V	the second s	
Appliance/Fixture Type	Standard	Q	
Clothes Washers	Maximum Water (WF) that will reduce the use of below the California Energy Comm for commercial clothes washer of the California Code of	water by 10 percent nissions' WF standards s located in Title 20	
Conveyor-type Dishwashers	0.70 maximum gallons per rack (2.6 L) (High-Temperature)	0.62 maximum gallons per rack (4.4 L) (Chemical)	
Door-type Dishwashers	0.95 maximum gallons per rack (3.6 L) (High-Temperature)	1.16 maximum gallons per rack (2.6 L) (Chemical)	
Undercounter-type Dishwashers	0.90 maximum gallons per rack (3.4 L) (High-Temperature)	0.98 maximum gallons per rack (3. L) (Chemical)	
Combination Ovens	Consume no more than 10 gallons per hour (3	8 L/h) in the full operational mode.	
Commercial Pre-rinse Spray Valves (manufactured on or after January 1, 2006)	Function at equal to or less than 1.6 gallons per mi Be capable of cleaning 60 plates in an a seconds per plate. Be equipped with an integral automatic Operate at static pressure of at least 30 rrate of 1.3 gallons per minute (0.08 L/s	werage time of not more than 30 shutoff. psi (207 kPa) when designed for a flow	
Source: Adapted from the California Green Building Stand: the California Plumbing Code for definitions of each applia Acronyms: L = liter L/h = liters per hour L/s = liters per source psi = pounds per square inch (unit of pressure) R#a = kilopascal (unit of pressure)		asures shown in Section A5.303.3. See	

10

# Attachment 10

# Marengo Morton Architects

7724 Girard Ave. Second Floor La Jolla, CA 92037 Tel. (858) 459-3769 Fax. (858) 459-3768 Michael Morton AIA Claude Anthony Marengo DESA



### ll design, ideas and arrangements as indica on these drawings are the legal property of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated and the specific project for which they were prepared as indicated on the project title block. Reproduction, publication or re-use by any method, in whole or part, without the express written consent of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated is prohibited. There shall be no changes, substitutions, modifications or deviations from these drawings or accompanying specifications without the consent of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated. Visual, physical, or electronic contact or use of these drawings and attached specifications shall constitute the acceptance of

all these restrictions.

LT)

DEN

SIL

RE

AGER

CHR

Ň

C

Ш  $\geq$  $\sim$ DR 203 AN A, 9 C/M AR. A. SUGA JOLLA 8356 LA J

8/15/2018 SINGLE PRELIM REVIEW 12/19/2018 FIRST SUBMITTAL 01/24/2019 COMPLETENESS CHECK 05/02/2019 COMMUNITY HEARING 08/07/2019 COASTAL RESUBMITTAL 09/20/2019 COASTAL RESUBMITTAL



09/20/2019

DATE

SHEET TITLE

Marengo Morton Architects, Inc. is providing, by agreement with certain parties, materials stored electronically. The parties recognize that data, plans, specifications, reports, documents, or other information recorded on or transmitted as electronic media (including but not necessarily limited to "CAD documents") are subject to undetectable alteration, either intentional or unintentional, due to, among other causes, transmission, conversion, media degradation, software error, or human alteration. Accordingly, all such documents are provided to the parties for informational purposes only and not as an end

anteriation. Accordingly, an such documents are provided to be parties for informational purposes only and not as an end product nor as a record document. Any reliance thereon is deemed to be unreasonable and unenforceable. The signed and stamped hard copies with the wet signature of the Architect of Record are the Architect's Instruments of Service and are the only true contract documents of record.

CAP CHECKLIST

**T-1.**]

Source Control BMP for Standard		For	m I-4A
All development projects must implement source control BMPs. Ref Appendix E of the BMP Design Manual for information to implement E <b>Note: All selected BMPs must be shown on the construction plans.</b>	-		
Source Control Requirement		Applied	<sup>(1)</sup> ?
4.2.1 Prevention of Illicit Discharges into the MS4	🖌 Yes	No	□n/a
4.2.2 Storm Drain Stenciling or Signage	🖌 Yes	No	N/A
4.2.3 Protect Outdoor Materials Storage Areas from Rainfall, Run- On, Runoff, and Wind Dispersal	Yes	ΠNο	✓N/A
4.2.4 Protect Materials Stored in Outdoor Work Areas from Rainfall, Run-On, Runoff, and Wind Dispersal	Yes	No	✓N/A
4.2.5 Protect Trash Storage Areas from Rainfall, Run-On, Runoff, and Wind Dispersal	Yes	No	✓N/A
4.2.6 BMPs based on Potential Sources of Runoff Pollutants	£		
On-site storm drain inlets	✓Yes	No	□N/A
Interior floor drains and elevator shaft sump pumps	Yes	✓ No	□N/A
Interior parking garages	✓Yes	ΠNο	□N/A
Need for future indoor & structural pest control	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
Landscape/Outdoor Pesticide Use	✓Yes	🗆 No	D N/A
Pools, spas, ponds, decorative fountains, and other water features	✓Yes	🗆 No	D N/A
Food service	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
Refuse areas IN GARAGE	Yes	<b>₽</b> No	□N/A
Industrial processes	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
Outdoor storage of equipment or materials	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
Vehicle/Equipment Repair and Maintenance	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
Fuel Dispensing Areas	🗆 Yes	□ No	✓N/A
Loading Docks	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
Fire Sprinkler Test Water	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
Miscellaneous Drain or Wash Water	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
Plazas, sidewalks, and parking lots	🗆 Yes	□ No	✓N/A
SC-6A: Large Trash Generating Facilities	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
SC-6B: Animal Facilities	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
SC-6C: Plant Nurseries and Garden Centers	🗆 Yes	🗆 No	✓N/A
SC-6D: Automotive Facilities	🗆 Yes	□ No	✓N/A
Discussion / justification for <u>all</u> "No" answers shown above:	<u> </u>		

NO DRAINAGE IS BEING OFFERED INSIDE THE HOUSE OR AT ELEVATOR OR INTERNAL AREAS EXCEPT THRESHOLD OF GARAGE. ALL AREAS ARE DRAINING TO OUR RETENTION BASIN AS WE ARE CONTROLLIN GTH PERMIETER OF THE BUILDING.

The City of San Diego | Storm Water Standards Form I-4A | January 2018 Edition

SD

All development project of the BMP Design Ma Note: All selected BMPs

4.3.1 Maintain Natural I Features 4.3.2 Conserve Natural

4.3.3 Minimize Impervio 4.3.4 Minimize Soil Con

4.3.5 Impervious Area [

4.3.6 Runoff Collection 4.3.7 Landscaping with

4.3.8 Harvest and Use Precipitation

<sup>(1)</sup> Answer for each source control and site design category shall be pursuant to the following: • "Yes" means the project will implement the BMP as described in Chapter 4 and/or Appendix E of the BMP Design Manual. Discussion / justification is not required.

/ justification must be provided.

Site	Design BMP Ch for Standard Pr			Forr	n I-5A
ects must implement site design Manual for information to imple <b>Ps must be shown on the constru</b> e	ment BMPs show	•			
Site Design Requirement			A	pplied <sup>(</sup>	<sup>1)</sup> ?
l Drainage Pathways and Hydrolo	gic	<b>۲</b>	es [	No	∏N/A
al Areas, Soils, and Vegetation		٧	es [	No	🔲 N/A
vious Area		٧	es [	No	🗌 N/A
ompaction		٧	es [	No	🗌 N/A
Dispersion		٧	es [	No	🗋 N/A
n		٧	es [	No	🔲 N/A
h Native or Drought Tolerant Spe	cies	<b>₽</b> Y€	es [	No	∏n/A
Precipitation		٧	es [	No	🗌 N/A

Discussion / justification for <u>all</u> "No" answers shown above:

• "No" means the BMP is applicable to the project but it is not feasible to implement. Discussion

• "N/A" means the BMP is not applicable at the project site because the project does not include the feature that is addressed by the BMP (e.g., the project has no outdoor materials storage areas). Discussion / justification may be provided.

The City of San Diego | Storm Water Standards Form I-5A | January 2018 Edition

SD





# LEGAL DESCRIPTION

LOTS 56 AND 57 OF LA JOLLA SCENIC HEIGHTS, IN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO MAP THEREOF NO. 4382, FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY, OCTOBER 29, 1959.

# NOTES

- 1. EASEMENTS, AGREEMENTS, DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS WHICH AFFECT THIS
- PROPERTY MAY EXIST, BUT CANNOT BE PLOTTED. SEE TITLE REPORT. 2. THE PRECISE LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND UTILITIES COULD NOT BE DETERMINED IN THE FIELD. PRIOR TO ANY EXCAVATION UTILITY COMPANIES WILL NEED TO MARK-
- OUT THE UTILITY LOCATIONS. 3. THE ADDRESS FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS 8356 SUGARMAN DRIVE, LA JOLLA CA
- 92037, 4. THE ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS 346-791-09.
- 5. THE TOTAL AREA OF THE SUBJECT PARCELS IS 0.54 ACRES.

# BENCHMARK

CITY OF SAN DIEGO BENCHMARK LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SUGARMAN DRIVE AND LA JOLLA SCENIC DRIVE NORTH. ELEVATION 401.96' MEAN SEA LEVEL (N.G.V.D. 1929).

# TITLE REFERENCE/NOTES

TITLE INFORMATION FOR THIS SURVEY IS FROM LAWYERS TITLE AMENDED PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT, FILE NO. 318311759, DATED FEBRUARY 5, 2018.

- AN EASEMENT FOR AERIAL AND UNDERGROUND COMMUNICATION STRUCTURES AND RIGHTS INCI-5 DENTAL THERETO GRANTED TO THE PACIFIC TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, RECORDED FEBRUARY 8, 1960 AS FILE NO. 25806 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.
- AN EASEMENT FOR THE RIGHT AND PRIVILEDGE TO PLACE AND MAINTAIN AN ANCHOR TO SUPPORT [6] A LINE OF POLES AND WIRES AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL THERETO GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, RECORDED MARCH 16, 1960 AS FILE NO. 54313 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.
- AN EASEMENT FOR POLES AND WIRES AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL THERETO GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO 7 GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY RECORDED MARCH 16, 1960 AS FILE NO. 54314 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.
- , AN EASEMENT FOR RIGHT OF WAY FOR DRAINAGE AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL THERETO GRANTED TO 8 HOWARD A NOFFER AND JEAN L. NOFFER, RECORDED OCTOBER 7, 1960 AS FILE NO. 200697 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

NOTE: AN EASEMENT FOR SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY IS SHOWN OVER A PORTION OF THE SOUTHERLY SIDE OF LOT 56 ON SUBDIVISION MAP NO. 4382, BUT IS NOT DISCLOSED IN THE REFERENCED PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT AND IS NOT PLOTTED.

Tebo. 3-31-2 04-23-18 PATRICK F. CHRISTENSEN, P.L.S. 7208 Date

Prepared By: CHRISTENSEN ENGINEERING & SURVEYING 7888 SILVERTON AVENUE, SUITE 'J' SAN DIEGO, CA 92126 PHONE (858)271~9901 EMAIL: CEANDS@AOL. COM Project Address: Revision 5: 8356 SUGARMAN DRIVE Revision 4: LA JOLLA, CA 92037 Revision 3: Revision 2: Revision 1: 4-29-18 ADDED TITLE DATA Project Name: 8356 SUGARMAN Original Date: APRIL 23, 2018 Sheet 1 Of 1 Sheet Title: TOPOGRAPHIC MAP DEP#



## **GENERAL SITE NOTES** THE SITE PLAN IS FOR GENERAL SITE REFERENCE ONLY. REFER TO OTHER CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS FOR COMPLETE SCOPE OF WORK. BEFORE COMMENCING ANY SITE FOUNDATION OR SLAB CUTTING OR **EXCAVATION THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY LOCATIONS OF ALL** SITE UTILITIES, DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS. THESE INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO PROPERTY LINES, SETBACK LOCATION TO ALL NEW OR EXISTING WALLS, EASEMENTS (IF ANY), EXISTING SITE UTILITIES, INCLUDING WATER, SEWER, GAS AND ELECTRICAL LINES AND ANY OTHER NEW OR EXISTING SITE ITEMS WHICH COULD AFFECT IN ANY WAY THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUILDING. FLAG OR OTHERWISE MARK ALL LOCATIONS OF SITE PROPERTY LINES, EASEMENTS (IF ANY) UNDERGROUND UTILITIES, AND INDICATE UTILITY TYPE. ALL CONDITIONS OR DIMENSIONS ON THESE PLANS SHALL BE VERIFIED IN THE FIELD BY THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR WITH Marengo ACTUAL SITE CONDITIONS. WRITTEN DIMENSIONS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER SCALED DIMENSIONS AND SHALL BE VERIFIED ON Morton THE JOB SITE. ON-SITE VERIFICATION OF ALL DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS SHALL BE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE GENERAL Architects THE CONTRACTOR OR SUB-CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT IF ANY CONFLICTS OR DISCREPANCY OCCURS BETWEEN THIS INFORMATION ON THIS PLAN AND ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS. 7724 Girard Ave. DO NOT PROCEED WITH WORK IN CONFLICT WITH THESE DRAWING UNTIL WRITTEN OR VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS ARE ISSUED BY THE Second Floor LOCATE REFUSE BIN AT APPROVED ON-SITE LOCATION. CONTRACTOR La Jolla, CA 92037 SHALL DISPOSE OF ALL SITE REFUSE AT CITY-APPROVED LOCATIONS. PROVIDE BUILDING ADDRESS NUMBERS, VISIBLE AND LEGIBLE FROM Tel. (858) 459-3769 Fax. (858) 459-3768 NO TREES OR SHRUBS WHOSE HEIGHT WILL BE 3'-0" AT MATURITY SHALL BE INSTALLED WITHIN 5'-0" OF ANY PUBLICLY MAINTAINED WATER Michael Morton AIA FACILITIES OR WITHIN 10'-0" OF ANY PUBLICLY MAINTAINED SEWER Claude Anthony Marengo DESA $D \star AR$ RENF \* ≥ C-19371 RENEWAL 04/30/2021 All design, ideas and arrangements as indicated on these drawings are the legal property of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated and the specific project for which they were prepared as indicated on the project title block. Reproduction, publication or re-use by any method, in whole or part, without the express written consent of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated is prohibited. There shall be no changes, substitutions, modifications or deviations from these drawings or accompanying specifications without the consent of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated. Visual, physical, or electronic contact or use of these drawings and attached specifications shall constitute the acceptance of all these restrictions. LT) EN > $\sim$ **RESID** MAN DRI CA, 92037 GER 8356 SUGARI LA JOLLA. $\checkmark$ **SCHR** $\infty$ 8/15/2018 SINGLE PRELIM REVIEW 12/19/2018 FIRST SUBMITTAL 01/24/2019 COMPLETENESS CHECK 05/02/2019 COMMUNITY HEARING 08/07/2019 COASTAL RESUBMITTAL 09/20/2019 COASTAL RESUBMITTAL PHASE COASTAL PROJECT NO. 2018-19 REVIEWED BY CAM DRAWN BY CS DATE 09/20/2019 Marengo Morton Architects, Inc. is providing, by agreem with certain parties, materials stored electronically. The pa ecognize that data, plans, specifications, reports, document er information recorded on or trans cluding but not necessarily limited to "CAD do subject to undetectable alteration, either intentional or unintentional, due to, among other causes, transmission conversion, media degradation, software error, or huma eration. Accordingly, all such documents are provided to parties for informational purposes only and not as an enproduct nor as a record document. Any reliance there red to be unreasonable and unenforceable. Record are the Architect's Instruments of Service and are the only true contract documents of record. SHEET TITLE LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT / DEMOLITION SITE PLAN A-1.0

Attachment 10

# DEMOLITION LEGEND

(E) ITEMS TO BE DEMOLISHED

\_\_\_\_ 

\_\_\_\_

FACILITIES.

(E) PATIO TO BE REMOVED

(E) EASTMENT

CONTRACTOR AND SUBCONTRACTORS.

STREET OR ROAD FRONTING THE PROPERTY.

ALL GRADES SHOWN / PROPOSED ARE EXISTING.

**ARCHITECT OFFICE.** 





octo/2018 Deviante/2018 10a 8256 Surgemen De/CADD Denuringed A mb















SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

# STORM WATER QUALITY NOTES CONSTRUCTION BMPs

THIS PROJECT SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL CURRENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE STATE PERMIT; CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD (SDRWQCB), SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL STORM WATER PERMIT, THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, AND THE STORM WATER STANDARDS MANUAL.

PRIOR TO ANY SOIL DISTURBANCE, TEMPORARY SEDIMENT CONTROLS SHALL BE INSTALLED BY THE CONTRACTOR OR QUALIFIED PERSON(S) AS INDICATED BELOW:

- 1) ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO "STORM WATER STANDARDS MANUAL" MUST BE INCORPORATED INTO THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROPOSED GRADING/IMPROVEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVED STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP) AND/OR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLAN (WPCP) FOR CONSTRUCTION LEVEL BMP'S AND, IF APPLICABLE, THE STORM WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN (SWQMP) FOR POST-CONSTRUCTION BMP'S.
- 2) THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL AND MAINTAIN ALL STORM DRAIN INLET PROTECTION. INLET PROTECTION IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY MUST BE TEMPORARILY REMOVED PRIOR TO A RAIN EVENT TO ENSURE NO FLOODING OCCURS AND REINSTALLED AFTER RAIN IS OVER.
- 3) ALL CONSTRUCTION BMP'S SHALL BE INSTALLED AND PROPERLY MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT THE DURATION OF CONSTRUCTION.
- 4) THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ONLY GRADE, INCLUDING CLEARING AND GRUBBING, AREAS FOR WHICH THE CONTRACTOR OR QUALIFIED CONTACT PERSON CAN PROVIDE EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES.
- THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THAT ALL SUB-CONTRACTORS AND SUPPLIERS ARE AWARE OF ALL STORM WATER BMP'S AND IMPLEMENT SUCH MEASURES. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE APPROVED SWPPP/WPCP WILL RESULT IN THE ISSUANCE OF CORRECTION NOTICES, CITATIONS, CIVIL PENALTIES, AND/OR STOP WORK NOTICES.
- 6) THE CONTRACTOR OR QUALIFIED CONTACT PERSON SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANUP OF ALL SILT, DEBRIS, AND MUD ON AFFECTED AND ADJACENT STREET(S) AND WITHIN STORM DRAIN SYSTEM DUE TO CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES/EQUIPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY AT THE END OF EACH WORK DAY.
- 7) THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT NEW AND EXISTING STORM WATER CONVEYANCE SYSTEMS FROM SEDIMENTATION, CONCRETE RINSE, OR OTHER CONSTRUCTION-RELATED DEBRIS AND DISCHARGES WITH THE APPROPRIATE BMP'S THAT ARE ACCEPTABLE TO THE CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER AND AS INDICATED IN THE SWPPP/WPCP.
- 8) THE CONTRACTOR OR QUALIFIED CONTACT PERSON SHALL CLEAR DEBRIS, SILT, AND MUD FROM ALL DITCHES AND SWALES PRIOR TO AND WITHIN 3 BUSINESS DAYS AFTER EACH RAIN EVENT OR PRIOR TO THE NEXT RAIN EVENT, WHICHEVER IS SOONER.
- 9) IF A NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGE LEAVES THE SITE, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL IMMEDIATELY STOP THE ACTIVITY AND REPAIR THE DAMAGES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER OF THE DISCHARGE, PRIOR TO RESUMING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY. ANY AND ALL WASTE MATERIAL, SEDIMENT, AND DEBRIS FROM EACH NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGE SHALL BE REMOVED FROM THE STORM DRAIN CONVEYANCE SYSTEM AND PROPERLY DISPOSED OF BY THE CONTRACTOR.
- 10) EQUIPMENT ND WORKERS FOR EMERGENCY WORK SHALL BE MADE AVAILABLE AT ALL TIMES. ALL NECESSARY MATERIALS SHALL BE STOCKPILED ONSITE AT CONVENIENT LOCATIONS TO FACILITATE RAPID DEPLOYMENT OF CONSTRUCTION BMP'S WHEN RAIN IS IMMINENT.
- 11) THE CONTRACTOR SHALL RESTORE AND MAINTAIN ALL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL BMP'S TO WORKING ORDER YEAR-ROUND.
- 12) THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL ADDITIONAL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES DUE TO UNFORESEEN CIRCUMSTANCES TO PREVENT NON-STORM WATER AND SEDIMENT-LADEN DISCHARGES.
- 13) THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE AND SHALL TAKE NECESSARY PRECAUTIONS TO PREVENT PUBLIC TRESPASS ONTO AREAS WHERE IMPOUNDED WATERS CREATE A HAZARDOUS CONDITION.
- 14) ALL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES PROVIDED PER THE APPROVED SWPPP/WPCP SHALL BE INSTALLED AND MAINTAINED. ALL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS FOR INTERIM CONDITIONS SHALL BE PROPERLY DOCUMENTED AND INSTALLED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER.
- 15) AS NECESSARY, THE CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER SHALL SCHEDULE MEETINGS FOR THE PROJECT TEAM (GENERAL CONTRACTOR, QUALIFIED CONTACT PERSON, EROSION CONTROL SUBCONTRACTOR IF ANY, ENGINEER OF WORK, OWNER/DEVELOPER, AND THE CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER) TO EVALUATE THE ADEQUACY OF THE EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES AND OTHER BMP'S RELATIVE TO ANTICIPATED CONSTRICTION ACTIVITIES.
- 16) THE CONTRACTOR OR QUALIFIED CONTACT PERSON SHALL CONDUCT VISUAL INSPECTIONS AND MAINTAIN ALL BMP'S DAILY AND AS NEEDED. VISUAL INSPECTIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF ALL BMP'S SHALL BE CONDUCTED BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER EVERY RAIN EVENT AND EVERY 24 HOURS DURING ANY PROLONGED RAIN EVENT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN AND REPAIR ALL BMP'S AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AS SAFETY ALLOWS.
- 17) CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE AND EXIT AREA. TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE AND EXITS SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CASQA FACT SHEET TC-1 OR CALTRANS FACT SHEET TC-01 TO PREVENT TRACKING OF SEDIMENT AND OTHER POTENTIAL POLLUTANTS ONTO PAVED SURFACES AND TRAVELED WAYS. WIDTH SHALL BE 10' OR THE MINIMUM NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT WITHOUT BY-PASSING THE ENTRANCE. (a) NON-STORM WATER DISCHARGES SHALL BE EFFECTIVELY MANAGED PER THE SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 4, ARTICLE 3, **DIVISION 3 "STORM WATER MANAGEMENT AND DISCHARGE** CONTROL".

# Attachment 10



# **STORM DRAINAGE NOTES**

- THE PRIMARY STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM SHALL CONNECT TO THE BUILDING STORM WATER THAT CONNECTS TO AN UNDERGROUND PUBLIC STORM SEWER
- 2. THE SECONDARY ROOF DRAINAGE SYSTEM SHALL DISCHARGE ABOVE GRADE, IN A LOCATION OBSERVABLE BY THE BUILDING OCCUPANTS OR MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL

3. ROOF DRAINS TO DISCHARGE INTO LANDSCAPE AREA.

# HEIGHT NOTES

- . THE HIGHEST POINT OF THE ROOF, EQUIPMENT, OR ANY VENT, PIPE, ANTENNA OR OTHER PROJECTION, SHALL NOT EXCEED 30' ABOVE GRADE.
- . NO PORTION OF THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE WILL EXCEED THE EXISTING BUILDING HEIGHT. PROPOSED HEIGHT TO BE FIELD VERIFIED TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE

# **ROOF NOTES**

- Roofing Underlayment slope 3:12 or less: "Ice and Water Shield" by W.R. Grace, ESR-1677, or "Winter Guard HT" by Certain Teed Corp. ESR-1492 (or architect approved equal). Install per manufacturer's instructions. Install a #40 fiberglass reinforced felt sheet over roof membrane.
- Counter-slopes: ¼" per 12" (minimum) towards drains created using G-26 (latex -cement) flooring underlayment by <u>Crossfield Products Corp.</u>
   Roof Edge Drip, Metal Flashing, Panel Clips and Counter Flashing: All exterior
- flashing to be 16 oz copper unless otherwise noted. Solder or seal all seams. Hem all exposed edges Plumbing Vent: ABS plastic to be flashed with Carlisle-Syntec TPO Pre-Molded pipe
- flashing Parapet, Transitions and other Horizontal Stucco Surface Waterproofing: Membrane waterproofing shall be JIFFY SEAL 140/60 by Protecto Wrap. Extend membrane a minimum of 6" below edge of parapet, each side. Provide a minimum end lap of 4" over adjoining membrane sheets. Where membrane abuts vertical surfaces, the membrane shall extend 6" up surface, and be overlapped by building wrap.
- ESR-1127. Roof Drain. Roof drain shall be TPO-RD2NH - 2" TPO-clad no-hub bottom outlet drain by <u>**Thunderbird Products**</u> with A.B.S. dome strainer. Telephone (800) 658-2473. Provide 3" I.D. ABS drain lines with min.¼":1' slope. Connect to building storm water.
- Fireplace Vent: Fireplace vent shall be Type B Stainless Steel as required by fireplace manufacturer. Minimum size mesh in spark arrestor shall be  $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Mesh shall be stainless steel or copper.
- Roof Vent: TPO Pre-molded roof venting see detail 6/A-10.4.1 10. Roof gutters shall be provided with the means to prevent the accumulation of leaves and debris in the gutter. All roof gutters and downspouts shall be constructed of non-combustible materials.
- 11. Drip edge flashing used at the free edges of roofing materials shall be non-combustible. 12. Valley flashings shall be not less than 0.019' (#26 copper gauge) corrosion-resistant metal installed over a min. 36"-wide underlayment consisting of one layer of No. 72 ASTM cap sheet running the full length of the valley.
- 13. Turbine attic vents shall be equipped to allow one-way direction rotation only and shall not free spin in both directions. 14. Enclosed rafter assemblies not required to be vented per CRC R806.5.
- 15. The entire roof shall be covered with a fire-retardant roof covering that is at least Class 'A' when the area of the addition to the existing building is more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the original floor area of the building [SDMC 149.0902(a)(2)].

# LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT AND PERMANENT BMPs

LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT DESIGN ELEMENTS

- 1. PLANTER/LANDSCAPE AREA TO BE USED FOR RAINWATER
- INTERCEPTION AND EVAPOTRANSPIRATION 2. DIRECT RUN-OFF FROM IMPERVIOUS AREAS TO BE DIRECTED TO LANDSCAPING AREAS

SOURCE CONTROL BMPS

- 1. AIR CONDITIONING CONDENSATE TO BE DISCHARGED INTO
- ADJACENT LANDSCAPE AREA 2. LANDSCAPE AREA TO BE PLANTED WITH DROUGHT TOLERANT AND/OR NATIVE PLANT SPECIES FOR EROSION CONTROL PERMANENT BMPS
- 1. ALL STORMWATER TO BE DIRECTED TO AND DISCHARGED INTO ADJACENT LANDSCAPE AREAS.

<b>Narengo</b> <b>Morton</b> <b>Architects</b> 7724 Girard Ave. Second Floor La Jolla, CA 92037 Tel. (858) 459-3769 Fax. (858) 459-3768 Michael Morton AIA Claude Anthony Marengo Desa Michael Morton AIA Claude Anthony Marengo Desa
All design, ideas and arrangements as indicated on these drawings are the legal property of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated and the specific project for which they were prepared as indicated on the project title block. Reproduction, publication or re-use by any method, in whole or part, without the express written consent of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated is prohibited. There shall be no changes, substitutions, modifications or deviations from these drawings or accompanying specifications without the consent of Marengo Morton Architects, Incorporated. Visual, physical, or electronic contact or use of these drawings and attached specifications shall constitute the acceptance of all these restrictions.
SCHRAGER RESIDENCE 8356 SUGARMAN DRIVE LA JOLLA. CA, 92037
8/15/2018 SINGLE PRELIM REVIEW 12/19/2018 FIRST SUBMITTAL 01/24/2019 COMPLETENESS CHECK 05/02/2019 COMMUNITY HEARING 08/07/2019 COASTAL RESUBMITTAL 09/20/2019 COASTAL RESUBMITTAL
PHASE COASTAL
PROJECT NO. 2018-19
REVIEWED BY CAM
DRAWN BY CS
DATE 09/20/2019
Marengo Morton Architects, Inc. is providing, by agreement with certain parties, materials stored electronically. The parties recognize that data, plans, specifications, reports, documents, or other information recorded on or transmitted as electronic media (including but not necessarily limited to "CAD documents") are subject to undetectable alteration, either intentional or unintentional, due to, among other causes, transmission, conversion, media degradation, software error, or human alteration. Accordingly, all such documents are provided to the parties for informational purposes only and not as an end product nor as a record document. Any reliance thereon is deemed to be unreasonable and unenforceable. The signed and stamped hard copies with the wet signature of the Architect of Record are the Architect's Instruments of Service and are the only true contract documents of record. SHEET TITLE PROPOSED ROOF PLAN
A-4.1

















































А







TO LANDSCAPING AREAS SOURCE CONTROL BMPS

1. AIR CONDITIONING CONDENSATE TO BE DISCHARGED INTO ADJACENT LANDSCAPE AREA 2. LANDSCAPE AREA TO BE PLANTED WITH DROUGHT TOLERANT AND/OR

ADJACENT LANDSCAPE AREAS.

NATIVE PLANT SPECIES FOR EROSION CONTROL PERMANENT BMPS 1. ALL STORMWATER TO BE DIRECTED TO AND DISCHARGED INTO

# GENERAL NOTES

- 1. PLANT MATERIAL LOCATIONS ON THE PLANTING PLAN ARE APPROXIMATE AND SHALL BE ADJUSTED AS DIRECTED BY THE
- ARCHITECT . ALL GROUNDCOVER PLANTS SHALL BE FULLY ROOTED PLANT MATERIAI
- IN FLATS, PLUGS OR POTS . BUDS AND BLOOMS ON ALL PLANTS MUST BE PROTECTED AT ALL TIMES
- INCLUDING TRANSPORTATION AND INSTALLATION 4. TREES AND SHRUBS SHALL BE SHAPED AND PRUNED DURING THE
- MAINTENANCE PERIOD . ALL AREAS TO RECEIVE SHREDDED BARK MULCH
- 6. MAINTENANCE SHALL INCLUDE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, MOWING, TRIMMING, PRUNING, WATERING, FERTILIZATION, WEED CONTROL CLEAN-UP, OPERATION / ADJUSTMENT AND REPAIR OF THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM . FILL, RE-COMPACT, AND REPLANT ANY AREAS THAT HAVE SETTLED AND
- **RE-ESTABLISH POSITIVE DRAINAGE** . CONTRACTOR SHALL ONLY APPLY SUFFICIENT WATER TO PROMOTE
- HEALTHY GROWTH OR THE PLANT MATERIAL. AT NO TIME WILL THE CONTRACTOR APPLY WATER AT A RATE OR FREQUENCY WHICH CAUSES RUNOFF OR SOIL SATURATION
- POINT OF CONNECTION TO BE AT SERVICE LINE DOWNSTREAM OF WATER METER, VERIFY LOCATION, TYPE AND SIZE PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION 10. ALL IRRIGATION CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNING CODES

# LEGEND

SYMBOL	DESIGNATION	SIZE	COMMENTS
	EXISTING LANDSCAPE TO REMAIN	4,760 S.F. (AREA)	
	PROPOSED LANDSCAPE	1,645 S.F. (AREA)	
	LAWN, DELTA BLUEGRASS	795 SQ FT	NOTE: NO SHRUBS TO
0	LOW SHRUB, STRIPED CENTURY PLANT	15 GAL.	EXCEED THREE IN HEIGHT AT MATURITY SHALL
	ACCENT SHRUB, SMALL CAPE RUSH	5 GAL.	BE INSTALLED WITHIN TEN FEET FROM SEWER LINE
<i>U</i> . <del></del>	VINES, JASMINE PANDOREA	15 GAL.	
	STREET TREE MAGNOLIA GRANDIFLORA SOUTHERN MAGNOLIA	24" BOX	NOTE: MIN. 40 SQ.FT. FOR PLANTER AREA

# IMPERVIOUS SURFACE CALCS

	PROPOSED AREA	PERCENTAGE
PERVIOUS SURFACE AREA	5,930 S.F.	51%
IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA	1,923 S.F.	16%
ROOF AREA	3,903 S.F.	33%
TOTAL	11,756 S.F.	100%

# PLANTING NOTES

1. DEDICATED LANDSCAPE IRRIGATION METERS SHALL BE REQUIRED IN ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT WITH A LANDSCAPE AREA GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 5.000 SOUARE FEET: EXCEPT THAT THIS REOUIREMENT SHALL NOT APPLY TO NEW SINGLE DWELLING UNIT DEVELOPMENT OR TO THE COMMERCIAL PRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL CROPS OR LIVESTOCK.

2. LANDSCAPE IRRIGATION SUBMETERS SHALL BE REQUIRED IN THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENTS:

(A) NEW SINGLE DWELLING UNIT DEVELOPMENT; (B) IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND MULTIPLE

DWELLING UNIT DEVELOPMENT WHEN: (I) THE IMPROVEMENT REQUIRES A BUILDING PERMIT AS IDENTIFIED IN TABLE 142-04A; AND

(II) THE LANDSCAPE AREA IS 1,000 SQUARE FEET AND GREATER. **3.** NO TREES OR SHRUBS EXCEEDING THREE FEET IN HEIGHT AT MATURITY SHALL BE INSTALLED WITHIN TEN FEET OF ANY SEWER FACILITIES AND FIVE FEET OF ANY WATER FACILITIES.

4.THE OWNER/PERMITTEE SHALL PROCESS ENCROACHMENT MAINTENANCE AND REMOVAL AGREEMENTS, FOR ALL ACCEPTABLE ENCROACHMENTS INTO THE WATER AND SEWER EASEMENT, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO STRUCTURES, ENHANCED PAVING, OR LANDSCAPING. NO STRUCTURES OR

LANDSCAPING SHALL BE INSTALLED IN OR OVER THE WATER AND SEWER EASEMENT THAT WOULD INHIBIT VEHICULAR ACCESS TO REPLACE A SECTION OF MAIN OR PROVIDE ACCESS TO ANY APPURTENANCE OR ISOLATED SECTION OF MAIN. 5. THE OWNER/PERMITTEE SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGE CAUSED

TO CITY OF SAN DIEGO WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES IN THE VICINITY OF THE PROJECT SITE, DUE TO THE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 142.0607. IN THE EVENT THAT ANY SUCH FACILITY LOSES INTEGRITY THEN, THE OWNER/PERMITTEE SHALL REPAIR OR RECONSTRUCT ANY DAMAGED PUBLIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITY IN A MANNER SATISFACTORY TO THE PUBLIC

UTILITIES DIRECTOR AND THE CITY ENGINEER. 6. ALL LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION SHALL CONFORM TO THE STANDARDS OF THE CITY-WIDE LANDSCAPE REGULATIONS AND THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO LAND DEVELOPMENT MANUAL LANDSCAPE STANDARDS AND ALL OTHER LANDSCAPE RELATED CITY AND REGIONAL STANDARDS.

7. A MINIMUM ROOT ZONE OF 40 SF IN AREA SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR ALL TREES. THE MINIMUM DIMENSION FOR THIS AREA SHALL BE 5 FEET, PER SDMC 142.0403(b)(5).

8. MINIMUM TREE SEPARATION DISTANCE:

TRAFFIC SIGNALS/STOP SIGNS - 20 FEET UNDERGROUND UTILITY LINES - 5 FEET (10 FEET FOR SEWER)

ABOVE GROUND UTILITY STRUCTURES - 10 FEET DRIVEWAY (ENTRIES) - 10 FEET

INTERSECTIONS (INTERSECTING CURB LINES OF TWO STREETS - 25 FEET 9. IF ANY REQUIRED LANDSCAPE INDICATED ON THE APPROVED CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT PLANS IS DAMAGED OR REMOVED DURING DEMOLITION OR CONSTRUCTION, IT SHALL BE REPAIRED AND/OR REPLACED IN KIND AND EQUIVALENT SIZE PER APPROVED DOCUMENTS TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT WITHIN 30 DAYS OF DAMAGE.

10. MAINTENANCE: ALL REQUIRED LANDSCAPE AREAS SHALL BE MAINTAINED BY OWNER. LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION AREAS IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY SHALL BE MAINTAINED BY OWNER. THE LANDSCAPE AREAS SHALL BE MAINTAINED FREE OF DEBRIS AND LITTER, AND ALL PLANT MATERIAL SHALL BE MAINTAINED IN A HEALTHY GROWING CONDITION.

DISEASED OR DEAD MATERIAL SHALL BE SATISFACTORILY TREATED OR REPLACED PER THE CONDITIONS OF THE PERMIT. 11. IRRIGATION: AN AUTOMATIC, ELECTRONICALLY CONTROLLED IRRIGATION SYSTEM SHALL BE PROVIDED AS REQUIRED BY LDC 142.0403(c) FOR PROPER IRRIGATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE VEGETATION IN A HEALTHY, DISEASE-RESISTANT CONDITION. THE DESIGN OF THE SYSTEM SHALL

PROVIDE ADEQUATE SUPPORT FOR THE VEGETATION SELECTED. 12.EXISTING TREES TO REMAIN ON SITE WITHIN THE AREA OF WORK WILL BE PROTECTED IN PLACE. THE FOLLOWING MEASURES MUST BE PROVIDED: 1.1. A BRIGHT YELLOW OR ORANGE TEMPORARY FENCE WILL BE PLACED AROUND EXISTING TREE AT DRIP LINE.

1.2. STOCKPILING, TOPSOIL DISTURBANCE, VEHICLE USE AND MATERIAL STORAGE OF ANY KIND IS PROHIBITED WITHIN THE DRIP LINE. 3.3. A TREE WATERING SCHEDULE WILL BE MAINTAINED AND DOCUMENTED DURING CONSTRUCTION. 3.4. ALL DAMAGED TREES WILL BE REPLACED WITH ON OF EQUAL OR

GREATER SIZE.







SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

