

La Jolla Community Planning Association

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

info@lajollacpa.org

President: Tony Crisafi

Vice President: Matt Mangano

2nd Vice President: Dave Gordon

Secretary: Suzanne Weissman

Treasurer: Mike Costello

FINAL MINUTES

Regular Meeting | Thursday, February 6, 2020 – 6 p.m.

1.0 Welcome and Call to Order: Tony Crisafi – President, presiding 6:07 pm

This is a full agenda, recorded meeting therefore, the following rules will be enforced:

- Mobile devices off or on silent mode.
- All public and trustee comment will be addressed to the chair. Public & trustee comment will be limited to 2 minutes.
- Comments will be directed to the project or matter stated in third person for the purpose of respect & clarity
- Chair may ask for member votes. Please keep hands raised until the vote tally is announced.
- Chair will alternate order of trustee comment. Upon consensus, Chair will close discussion and call for a motion.
- Please notify chair of any organized public presentation requests prior to meeting

Quorum present: Brady, Costello, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Fremdling, Ish, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Manno, Neil, Shannon, Weissman, Will

Absent: Gordon, Little, Courtney

2.0 Adopt the Agenda

Motion: (Neil/Kane) Amend agenda to move item 4.4, 7760 Hershel project from consent agenda and add as item 11.4, action item and move item 4.5, Municipal code update, to item 11.5, action item.

Vote: 13-0-1, unanimous, Chair abstains, Motion carries, 2/3 vote requirement met.

Motion: (Neil/Jackson) Adopt agenda as amended: **Vote:** 13-0-1, unanimous, Chair abstains. Motion carries

3.0 Meeting Minutes Review and Approval:

3.1 – Regular meeting minutes

Motion: (Jackson/Fitzgerald) approve minutes as presented: **Vote:** 12-0-2, unanimous, Kane and Chair abstain. Motion carries

4.0 Consent Agenda – 4.1 – 4.5

The Consent Agenda allows the LJCPA to ratify recommendations of the community joint committees and boards 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. Projects may be pulled from consent agenda by anyone present. Items will be moved to full review at the present of following regular LJCPA meeting.

The public is encouraged to attend and participate in Community Joint Committee & Board meetings before the item/project is considered by the LJCPA.

PDO – Planned District Ordinance Committee, Chair Deborah Marengo, 2nd Monday, 4:00 pm
 DPR – Development Permit Review Committee, Chair Brian Will, 2nd & 3rd Tuesday, 4:00 pm
 PRC – La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee, Chair David Gordon, 3rd Monday, 4:00 pm
 T&T – Traffic & Transportation Board, Chair David Abrams, 3rd Wednesday, 4:00 pm

**4.1 – Proposal for diagonal parking on Eads Ave. between Rushville & Genter Streets
 T&T Motion to deny proposal 7-0-1**

4.2 – Review of Valet Service Permit for La Plaza Building – Recommend reduction of four parking spaces to two white spaces and change the signage to reflect clear instructions on where to park in front of La Jolla Plaza Building – 7863 Girard Ave. @ Wall St.
T&T Motion to accept recommendation to reduce white parking spaces 5-3-0

4.3 – Said Residence - 7834 Esterel Dr. – Project No. 646224, Process 3, SDP for the addition to an existing single family residence consisting of 945 s.f. to basement, 551 s.f. to first floor and a new detached 1,200 s.f. companion unit over 546 s.f. of basement parking. The .49 acre site is located in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Zone of the La Jolla Community Plan Area, Council District 1.
PRC motion to approve 7-1-0

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.

None pulled. **Motion:** approve consent agenda items 4.1 – 4.3, (Will/Costello) **Vote:** 13-0-1, unanimous, chair abstains. **Motion carries.**

5.0 Officer Reports:

5.1 Treasurer - Mike Costello’s report –

Treasurer’s Report for February 6, 2020 Regular Meeting

Beginning Balance as of January 1, 2020		\$206.41
Income		
Collections, Jan 9, 2020	\$118.00	
CD Sales	\$ 00.00	
Total Income		<u>\$118.00</u>
Expenses		
Agenda printing, Jan. 8, 2020	\$72.41	
other	00.00	
Total Expenses		<u>\$72.41</u>
Net Income/(Loss)		\$45.59
Ending Balance of January 31, 2020		\$252.00

Financial Hi-lights of year 2019

Income for 2019 (includes SD City Grant to CPG)	= \$2,366.60
Balance, Dec 31, 2019	= \$206.41

Agenda printing continues to be a necessary major expense. 12 x ~ \$75 = ~\$900

LJCPA website was switched (migrated) to GoDaddy (Linux) and modernized to current technology. GoDaddy will handle domain name, website hosting, and email.

One time 2019 = \$414.34

Anticipated expenses 2020 = none

Domain registration (lajollacpa.org), \$60 for 5 years, by 4/19/2021

SSL certificate for website, \$130 for 2 years, by 11/4/2021

Office 365 email (info@lajollacpa.org), \$300 for 3 years, by 6/17/2022

Economy Linux Hosting (lajollacpa.org), \$220 for 3 years, by 10/25/2022

Anticipated averaged annual expenses 2021 forward about = \$250

AT&T telephone service was cancelled. **annual saving** 12 x \$17.92 = \$215.04

LJ Rec. Center, Over-time payment was eliminated, **annual saving** = \$540

Applied for annual SD City Grant to Community Planning Groups. = \$500

5.2 Secretary -

If you want your attendance recorded today, you should sign in at the back of the room or let me know that you want your attendance recorded. You are welcome to attend without signing in or joining.

LJCPA is a membership organization open to La Jolla residents, property owners and local business and non-profit owners at least 18 years of age.

Eligible visitors wishing to join the LJCPA need to submit an application, copies of which are available at the sign-in table or on-line at the LJCPA website: www.lajollacpa.org/.

We encourage you to join so that you can vote in the Trustee elections and at the Annual Meeting in March.

You can become a Member after completing the application and attending one meeting. You can maintain your membership by documented attendance at one meeting per year. If you do not attend one meeting per year, your membership will expire.

To qualify as a candidate in an election to become a Trustee, a Member must have documented attendance at **three** LJCPA meetings in the preceding 12-month period.

6.0 Elected Officials – Information Only

6.1 Council District 1: Councilmember Barbara Bry.

Rep: Steven Hadley, 619-236-6972, srhadley@sandiego.gov

Hadley: Projects we are working on:

- Traffic and transportation stormwater department has asked “what part of Hillside Dr. needs to be paved?” (laughter) That is progress.
- Mauricio was able to get some money from the gas tax revenue to repave Hillside Dr. from Soledad to Amalfi, so we will look at the northern end to see how much we can suggest for repaving.
- On Nottingham Dr. students are now parking farther south using scooters to travel to the university. Scooters are getting left in the neighborhood; we have contacted Bird to see that they are not staging scooters there are cleaning things up in the evening so that scooters are not left all over.
- The lights on Prospect that are out near St. James church will be fixed.
- The lights on the Rec Center ball fields are too bright so we are asking Park & Rec to reduce the lights disturbing nearby residents.

- Fay Ave. extension has been awarded the weed abatement contract.
- Lake Forward in Bird Rock: we are going to have a design for re-engineering that part of the round-about that doesn't drain by the end of this fiscal year.
- MTS will release its feeder study for the new trolley next Thursday. I will be there to put weight of Council Member behind what Dave Gordon will say. We are looking for a shuttle here.
- We will be monitoring the remodel at the end of Olivet Lane to see that permits are properly issued and that the permits themselves are proper.
- We are working with the undergrounding people in the city and SDG&E to resolve problems with the undergrounding project in the Muirlands that has come to a halt.

Kane: There is a trend at DSD to not send projects back to the community for SCR as required in the coastal zone. Several times we have specifically asked for these projects and have been ignored. We do not get a response from city staff. Can you help us with this? **Hadley:** We keep asking and are happy to pass comments from this board along.

6.2 78th Assembly District: Assembly member Todd Gloria

Rep: Mathew Gordon 619-645-3090, mathew.gordon@asm.ca.gov Not present

6.3 39th Senate District: State Senator Toni Atkins, Senate President pro Tempore Rep: Miller Saltzman, 619-518-8188, MillerSaltzman@sen.ca.gov Not present

7.0 President's Report – Information only unless otherwise noted

7.1 Annual trustee election will be held on March 5, 2020. Announcement, item 10.1

President thanks the election committee for being diligent, working in a short time to secure good candidates for the March election.

7.2 La Jolla Community Foundation invites Community Planning Group members to view and discuss the Streetscape Plan – the village of La Jolla improvements – on Thursday, March 5th from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. at the La Jolla Recreations Center. A short presentation will be made at the LJCPA meeting. Thanks to trustees who attended the meeting last month. They listened and are doing more outreach for the proposal.

7.3. The Coastal Commission hearing on the Childrens Pool SCR will be on Feb. 14, item 18 at the Long Beach City Hall council chambers. 411 W. Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, 90802. As of now we don't have a trustee attending. If you can go and would like to speak on behalf of the CPA, the president and Mike Costello will be happy to coach you.

7.4 If no objections, the president will call the Mayor's office and Gary Geiler to follow up on the letter that was sent regarding SCR's. On an issue on Spindrifft, Steve Hadley was very effective in getting a response and an agreement.

8.0 Public Comment

Opportunity for public to speak on matters not on the agenda, 2 minutes or less.

8.1 City of San Diego – Community Planner: Marlon Pangilinan, mpangilinan@sandiego.gov Not present.

6:30pm Courtney arrives; reflected in vote count

8.2 UCSD - Planner: Anu Delouri, adelouri@ucsd.edu

Delori: Passed out Community Group Update sheets for February 2020 and Project Information Sheet for Future College Living and Learning Neighborhood. (FCLLN) There are 3 Capital Projects in Planning and Design. The FCLLN, the Nuevo West Graduate Student Housing Project and the I-5 Switch Station Project.

On January 22, we had a community open house on campus about the FCLLN, also a Capital Projects open house in June 2019. The 2018 Long Range Development Plan also included and evaluated this project. The January open house was well attended with about 150 members of the public attending. This plan will be similar to the North Torrey Pines Living and Learning Neighborhood now under construction which is anticipated to open in April 2020. The ultimate goal is to enhance the student experience. The projects will provide housing, academic, parking retail and restaurants and open space.

As part of the University of California we have an obligation to the state to maximize the resources in a sensitive manner. The buildings planned on this existing parking site have been designed so that the 16 and 21 story buildings are located inward to the east side and the buildings along the campus edge are in harmony with the aesthetic character in keeping with the building heights along the campus edge along North Torrey Pines Rd. It is designed to be a mixed-use community south of Revelle College adjacent to the Theater District. As one of two new colleges in the most recent LRDP – 8th college – it will be a future undergraduate college with housing of 2000 beds, 1200 parking spaces, dining and retail services and a small conference facility. Another environmental analysis will be performed at the project level in accordance with CEQA. It is slated to begin construction fall of 2020 with a 3 year duration.

I feel obligated to comment on a letter sent to the editor at the La Jolla Light and a mass mailing that went out last night sent by the Chair of the La Jolla Shores Association that included information to our Director of Campus Planning. I come to these meetings every month and share information on UC San Diego projects, we have engaged a Community Advisory Group, and are trying to do our best in terms of collaboration and transparency. I feel obligated to share with you this excerpt from an unpleasant letter directed to the Director of Campus Planning received earlier today (“Shame on you . . .”) I request you engage with the University and its personnel in a civil manner respecting principles of community engagement.

Courtney: Is a building going to be more than 20 stories high? **Reply:** Yes. There will be 5 buildings on the approximately 10.9 acre site; the 3 buildings adjacent to Torrey Pines will range in height between 9, 10, 11 stories, then a 16 and 21 story building located towards the inner, eastern portion of the site.

Miller: Those are going to tower over the playhouse.

Kane: How does your plan comply with the 30’ height limit in the coastal zone? **Reply:** The 30’ height limit is a City of San Diego limit; it is not a California Coastal Commission enforced height limit.

Kane: How does your project interface with the property across the street which does have the height limit? **Reply:** We paid careful attention with the design that the lower buildings along TP Rd. are in keeping with buildings on the campus edge.

Kane: This group would be more comfortable if your group could bring in some drawings showing what that project would do to the neighboring properties. **Reply:** There are renderings and much more information on our website. It would behoove those in the community to do a little homework, review the website, attend the meetings on campus organized in response to requests for more transparency and sharing.

Crisafi: I think the request is for a presentation to the community. **Reply:** Yes, we will consider a presentation, but we do want the public to come to the campus.

Costello: Have you considered alternative sites such as Jamul for campus expansion? **Reply:** We are looking to enhance campus life for the students; they are the reason we are here. We are trying to house more students on campus. We are building a satellite campus downtown.

Shannon: What is the motivation for this vast expansion? **Reply:** We owe an obligation to educate the children of California.

Boyden: Where will there be interim parking for the Playhouse? **Reply:** I assure you we will continue to engage with the Playhouse to make a robust parking plan.

Granger: I am concerned about the impact of this huge development. **Reply:** The LRDP has an environmental impact report that has considered all impacts. At the project level we will do additional analysis to see if what was considered is sufficient. We will add 17 traffic signals along development streets to provide for smoother flow of traffic. We are working proactively with the City to install these.

Courtney: What increase in enrollment will these developments bring? **Reply:** This plan is more for providing housing for existing students. Currently we have approximately 39,000 students; our long range plan is for 42,400 students.

8.3 General Public

Joe LaCava: I am running for City Council District 1. An editorial in the local paper took exception to me because I expressed strong views on issues critical to our community. Having been at City Hall for 2 decades, I understand where the community is coming from and how the battles are being fought at the political level and I am not embarrassed by having those opinions. I want to make sure your voice is being heard at City Council. I have spent many years on the CPA listening to issues that have never been resolved. I may not have a silver bullet, but I will put in a good fight.

Melinda Merryweather: On behalf of Childrens Pool, if everyone who has ever used the ramp at the childrens pool please write a letter to the CCC because the City of SD is telling them that the ramp wasn't used by the public. Just tell your story that there are people who will use that ramp.

Janie Emerson: At the UCSD event on Jan. 22, many members of the public were shocked, upset, asking when is the University going to stop this growth. They have not fully evaluated the impacts of this development. We were told at the Shores Association in October 2019 that this was just in the early thought stages; at January open house a fully planned project was presented. This huge project will bring more traffic to Torrey Pines Rd. and LJ Village Dr. where there is now too much traffic. If you want this untenable development to stop you must stand up now.

Crisafi: I don't think we have a vote on this; we have asked for a presentation.

Merten: On your agenda is consideration of some Code amendments but no potential amendments affecting the LJ Shores PDO. Please direct the LJPRC to propose some amendments. i.e. The city-wide fence and retaining wall regulations limit the height of retaining walls in a residential zone to a maximum of 12'. Currently in La Jolla Shores there are vertical retaining walls that exceed 25' often built on sensitive hill sides. Some of those city-wide regulations need to apply in the Shores.

Wampler: There is growing concern in the community about the health impacts of 5G antennas being placed. Now a team of scientists and physicians from UCSD and a member of the UC planning group are making presentations to community groups to educate the public on the published research and potential health impacts of these towers. Hopefully this will be on the agenda in the near future to discuss these impacts and what can be done.

9.0 Non-Agenda Trustee Comment

Opportunity for trustees to comment on matters not on the agenda, 2 minutes or less

Courtney: I live near the corner of Torrey Pines Rd. and LJ Shores Dr. There was a car upside down in front of my house. The driver was speeding using the median as a 3rd lane. The original Torrey Pines road plan called for a raised median to discourage driving on the median, but this was not done. We should ask for a raised median on TP Rd. for traffic safety.

Manno: My understand is that the community has no input regarding UCSD. Is that correct?

LaCava: We don't have a vote; the public has a voice.

Shannon: Regarding the height of the buildings, I was told that UCSD planning staff pushed back against UC plans for even higher buildings and less parking.

Later reply from Delouri: In response I add that when this LRDP was in planning at higher levels at UC they addressed the concerns of the newly formed UCSD Community Advisory Group in 2016 about parking and density by placing the taller buildings back and providing underground parking.

Costello: Regarding the 801 Pearl St. project heard last month: I present a sheet showing that the computations for average sq.ft./unit presented at the November DPR meeting were different from the same computations presented at the December CPA meeting. Because of this discrepancy this project should have been sent back to the DPR committee for an explanation.

10.0 Reports from Election Committee, Ad Hoc and non-LJCPA Committees - Information only unless noted.

10.1 Elections Committee, Nancy Manno- Election Committee Announcement:

There are 7 Open Trustee seats; six 3-year terms expiring in 2023, and one 2-year term. Those who have declared their candidacy are listed below. Others who have attended three LJCPA meetings from March 2019 through this evening may declare their candidacy until gavel down tonight. The election will be held from three to seven PM on March 5, 2020 in the Irving Gill Room of this building. Photo identification will be required. All those current members listed as having an expiration date of 2/29/2020 will be removed from the membership if they have not attended one meeting in the months beginning March 2019 to tonight. They will not be able to vote next month. New members joining tonight will have an expiration date of February 28, 2021. Interested candidates may speak for 2-minutes each. Statements were heard from the following candidates running for trustee:

- Dave Gordon (read by Crisafi)
- Greg Jackson
- Patrick Ahern
- Helen Boyden
- Bob Steck
- Ray Weiss (read by Courtney)
- Suzanne Weissman
- Larry Davidson (read by Costello)
- John Fremdling

Full candidate statements are posted on the website: www.lajollacpa.org.

10.2 Coastal Access & Parking Board – did not meet

10.3 UC San Diego advisory Committee – did not meet

10.4 Hillside Drive Ad Hoc Committee – Diane Kane, Chair –

Kane: The committee will meet on Wednesday, next week. On the agenda will be City repaving of Hillside Dr., additional truck length and weight limit signs at Via Seina and Soledad Rd., vacation of ROW at Torrey Pines Rd. and Hillside Dr. I request that this ad hoc committee be permitted to continue another year.

Crisafi: Seeing no objection, the committee may continue.

10.5 Airport Noise Advisory Committee – Matthew Price – no report

10.6 Playa Del Norte Stanchion Committee –

Courtney: The City is processing the crosswalk work.

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 – LJCPA Review and Action Matter 11.1 – 11.5

11.1 – Presentation from Vanessa Mapula Garcia representing SDG&E – Franchise renewal agreement with the City of San Diego.

Vanessa Mapula Garcia: Power Point presentation on SDG&E & City of San Diego Franchise Agreement:

- The current franchise agreement was initiated in 1971 and will expire in January 2021.

- This is essentially a lease agreement with the City of SD that enables us to have our infrastructure for gas and electricity in the City of SD right of way.
- SDG&E now pays 3% of its gross revenue to City of SD plus 3.5% surcharge for undergrounding.
- This fee generates ~ \$130 million revenue to the City yearly.
- San Diego is one of five of the 29 cities that SDG&E serves that has a franchise agreement with an expiration date.
- The franchise fees paid to SD are significantly higher than any other city pays.
- San Diego should renew this agreement for the following reasons outlined with explanations:
 - SDG&E is a local company recognized as an energy industry leader.
 - They prioritize safety and reliability.
 - They have partnered with the City to expedite undergrounding.
 - Their modern electric grid will enable new clean technologies to be built.
 - They support solar with renewable meter adapter.
 - They lead the state in renewable energy procurement.
 - They will help support the City's clean energy vision.
 - They are committed to San Diego.

Q & A about SDG&E's views on solar energy, environmental protection and fees.

11.2 – Matthew Vasilakis from Climate Action Campaign, presents on an alternative to SDG&E - a non-profit public power agency with 100 renewable energy called Community Choice Energy who's goal is to secure a franchise agreement with SDG&E. email dated Dec 17, 2019 in my inbox. Not present.

11.3 – Follow up on the misinformation of beach erosion advertisements:

Dave Ish: Showed full page ads that appeared several times in the SD Union & the LJ Light promoting building of groins on the beaches. In response to the CPA letter sent to the editors of the newspapers regarding these misleading ads we were referred to the advertising agency that placed the ads. The agency referred us to a website, saveoursand.org, that promotes an option to build groins to collect sand along our coast. They encourage people to text a keyword that would send a letter to political representatives promoting building groins.

I spoke to Dr. Ron Schlick at Scripps Institute of Oceanography who has done studies on the impact of groins and structures along the California coast. I will be happy to send copies of his studies to anyone interested. He stated that building groins, breakwaters, etc. is not a new issue. Locally, Oceanside has had a problem since Marines built a facility during WWII without concern for the environment. Oceanside Harbor compounded the problem south of the harbor. Groins are a simplistic answer; much more study and analysis need to be done before building any structures. The rising seas and global warming will bring this issue to the forefront. La Jolla Shores, Pacific Beach and Mission Beach are most vulnerable. Cliff erosion along the coast from LJ Cove to PB is likely with consequent property damage.

We need to stay vigilant on this issue and insist on proper analysis when solutions are proposed. NO proposed action at this time; just keep the issue alive.

11.4 -- 7760 Herschel Ave. – Project No. 632775, Process 3, CDP & TM for the construction of a four residential unit condominium building for a total of 14,817 s.f. of construction on a vacant lot. The 0.16 acre site is located in the LJPD-2 base zone of the Coastal (non-appealable) overlay zone of the La Jolla Community Planning Area, Council District 1.

DPR motion to approve 3-1-1

Presentation by Richard Gombes, project architect and Roy Sloan, owner:

- The project is on a 7,000 sq.ft. lot in zone 2 of the La Jolla Planned District.

- Basic requirements in this zone are: (1) 29 units/acre or 4.66 units on this 7,000sq.ft. lot; (2) FAR of 1.3 allowed or 9,060 sq. ft. on this lot. The difference from the proposed 14,817 sq.ft. is basement.
- We are building 4 units 1 – 3 bdr unit and 3 – 2 bdr units.
- A subterranean basement has 8 parking spaces and living space.
- Above that are 2 stories and a penthouse.
- 2 buildings each containing 2 units separated by a large courtyard.
- Lot coverage is 57% providing more open space than other buildings on Hershel.
- Front setback is 26', 10' more than required by code. The penthouses on top are 40' back from curb.
- Reviewed the drawings presented showing the placement of units, number of units and entry locations.

Public Comment:

Chris Popov, partner with Linda Cristel in cottage next door to south: The California Coastal Act designated La Jolla as a community of special interest and that set the tone for the La Jolla Community Plan which is why you all are here. The mandate in the LJ Comm. Plan is to preserve the existing streetscape themes and allow for a harmonious visual relationship between bulk and scale of new and older structures with an overall architectural theme and sense of neighborhood scale. Looking at this project from above does not reflect the view from the street. With 0 lot line setbacks the project structures block any air and light and sense of space between the buildings on Hershel. I am in favor of residential in the village, but I am not in favor of losing the village atmosphere to something that is larger and blocks out air and light around the buildings. Setting the buildings back by 1.5 feet on each side will save 10 trees, 5 pigmy palm trees and 2 mature king palms and create a sense of community, unlike Girard Ave. This is a 3 story building out of scale with the neighborhood.

Sally Miller: I worry about parking. This project has 10 bedrooms and 8 parking spaces. Many families have more than 2 cars.

Linda Cristel: The project is very large. My issues are size and the 0 lot line setbacks. It crowds properties and is larger than other neighborhood properties. It stands out especially with 3rd story penthouses; it sets a precedent.

Lisa Kostner email (read by Tony Crisafi), owner of parking lot to north: The outside wall of the structure placed on the property line will necessitate relocation of lights and electrical on my property. I should not have to incur costs necessitated by this project. It also puts future limitations on development of my property impacting the value and usage of my property. Would this commission approve a similar project on my lot?

Phil Merten: Has this project been before the La Jolla PDO Committee? It is in their district and they should look at it. The LJ Community Plan says to transition between newer and older development, the 2nd floor exterior walls on the front and side should be stepped back to provide light and air to adjacent properties.

Joe Manno: questions about adjacent properties. Concerned that it is huge and inconsiderate of neighbors.

Gombes: The large center courtyard provides a lot of air to cottage next door.

Merten: This is not perceived from the public right of way.

Trustee Comment:

Will, DPR Chair: The term 'penthouse' in the Municipal Code refers to a structure on the roof of a building that supports stairs or mechanical equipment. It doesn't count as a story provided it doesn't exceed 10% of the floor area. These structures meet these requirements and are not living spaces. I support residential density in the village. Other than the property to the south, every building on the block is built to the property line. The courtyard does provide air and light to cottage next door. This project is not built out to all property lines as it could be. I support.

Crisafi: Penthouse is legal so we are here to talk about community character.

Neil: The short wall along the street could be lowered. **Reply:** This wall is 5' tall, broken into 2 segments, not the whole width of the lot.

Neil: This wall closes off the units; it is not street friendly. **Reply:** There is an 18" planter and plantings will soften the look.

Costello: This should go to the PDO Committee. Since this is an extreme change from parking to residential it is a question for the PDO. I also would like to see a little bit more setback.

Kane: Would be nice to have PDO input. The character of this block is in transition. The direction is lot line to lot line and near 30' height. This one is below the height limit and building sighting is sensitive to the cottage next door. Having two buildings breaks up the massing and provides open space in a courtyard adjacent to the cottage. The penthouses will not be particularly visible from the street. A big change from what we have now and very different from the cottage, but this is the direction we are going. I did ask that the front wall be lowered or 50% open at the top.

Manno: A very handsome project, but enormous. Would love to have front wall lowered. Penthouses were questioned; it was confirmed that they were not living space and very small.

Motion: Direct applicant to take project to PDO Committee then return with recommendation to CPA. (Costello/Courtney)

Discussion: **Brady:** DPR has extensively reviewed this project.

Vote: 5-9-1 (per voting sheets) **Motion fails.**

In favor: Costello, Courtney, Ish, Manno, Neil

Opposed: Brady, Fitzgerald, Fremdling, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Shannon, Weissman, Will

Abstain: Crisafi (chair)

Crisafi: My opinion is the project would enhance the street; the horizontal line of the 1st floor in line with the cottage next door is attractive. The penthouses provide a nice amenity to the units for a roof deck. The wall on the side facing the cottage could open up a little sooner to the courtyard space by reconfiguration of the kitchen. The front wall could be articulated further and with additional landscaping.

Fitzgerald: The best time to make suggestions is at the subcommittee level. What is before us now is not to redesign the project but to approve or disapprove in terms of whether it is in compliance with all community regulations.

Motion: Approve as presented. (Fitzgerald/Brady) **Vote:** 9-5-1, **Motion carries.**

In Favor: Brady, Fitzgerald, Fremdling, Jackson, Kane, Mangano, Shannon, Weissman, Will

Opposed: Costello, Courtney, Ish, Manno, Neil

Abstain: Crisafi (chair)

11.5 – Municipal Code Update – Recommendations for the upcoming 2020 Municipal Code Update. Identify items/deficiencies in the land development code that do not serve the community. Draft a letter on behalf of the CPA (for CPA ratification), outlining key areas requiring code updates and possible corrections.

DPR motion to approve 4-0-1

Kane: I wanted to find out if other committees wanted to add suggestions. We did not get any feedback from LJPRC.

Merten: LJ Shores issues such as establishment of FAR and retaining wall specifications could be included in this update. The Shores Committee should take a look and see what they could do to protect themselves.

Further discussion as to why the Shores didn't weigh in at the DPR meetings, how to include recommendations from the Shores in this update and to ask the LJPRC to put this on their agenda and report back to CPA next month.

Motion: Approve DPR recommendations for the Code Update and send to LJPRC to put on their next agenda for review and return them to CPA in March. (Jackson/Kane)

Will: The Shores PDO was meant to make development in the Shores more restrictive but today it has gone the other way. I would ask those involved in the Shores to consider whether the Shores should become the RS Zones.

Vote: 12-0-1: unanimous, Chair abstains, (Fremdling, Fitzgerald left) **Motion carries**

XX. Adjourn at 9:25 pm. to next regular LJCPA Meeting: Thursday, March 5, 2020