

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

Email: info@lajollacpa.org

President: Tony Crisafi

Vice President: Matt Mangano

2nd 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

Opposed: 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	
• Collections	\$ 163.00
• CD Sales	\$ <u>0</u>
Total Income	\$ 163 .00
Expenses	
• Agenda printing	\$ 63.06
• AT&T telephone Final Bill	\$ <u>17.92</u>
Total Expenses	\$ <u>80.98</u>
Net Income/(Loss)	\$ 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, mauriciom@sandiego.gov (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 scooters: 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

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 39th 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. This bill does not suspend the height limit in the coastal regions. 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 LaMaterly at Community Planners meeting, SB 330 and 50 are moving targets. One thing not mentioned according to Jim La Materly 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

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.

- 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 not on the agenda, 2 minutes or less.

7.3 Public Comment:

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

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:

[Wireless Communication Facilities Webpage](#) | [Informaion Bulletin 536](#) | [WCF Questionnaire/Checklist \(DS-420\) Wireless Ordinance](#) (see Page 29)
[WCF Guidelines](#) | [Information Bulletin 545 \(Small Cells\)](#) | [Submittal Manual](#)

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:

Brian Will
Mike Costello
John Fremdling
Eamon Callahan
Gregory Jackson

LJTC (Town Council) Appointees:

Bob Collins
Diane Kane
Angeles Leira
Matthew Welsh
Lawrence Zynda

II. La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee

LJCPA Appointees:

Andy Fotsch
David Mandelbaum
Dave Gordon

LJSA (Shores Association) Appointees:

Janie Emerson
Myrna Naegle
Angie Preisendorfer
Matt Edwards
Ted Haas

III. Traffic & Transportation

LJCPA Appointees:

Dave Abrams
Tom Brady

BRCC (Birdrock Comm Council Appointees:

Erik Gaenzle
Patrick Ryan

LJSA (La Jolla Shores Assoc.) Appointees:

Brian Earley
Ross Rudolph

IV. La Jolla Planned District Ordinance

LJCPA Appointees:

Joe Parker
Deborah Marengo

LJTC (Town Council) Appointees:

LJBID (La Jolla Bus Improvement District):

V. Community Planners Committee

Representative – Dave Gordon
Alternates – Matt Mangano
Tony Crisafi

VI. UCSD Liason Subcommittee

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:

Brian Will

Mike Costello

John Fremdling

Gregory Jackson

Elizabeth Gaenzle

Appointed by La Jolla Town Council:

Bob Collins

Diane Kane

Angeles Leira

Matthew Welsh

Lawrence Zynda

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee:

Appointed by LJCPA:

Andy Fotsch

Dave Gordon

Appointed by La Jolla Shores Association:

Janie Emerson

Myrna Naegle

Angie Preisendorfer

Matt Edwards

Ted Haas

La Jolla Traffic & Transportation Committee:

Appointed by LJCPA:

Dave Abrams

Tom Brady

Appointed by Birdrock Community Council:

Erik Gaenzle

Patrick Ryan

Appointed by La Jolla Shores Association:

Brian Earley

Ross Rudolph

**La Jolla Planned District Ordinance
Committee:**

Appointed by LJCPA:

Joe Parker

Deborah Marengo

Appointed by La Jolla Town Council:

**Appointed by La Jolla Business Improvement
District:**

Appointed by LJCPA:

Community Planners Committee:

Dave Gordon

Matt Mangano - alternate

Tony Crisafi - 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
www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/resources 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 Hershfield 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 not 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 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. 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 (1st 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, 2nd 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 6th 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 6th 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 18th 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 18th 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 LCPA Action Items

11.0 Panorama Homes – 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

Opposed: Costello, Neil

Abstain: 1 (chair)

12.0 Sugarman - SDP

(2nd review) Project #625569 Project manager Xavier Del Valle (619) 557-7941

xdelvalle@sandiego.gov.

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 2nd 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 2nd meeting addressing some of their comments, but it still didn't satisfy the committee and the plan was denied. 2nd 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 2nd 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 2nd 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

Action Item: 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