



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board**  
**APPROVED** Meeting Minutes for May 19, 2021  
Online Virtual Meeting

<b>Trustee</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Trustee</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Jane Potter	Present	Herbert Lazerow	Present
Andrea Moser	Present	Suzanne Weissman	Present

---

**1. Call to Order:** 10:00 a.m.

Potter called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**2. Approval of the Agenda:**

Lazerow moved to approve, Weissman seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

**3. Approval of the minutes for February 17, March 17, 2021**

Potter said Item 3 and 4 should be reversed on both February and March minutes.

**Motion:** Lazerow moved to approve February 17 minutes, Moser seconded. Minutes approved 4-0-0.

Lazerow said substitute 'approval of minutes' for 'item' in last line of page 1 of March 17 minutes and to spell out right-of-way instead of abbreviating. Weissman said names may be misspelled for 'Kuttrell'. On page 5 of March 17 minutes Susan McKean is misspelled.

**Motion:**

Weissman moved to approve March 17 minutes, Lazerow seconded. Minutes approved 4-0-0.

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

Phil Merten urged the Advisory Board to reconsider their vote on Barba/Lowther residence because the information presented was inaccurate and does not comply with the La Jolla Shores PDO.

## 5. Project Review:

### **ACTION ITEM A – PTS 589178 – Lookout Lot 2-Lot 2 SDP/CDP**

**Location:** 7729 Lookout Drive

APN: 352-012-1700

**Description:** Proposal for a new 3,849 sf single family dwelling, 507 sf garage, and 1,011 sf full basement on a 0.12-acre lot. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

#### **Presentation:**

No project presentation was given by the Applicant. It was noted that Nick Wilson a member of the Applicant team from Island Architects, was present at the meeting as an observer. At a previous meeting, the Applicant team stated that they would not be returning to any subsequent Advisory Board meetings. Staff shared project details that were initially provided by the Applicant in Attachment 1.

#### **Board Clarification Comments**

- Clarification was requested by Board Member Lazerow on what specifically, project or plans, the Advisory Board would approving and that he could not make a decision without seeing the exterior plans and their relation to the property line, as no plans were provided to the board. Weissman said the project has changed substantially from 2018 and therefore it would be unreasonable for the board to make a recommendation on the project.
- Staff clarified that the role of La Jolla Shoes Advisory Board is to review projects referred to them by the City and indicated that the Advisory Board would be providing a recommendation on the project as provided in the project description. Staff indicated emails and the agenda have been provided to the Applicant team, but that the applicant can choose to attend that meeting or not.
- It was mentioned by the Advisory Board that both projects were presented to the Advisory Board in 2018 and have returned as a different project and that the projects should have returned to the Advisory Board as a substantial conformance review with submitted plans
- Staff said the board could either: 1) not forward a recommendation based on information provided, 2) request information sufficient to make a recommendation

#### **Public Comment:**

- A letter was forwarded to the Advisory Board on behalf of the La Jolla Hills Committee (LJHC) stating that the developer has not participated or provided

information requested by the board - reflecting the developer's lack of concern for neighborhood. Public comment indicated changes to the project since 2018 included limiting the development to two lots and delay of development of lot 4, but not designating it for open space, as requested by the LJHC. Additionally, it was mentioned that the proposal would represent a permanent change to the neighborhood and without more detailed plans to review, would make it difficult to determine the extent of that change.

- It was expressed that density is the number of units relative to lot size and that the PDO requires that development may not exceed the average density within 300 feet of the subject parcel and that the average density within 300 feet would be 1 du per lot. When lot size is halved, through the proposed lot line adjustments, the density is doubled conflicting with the PDO.

**Comments and discussion from the Advisory Board included:**

- Concerns were expressed over the difference between the previous proposal and what is different in the proposed project (e.g. including a new basement) without any detailed plans to review. It was questioned as to why there was not a new Project Tracking System number provided for the proposed project.
- Plans relative to property line were requested and the previous plans were thought irrelevant.
- It was said that the proposed density would be greater than the average density per acre within 300 feet of the subject site and cannot be approved.
- A denial was suggested as the proposal violates section 1510.0304 related to Single-Family Zone – Development Regulations of the Municipal Code/PDO by exceeding average density per acre within 300 feet.

**Motion:**

Moser moved to recommend project not be approved due to it violating section 1015.0304 of the Municipal Code/. Potter seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

**6. ACTION ITEM B – PTS 482904 – Lookout Lot 5- SDP/CDP**

**Location:** 7813 Lookout Drive

APN: 352-012-2000

**Description:** Proposal for a new 4,900 sf single family dwelling which includes partial basement on a 0.12-acre site. The Applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit from the Advisory Board.

**Presentation:**

No project presentation was given by the Applicant. It was noted that Nick Wilson a member of the Applicant team from Island Architects was present at the meeting as an observer. At a previous meeting, the Applicant team stated that they would not be

returning to any subsequent Advisory Board meetings. Staff shared project details that were initially provided by the Applicant in Attachment 2.

**Public Comment:**

- Objections to the project similar to Phil Merten’s were provided also indicating that the proposal violated section 1510.0304 of the Municipal Code/PDO (exceeding average unit density per acre within 300 feet of the subject site), and bulk and scale requirements in the La Jolla Community Plan
- It was mentioned that the project FAR is 95% higher than the average within 300 feet.
- It was expressed that Lot 5 was originally a remnant from an illegal lot line adjustment, does not meet frontage requirements, and would exceed average density per section 1015.0304 related to Single-Family Zone – Development Regulations of the Municipal Code/PDO.

**Comments and discussion from the Advisory Board included:**

- Issues for this project are similar to the previous project (Lot 2) on Lookout Drive
- Setback impinges on master bedroom of neighbor’s home.
- Average sideyard set back within 300 feet is 41% greater than what applicant is proposing

**Motion:**

Lazerow moved to recommend project not be approved due to it violating section 1510.0304 related to Single-Family Zone – Development Regulations of the Municipal Code related to average density within 300 feet of the subject site. Moser seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

**7. ACTION ITEM C – PTS 676214 – Barth Addition CDP**

**Location:** 8341 Paseo Grande

APN: 346-171-0600

**Description:** Proposal for a 933.2 sf second story addition and a 150.3 sf deck to an existing 1,702.9 sf dwelling on a 0.12-acre site. Application also includes vacation of a PUD easement dedicated per map 2417 circa 1929. The applicant is seeking a recommendation for approval of a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit (TBD) from the Advisory Board.

**Presented by:** Justin Salbato, [jsalbato@masterworksgcc.com](mailto:jsalbato@masterworksgcc.com) ((858) 405-2305

**Presentation:**

- The proposed project is returning to the Advisory Board after several months
- Presenter said they reached out to residents to the south of the proposal and have received their support

- An upstairs suite has been added, preserving a view corridor on the north side of the building
- Some minor changes include a topological survey, setting back the deck more than previous to be consistent with property to the south
- Proposal added 933 sf for the upstairs suite

**Public Comment:**

- It was mentioned the project should comply with parking regulations for La Jolla Shores. A 20-foot long driveway to curb should also be provided, but if impossible then two parking spaces should be provided. As designed the project does not comply with Parking Impact Overlay Zone. Salbato replied that the City review did not cite a parking deficiency. He said parking was an existing condition not requiring new spaces.
- A question was raised as to how many neighbors within 300 feet have seen the plans. Salbato said they complied with noticing requirements and heard no comments back. The did contact immediate neighbors. The owner said neighbors were aware of the project and that he talked with immediate neighbors
- A question was posed whether project should have a Site Development Permit, requiring a notice for those within 300 feet. Staff said noticing was provided.

**Board Comment:**

- Members complimented plan as presented
- Clarification requested for front yard setback
- Question posed as to why south elevation second story had not been stepped back. Presenter replied the design was cleaner that way, but that a horizontal band was provided for architectural relief.
- It was mentioned that several houses in neighborhood have straight up and down sides on the second story and that the project is compatible with the neighborhood

**Motion:** Moser moved to approve. Lazerow seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

**Next meeting date:** June 16, 2021.

**Adjournment:** 11:37 a.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department