



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board

APPROVED Meeting Minutes for June 15, 2020

615 Prospect Street

La Jolla, CA 92037

Trustee	Attendance	Trustee	Attendance
Jane Potter	Present	Herbert Lazerow	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:

Weissman moved to approve the agenda. Lazerow seconded. Motion approved 4-0-0.

3. Approval of the May 18 Minutes:

Lazerow said, under Item #3, substitute 2175 Calle Frescata for 2178. On page 2, Weissman moved to approve project as it would decrease sf by 550 sf. Is in error as project would increase by 550 sf. On p. 3 change minutes from stating, although proposal would not be visible from street to the bedroom part of proposal was visible from street. Potter moved to continue approval of minutes to July meeting. Weissman seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

4. Public Comment:

Marlon Pangilinan, Senior Planner with the Planning Department, said no non-agenda public comment was received.

5. Project Review:

ACTION ITEM A

Project: 661815 – 8423 El Paseo Grande CDP/SDP

Location: 8423 El Paseo Grande

Presented by: Nick Wilson, Tony Crisafi, NWilson@islandarch.com 858-459-9291

Description: Proposed 4,058 sf, two-story single-family residence with attached 1,009 sf accessory dwelling unit to replace existing 1,528 sf single-family residence.

Presentation: The applicant, Nick Wilson, presented the project:

- The applicant has met with three neighbors. The owner owns the house to the south of the subject property.
- Applicant has worked with neighbor to the north on the shared driveway and the neighbor has no issues with it.
- Building height is 28 feet, 8 inches.
- The 15-foot front yard setback is consistent with the neighborhood and will accommodate off-street parking
- The second level is stepped back from the first level to provide articulation on the street elevation with large window openings to the ocean.
- Side yards have upper level shingle siding, while lower level has wood siding.
- There are no public view issues with either height or side setbacks of the project based on the scenic view in the La Jolla Community Plan.
- Side yard setbacks are 4 feet with companion unit on property line.
- Rear yard setback is 6 feet.
- Companion unit on lower level.
- FAR is .78 without the companion unit.

Board Comment:

Board comment questioned the height of the highest ridge line. Applicant replied it was 26 feet, 8 inches. In response to whether grading would be performed applicant said that grading would occur on the northwest portion of the lot to a 3-foot grade differential. Another question regarding where structure height was measured from was answered with information that the Proposition D measurement was measured 30 feet above the high datum. Regarding building bulk, applicant replied that the City had signed off on the FAR of .98, which includes the accessory/companion unit. Applicant explained that the accessory unit is confined to the first floor, mitigating for bulk and scale. The companion unit was thought to be on the property line, creating a walled effect, in conflict with neighborhood character. The second story would be stepped back 4 feet from the property line, with the companion unit at the property line.

Public Comment:

Marlon Pangilinan read a letter from Peggy Davis to Sandy and Jeff Davis. Davis expressed that the home should not be allowed on the lot. Davis questioned if the house, as well as the neighboring house, both owned by the applicant, would be used for vacation rentals. Davis said the 4-foot side yard setbacks are inadequate for air flow. Davis said the .98 FAR house is not compatible with adjacent properties.

Jane Potter read a letter from Phil Merten who represents neighbors to project. Merten said the existing development would have a 2-story companion unit within 6 feet of the neighbor's property line, which would be out of character with the neighborhood and out of compliance with the La Jolla Shores PDO. The proposed FAR of .98 and rear yard setback further place the proposal out of PDO compliance and neighborhood character. Merten recommended the second story at the rear of the property be removed, which would also lower the FAR.

Motion: Lazerow requested a chart with setbacks for properties within 300 feet, the FAR plus height and number of stories with second story step back information, along with letters from neighbors. Weissman said bulk and scale is out of character with the neighborhood. Moser said bulk and scale were out of character. Potter moved continuing item due to lack of compatibility with neighboring properties regarding within 300 feet, FAR, height, bulk and scale and resolution of neighbor issues, as amended by Weissman. Lazerow seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0.

ACTION ITEM B

Development Process Determinations

Potter suggested the La Jolla Shores Advisory Board write a letter to the Development Services Department with a list of issues that the LJSAB wants answers to. The letter and issues of concern would be included on the July agenda to be voted on. Weissman voiced concern that projects were not being sent to the LJSAB for their review and were processed under Process 1. Weissman also questioned how the 50 percent rule applied since the LJSAB only determines whether a project is major or minor. Also, Process 2 projects do not appear to get routed to LJSAB, which they should. Pangilinan mentioned that the City staff approves Process 2 decisions and the PDO states that LJSAB reviews projects forwarded to them and one could then assume Process 2's would be reviewed by LJSAB. Weissman also said that electronic submittal of plans made it easier for projects to bypass the LJSAB. Lazerow agreed. Moser suggested sharing LJSAB concerns with the Councilmember. Marlon suggested forwarding the letter to the Director of Development Services. Weissman offered to draft a letter and then include it in the agenda, so all receive the information at the same time to avoid any Brown Act issues. Pangilinan suggested that Weissman include within the draft letter, addresses of projects she thought the LJSAB should have seen.

Motion:

Lazerow moved to have Weissman draft a letter on projects bypassing community organizations. Weissman amended to motion to have the letter only relate to bypassing review by the LJSAB. Motion passed 4-0-0.

Next meeting date: July 20, 2020

6. Adjournment: 12:53 p.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department