



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

**La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board**

**DRAFT** Meeting Minutes for July 20, 2020

615 Prospect Street

La Jolla, CA 92037

<b>Trustee</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Trustee</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
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:**

Pangilinan noted that address for Hicks residence is incorrectly listed. Should be 8405 Paseo del Ocaso. Therefore, staff advised that this item be continued to August agenda to meet Brown Act noticing requirements. Moser noted that the incorrect address also appeared on the submitted materials by the applicant. Weissman moved to approve the agenda. Lazerow seconded. Motion approved 4-0-0. Lazerow noted that there was no notice of a permit in process when he visited the site and suggested that applicant avoid same situation in August.

**3. Approval of the May 18 Minutes, June 15:**

Lazerow recalled that Weissman moved to approve project as it would decrease building footprint by 550 sf., not reduce square footage by 550 sf., as reflected in June minutes. On p. 3 change June minutes to state proposal for dining room would not be visible from street but the proposal for the bedroom would be visible from street. Potter moved to approve minutes of May meeting. Lazerow seconded. Weissman seconded. Motion passed 4-0-0. For June 15, Moser asked for clarification regarding letter read by Potter from Phillip Merten regarding neighbors opposed or adjacent to the project. Weissman requested clarification on a letter being from Peggy Davis to Sandy and Jeff Davis or the other way around. Pangilinan clarified that a communication from Peggy

Davis opposing the project had been written to homeowners Sandy and Jeff Davis. Lazerow moved to approve. Weissman seconded. 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-Continued**

**Project: 661815 – 8423 El Paseo Grande CDP/SDP**

**Location:** 8423 El Paseo Grande

APN: N/A

**Presented by:** Nick Wilson, Tony Crisafi, [NWilson@islandarch.com](mailto: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, Continued from previous meeting:** The applicants, Tony Crisafi and Nick Wilson, presented the project. Potter requested to start presentation with what changes have been incorporated into project since last reviewed in June.

- Previous FAR .98 reduced to .96.
- Rear setback was 6 ft. on lower and upper levels. Now it is 6 ft. on lower level and 10 ft. on upper level.
- North setback was 4 ft., increased on upper level to 6 ft. and on west and east sides as well.
- New fence on 8423 El Paseo Grande property.
- Second story of stair tower now steps back a maximum of 6 ft.
- Five different wall planes on upper level now and three different wall planes on lower level.
- Moved trash enclosure to north side of property.
- On south side of project site (facing residence also owned by applicant) upper level now stepped back.
- Previous 6 ft. setback on second story facing Gneezy property now 10 ft.
- Met a second time with adjacent property owners.
- Applicant agreed to remove tree on 8415 Paseo Grande property.
- Neighborhood building massing consists of 1, 2, 3 story buildings with FAR from .27 to 1.07.
- Project consistent with existing modern interpretations of Spanish, Mediterranean, etc. architecture in neighborhood.
- Companion unite is code compliant at 1200 sf.

- Main building materials include Santa Barbara fieldstone, vertical western hemlock siding, wood windows and first story roof. Upper wall material is cedar shingle.
- Sustainable design.

**Board Comment:**

Board comment questioned the percentage for landscaping possibly related to overlapping into next door lot and entrance to the accessory dwelling unit (ADU). Applicant responded that landscaping percentage pertains only to the subject site and there are both exterior and interior entrances to the ADU.

**Public Comment:**

Pangilinan read communications regarding 8423 El Paseo Grande from Phillip Merten identifying issues that the Gneezy neighbors have with the proposed project. Issues included setbacks, step backs, FAR, bulk and scale not in conformance with the neighborhood or the PDO. Also included was a comparison of applicant's data with an independent business' data.

Presenter responded that Merten's comparison used altered elevations from Island Architects, thus infringing on their copyright. Presenter clarified that the ADU is one story, not two. Presenter verified that their neighborhood FAR information is accurate, as well as setback and step back information.

Pangilinan also read a communication from Chris McNamara. McNamara opposed the project regarding setbacks, property line and FAR.

Pangilinan read a communication from a neighbor who opposed the project based on property line, FAR, setbacks and non-conforming ADU, as it has interior entrances. Pangilinan read a communication from the neighboring Gneezy's. They opposed the project based on bulk and scale affecting air flow and shadows, and setback. The Gneezy's contacted the owner, Mr. Broe, who felt that the project did not cast shadows and constrict air flow because of its design.

Pangilinan read a letter from Peggy Davis. Davis opposed the project based on FAR, and out of neighborhood character.

Pangilinan read a letter from a banker. The banker also opposed the project. Potter read a letter from neighbor Jeff Davis opposing the project for the above-mentioned reasons, having to do with bulk and scale.

**Board Comment:**

Lazerow requested verification on east, west, south and north first and second level step backs. Including garage, chimney and planters. Presenter verified. Presenter added that

neighboring Gneezy's sent pictures from their residence regarding existing views and light/air for the proposed project which they feel would negatively impact. . Presenter added that existing two-story residences in the immediate neighborhood are all larger than the proposed project. Weissman said that proposed .96 FAR is out of conformance with neighborhood. Weissman said that when a conflict exists between the development regulations in the Municipal Code and the La Jolla Shores PDO, the PDO pertains. So, in this case, though the zero-lot line is allowed by the Municipal Code the PDO states that projects should conform to existing character, which would disallow the accessory dwelling unit. Presenter replied that PDO, Chapter 15, Section 10 describes how buildings without entrances on side property line may be constructed on the property line in some circumstances, providing certain conditions are met, including that see-through provisions and drainage requirements for directing storm water off the property are met. Weissman said the rear setback is not acceptable and also questioned the presenter's figures for large FAR on adjacent properties. Presenter recounted previous projects his firm was involved in that had large FAR's and said that his project met sustainability guidelines and asked that it be judged on its design merits. Lazerow said the neighborhood has several one-story dwelling and some with pop-ups. He said the neighboring two-story dwelling's second story is substantially setback from the first. Lazerow said the subject site's second story is not stepped back enough and looms over the street. He objected to the accessory unit being on the property line as well. He therefore felt the project to be out of conformity with neighboring dwellings. Potter agreed with Lazerow's views.

**Motion:**

Lazerow moved to recommend denial of the project as presented because it exceeds the bulk and scale of neighboring properties and the setback and step backs are less than those of neighboring properties. Seconded by Moser. Passed 4-0-0.

**Motion:**

Moser moved to continue Item B in order to have a robust discussion. Seconded by Lazerow. Passed 4-0-0.

**Next meeting date:** August 17, 2020

**6. Adjournment:** 1:00 p.m.

Minutes taken by Tony Kempton, Associate Planner, Planning Department