



PO Box 889, La Jolla, CA 92038
<http://www.LaJollaCPA.org>
Voicemail: 858.456.7900
info@LaJollaCPA.org

President: Tony Crisafi
Vice President: Rob Whittemore
Treasurer: Jim Fitzgerald
Secretary: Dan Allen

La Jolla Community Planning Association

Regular Meetings: 1st Thursday of the Month
La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street

Thursday, 6 October 2011

***D R A F T* AGENDA – REGULAR MEETING**

6:00p

1. Welcome and Call To Order: **Tony Crisafi**, President
2. Adopt the Agenda
3. **Meeting Minutes Review and Approval:** 1 Sept 2011
4. **Elected Officials Report** – Information Only
 - A. Council District 2 – Councilmember Kevin Faulconer
Rep: **Katherine Miles**, 619.236.6622, kmills@san Diego.gov
 - B. Council District 1 – Councilmember Sherri Lightner
Rep: **Erin Demorest**, 619.236.7762, edemorest@san Diego.gov
5. **Non-Agenda Public Comment**
Issues not on the agenda and *within LJCPA jurisdiction*, two (2) minutes or less.
 - A. UCSD - Planner: **Anu Delouri**, adelouri@ucsd.edu, <http://commplan.ucsd.edu/>
6. **Non-Agenda Items for Trustee Discussion**
Issues not on the agenda and *within LJCPA jurisdiction*, two (2) minutes or less.
7. Officer's Reports
 - A. **Secretary**
 - B. **Treasurer**
8. **President's Report** – Action Items Where Indicated
 - A. San Diego Foundation – information only, by Rob Whittemore
 - B. LJ Community Planning Association policies
 - C. Joint Committee Review Guidelines

9. CONSENT AGENDA – Ratify or Reconsider Committee Action

Consent Agenda allows the Trustees to ratify actions of our joint committees and boards in a single vote with no presentation or debate. The public may comment on consent items.

→ **Anyone may request that a consent item be pulled for reconsideration and full discussion.**

→ **Items pulled from this Consent Agenda are automatically trailed to the next CPA meeting.**

PDO – Planned District Ordinance Committee, Chair Ione Stiegler, 2nd Mon, 4pm

DPR – Development Permit Review Committee, Chair Tony Crisafi, 2nd & 3rd Tues, 4pm

PRC – LJ Shores Permit Review Committee, Chair Helen Boyden, 4th Tues, 4pm

T&T – Traffic & Transportation Board, Chair Todd Lesser, 4th Thurs, 4pm

A. Hennessey’s Sidewalk Café

PDO ACTION: Sidewalk Café Use conforms with the PDO 6-0-0

7811 Herschel Ave - Installing wrought iron fence as an encroachment into the PROW

B. Emrich Building Tenant Improvements

PDO ACTION: Façade changes conform to the PDO 6-0-0

7655 Girard Ave - Façade Renovation and Tenant Improvement

C. Encore Trust Residence

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to construct 21,592 SF single family residence & 2,149 SF guest quarters on vacant 1.52 acre site. 5-0-0

9872 La Jolla Farms Road - Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to construct a 21,592 SF single family residence and 2,149 SF guest quarters on a vacant 1.52 acre site

D. Soledad Avenue Slide Repair

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for an emergency Coastal Development Permit at 1760, 1796 and 1840 Soledad Avenue and 7750 Sierra Mar Drive to repair slide damage. 7-0-0

1760, 1796 & 1840 Soledad Ave & 7750 Sierra Mar - Coastal Development Permit for previous emergency CDP on 4 properties

E. Undergrounding Residential 1J West

PRC ACTION: Findings can be made for a Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands and a Coastal Development Permit for the Undergrounding of Utilities project Project 1J West. [properties not yet undergrounded in the district: Avenida de la Playa north to SIO and La Jolla Shores Drive west to the ocean with some outliers] 7-0-1

North of Ave. de La Playa, West of LJS Drive – SDP & CDP Undergrounding of approximately 13,300 l. f. of overhead utility lines and poles in an area roughly described as north of Avenida de la Playa to SIO, west of La Jolla Shores Drive to the ocean.

F. Hooshmand Residence

PRC ACTION: Findings can be made for a Site Development Permit and a Coastal Development Permit. 6-0-2

2480 Rue Denise - CDP and SDP for a 4,463 sq. ft. addition & remodel to an existing single family residence on a 0.29 acre site

G. On Street Parking

T&T ACTION: See attached draft minutes for approved motions

Consideration of Draft of City Council Policy relating to On-Street Parking

10. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADVISORY COMMITTEES - Information only

A. LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PARKING DISTRICT ADVISORY BOARD – *Inactive*

B. COASTAL ACCESS AND PARKING BOARD – Meets 1st Tues, 4pm, Rec Center

C. COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE – Meets 4th Tues, 7p, 9192 Topaz Way
1. San Diego Canyonlands – www.sdcanyonlands.com

D. LA JOLLA PARKS & BEACHES, INC. – Meets 4th Mon, 4pm, Rec Center

- 11. Children's Pool Lifeguard Station** – Consider Waiving Summer Moratorium
Proposal to waive the moratorium for Summer 2012 and 2013 to allow uninterrupted construction of the new station. (15 min. limit)
Presenter: Jihad Sleiman, City of San Diego (619) 533-7532 JSleiman@sandiego.gov
- 12. Nooren Residence** – Pulled from Consent, Action Item
8001 Calle de la Plata - Demolish an existing single family residence and construct a 2,725 square foot, two-story single family residence over a 656 square foot garage on a 0.10 acre site. Eliminate subterranean garage and basement.
NEW AUG 2011: substituting a parapet building sides and short walls parallel to street frontages.
PRC REVIEW: March, April, May, June 2011
PRC ACTION (June '11): Findings can be made for a CDP and a SDP based on the plans presented-dated 6/17/2011 and submitted to the City 6/28/2011. 4-0-3
CPA ACTION (July '11): To accept the recommendation of the LJ Shores Permit Review Committee 12-0-1
PRC ACTION (August '11): Findings can be made for a SDP and a CDP 3-2-1
- 13. Lundberg Addition SCR** – Action Item
Ratify appeal (dated Sept. 21, 2011) of NOD dated Sept. 2nd, 2011
7820 Lookout Drive - add 537 square feet on the second floor, partially over the garage of an approximate 5,770 square foot single family residence on a 0.326 acre site
PRC ACTION (Aug '11): Findings can not be met that the project is in Substantial Conformance with the original CDP and SDP, 3-2-1
PRC ACTION (Aug '11): The city should review the issue on whether the existing driveway wall conforms to the driveway visibility triangle requirements in the municipal code. 5-0-1
CPA ACTION (Sept '11): To accept the recommendations of the La Jolla Shores PRC. 14-0-1
- 14. 1912 Spindrift** – Action Items
Rescind previous La Jolla Community Planning Association Actions to 1912 Spindrift. Vote on changes to proposed project, project has changed.
- A. LJ Community Planning Association action of Feb 3, 2011**
Approved Motion: Motion: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit. (Burstein/Manno 9/4/2)
In favor: Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Fitzgerald, Lucas, Manno, Salmon, Whittemore.
Opposed: Gabsch, Little, Merten, Weiss.
Abstain: Courtney, LaCava,
Recused: Crisafi (Mr. Crisafi left room).
- B. LJ Community Planning Association action of April 7, 2011**
Approved Motion: Motion: Recommend denial: Findings cannot be made for a Site Development Permit and a Coastal Development Permit: 1) The south setback does not comply with the La Jolla Community Plan. 2) Off street parking within the front yard does not comply with the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, (Merten/Little 9/5/1)
In favor: Brady, Costello, Courtney, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Weiss.
Oppose: Allen, Burstein, Conboy, Fitzgerald, Salmon.
Abstain: LaCava.
Recused: Crisafi
- C. LJ Community Planning Association action of Aug 4, 2011**
To appeal the decision of the Hearing Officer regarding 1912 Spindrift to the Planning Commission, (Little/Courtney, 8-4-1).
In favor: Allen, Bond, Courtney, Costello, Gabsch, Little, Merten, Weiss.
Against: Burstein, Conboy, Fitzgerald, Manno.
Abstain: Whittemore.

Recused - out of room: Crisafi.

D. LJ Community Planning Association action of Sept. 1 2011

Approved Motion: La Jolla Community Planning Association commends the applicant for the changes made to the project, (Weiss/Fitzgerald, 7-6-1).

In favor: Brady, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Lucas, Weiss.

Against: Allen, Bond, Burstein, Little, Manno, Thorsen.

Abstain: Whittemore.

Recused - out of room: Crisafi.

15. 1912 Spindrift – Action Item

1912 Spindrift - Demolish existing residence and construct a 3,475 sf, two-story single family residence on a 13,511 sf parcel. La Jolla Shores PDO. NEW AUG '11: Add garage to accommodate two cars stacked.

Presenter: Matt Peterson, (619) 234-0361, MAP@petersonprice.com

PRC Action (Aug '11): Findings can be met for a CDP & SDP for the revised design with the attached garage and stepped back second story, dated 8/11/11. 4-1-1

16. Ad Hoc Committee on Operating Procedures – Action item

Ad Hoc Action: Consideration to adopt Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations #2 & #3, listed below.

See Procedures created by the ad hoc committee attached to this agenda.

Aug 2011 Recommendations:

2. *The ad hoc committee recommends that the LJ Community Planning Association eliminate the policies of January 8, 2009 and March 6, 2008, and leave it to the Community Joint Committees and Boards to develop their own policies and procedures. (Boyden/Conboy 5/0/0).*
3. *The ad hoc committee recommends that the LJ Community Planning Association eliminate the policy of January 4, 2009, and leave it to the Community Joint Committees and Boards to develop their own policies and procedures. (Whittemore/LaCava 4/1/0).*

17. Adjourn to next Regular Monthly Meeting, Nov. 3, 2011, 6:00 pm

PO Box 889, La Jolla, CA 92038
<http://www.LaJollaCPA.org>
Voicemail: 858.456.7900
info@LaJollaCPA.org

President: Tony Crisafi
Vice President: Rob Whittemore
Treasurer: Jim Fitzgerald
Secretary: Dan Allen



La Jolla Community Planning Association

Regular Meetings: 1st Thursday of the Month
La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street

Thursday, 01 September 2011

D R A F T MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING

Present: Dan Allen, Cynthia Bond, Tom Brady, Devin Burstein, Michael Costello, Tony Crisafi, Jim Fitzgerald, Orrin Gabsch, Joe LaCava, David Little, Tim Lucas, Nancy Manno, Cynthia Thorsen, Rob Whittemore, Ray Weiss.
Absent: Laura Ducharme Conboy, Dan Courtney, Phil Merten

1. Welcome and Call To Order: Tony Crisafi, President, at 6:06 PM

2. Adopt the Agenda

Trustee Manno corrected two items in the prepared agenda: For Item 10.F the numerical data for square footage was clarified, and Item 10.G was deleted from the Consent Agenda since it duplicated Item 12.

Approved Motion: Motion to Adopt the Agenda as corrected, (Fitzgerald/Whittemore, 13-0-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Whittemore, Weiss.
Abstain: Crisafi.

3. Election - Swearing in of newly elected Trustee

President Crisafi announced no objections or challenges to the special trustee election. Therefore, the election results announced at the August meeting will stand. **President Crisafi** thanked election chair **Trustee LaCava** for a well-run election.

President Crisafi invited newly elected **Trustee Cynthia Thorsen** to come forward, offered his congratulations and administered the LJCPA oath of office.

4. Meeting Minutes Review and Approval: 04 August 2011

Approved Motion: Motion to approve the Minutes of August 4th 2011, (Manno/Fitzgerald, 12-0-3).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Whittemore, Weiss.
Abstain: Brady, Crisafi, LaCava,

5. Elected Officials Report - Information Only

A. Council District 2 - Councilmember Kevin Faulconer
Rep: Katherine Miles, 619.236.6622, kmiles@sanidiego.gov

Ms. Miles reported three recent developments: The Redistricting Commission set new boundaries for City Council districts, and La Jolla will be united in one district -- District 1. The new districts will apply to the next election, but the old districts will stay in effect for administration to December 2012. Therefore part of La Jolla will be the concern of Council District 2 office until the end of 2012. The councilman's office has prepared a draft ordinance on overnight parking of oversized (recreational) vehicles and the draft ordinance will go to the Land

Use and Housing Committee in the fall. The City's outside auditor has finished the 2010 audit, and if approved by the Budget Committee, this will allow the Mayor to market \$100 million in bonds, which will be used for infrastructure.

- B. Council District 1 - Councilmember Sherri Lightner**
Rep: Erin Demorest, 619.236.7762, edemorest@sandiego.gov

Ms. Demorest iterated the redistricting result, pointing out that the new District 1 boundaries are the exact boundaries of the "Coast and Canyon Plan," supported and recommended by the LJCPA. She noted the Council is not in session in August.

6. Non-Agenda Public Comment – Issues not on the agenda and within LJCPA jurisdiction, two (2) minutes or less.

- A. UCSD - Planner: Anu Delouri, adelouri@ucsd.edu, <http://commplan.ucsd.edu>**

Ms. Delouri provided copies of the University updates. She reported that the Coastal Commission approved the proposed rehabilitation of University House. The first phase of the work will be slope stabilization.

Community member **Tricia Kay** comments that there is something missing in the draft PDO committee report on the Riford Center Façade (see Consent Agenda, agenda Item 10.A). She finds faults with assumption the access upgrade is legal and that signage colors are compatible with the PDO.

JLCPA member **Patrick Ahern**, president of La Jolla Parks and Beaches, Inc., reported that they are concerned with the limited scope of the City's new lifeguard station project at Children's Pool and Casa Beach. LJP&B is initiating *Beautification of Coast Boulevard Walk at Children's Pool, Casa Beach*, a project to address the section of landscaping not in the City's project scope. Estimated cost of the added landscape is \$100,000. The first step will be a community workshop Oct 1 at site at 8AM; subsequently registrants will meet at 939 Coast Boulevard. He distributed a handout. He also introduced community member **Phyllis Minick**, treasurer of LJP&B Inc., who has been the leader and organizer of the workshop, and who is providing substantial financial assistance. **Ms. Minick** elaborated on the plans and scope of the workshop.

7. Non-Agenda Items for Trustee Discussion

Issues not on the agenda and within LJCPA jurisdiction, two (2) minutes or less.

Trustee Costello informed that Trustee Laura Ducharme Conboy's father passed away a week ago. He distributed copies of the obituary.

Trustee LaCava was disturbed to learn that the trustee's direction to appeal 1912 Spindrift was not carried out and asked for an explanation. **President Crisafi** suggested this should be discussed under #14 but **Trustee LaCava** objected not wanting to bias the applicant's presentation with this procedural issue. **Trustee Little** questions whether or not it was the responsibility of the President. **President Crisafi** replied that it is his understanding that filing the appeal was the responsibility of **Trustee Whitemore**, who is Vice President and was chairman at the time of the vote by Trustees to appeal last month, **President Crisafi** having recused himself. **Trustee Costello** pointed out that the project was changed and that this is the subject is on agenda at #14, and that if the project was changed to address the LJCPA objection, then there is no "fault" that the appeal was not filed. **Trustee LaCava** objected that we can not presume the trustees will support the proposed change and if they do not, there is no recourse.

Trustee Little asked for a Trustee policy on ADA issues, and he read a quote on ADA improvements by an unidentified architect in La Jolla. **President Crisafi** says he has been assured that all PDO ministerial projects will be referred to LJCPA, which he assumes includes ADA improvements. **Trustee Fitzgerald** points out the ADA requirements are not directly included in Municipal Code.

8. Officer's Reports

A. Secretary: Dan Allen

Trustee Allen stated that if one wants his or her attendance recorded today, please sign-in at the back of the room. You are entitled to attend without signing in, but only by providing proof of attendance can you maintain membership or become a Trustee. If you want your attendance recorded without signing-in at the back, then hand to me before the end of the meeting a piece of paper with your printed full name, signature and a statement that you want your attendance recorded.

When you do sign-in at the back, note there are two lists: one for LJCPA members and one for non-members. LJCPA is a membership organization open to La Jolla residents, property owners and local businesspersons at least 18 years of age. This is a meeting of the Trustees, who are elected by the LJCPA members. Eligible non-members wishing to join the LJCPA must have recorded attendance for one meeting and must submit an application, copies of which are available from **Trustee Thorsen** and on-line at our website: www.lajollacpa.org.

B. Treasurer: Jim Fitzgerald

August Beginning Balance: \$116.86 + Income \$184.02 – (Expenses \$131.95) = Ending Balance: \$168.93.
Expenses include the agenda printing, election ballot printing and telephone expenses.

Trustee Fitzgerald commented on the special generosity of the Membership and Trustees and reminded Trustees, Members and guests: LJCPA is a non-profit organization and must rely solely on the generosity of the community and the Trustees. All donations must be in cash to preserve anonymity.

9. President's Report – Action Items Where Indicated

A. 8470 Whale Watch Way – Action Item

Whether to appeal the Hearing Officer decision of Aug. 24, 2011

President Crisafi read a letter on the subject from Trustee Merten.

Approved Motion: Motion to appeal the decision of the Hearing Officer regarding 8470 Whale Watch Way to the Planning Commission, (Lucas/Costello, 11-1-3).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Thorsen, Weiss, Whittemore

Against: Manno.

Abstain: Burstein, LaCava, Crisafi.

B. Donation Mechanism through La Jolla Town Council Foundation – Possible Action Item.

Trustee LaCava provided a handout on the proposed mechanism. LJCPA member **Claude-Anthony Marengo** questioned buying services from another group that makes community decisions influencing government. Others expressed that cleansing through a foundation questionable relative to tax deduction and tax exemption.

Trustee Thorsen inappropriate to have linkage with any other organization such as the LJTC. **Trustee Fitzgerald** emphasized that the anonymity of donations this way is more significant than the tax issue. **Trustee LaCava** says LJTC Foundation a separate entity from LJTC. **Trustee Whittemore** will look into using San Diego Foundation because it may be more flexible.

Failed Motion: Pending approval by the City Attorney, to endorse the proposed arrangement and direct the President and the Treasurer to coordinate with the LJTC Foundation as well as advertise the availability of the program to the public, (LaCava/Fitzgerald, 5-8-2).

In favor: Allen, Burstein, Costello, Gabsch, LaCava.

Against: Bond, Brady, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Thorsen, Weiss, Whittemore.

Abstain: Manno, Crisafi.

10. Consent Agenda – Ratify or Reconsider Committee Action

Consent Agenda allows the Trustees to ratify actions of our joint committees and boards in a single vote with no presentation or debate. The public may comment on consent items. Anyone may request that a consent item be pulled for reconsideration and full discussion. Items pulled from this Consent Agenda are automatically trailed to the next CPA meeting.

PDO – Planned District Ordinance Committee, Chair Ione Stiegler, 2nd Mon, 4pm

DPR – Development Permit Review Committee, 2nd & 3rd Tues, 4pm

PRC – LJ Shores Permit Review Committee, Chair Helen Boyden, 4th Tues, 4pm

T&T – Traffic & Transportation Board, Chair Todd Lesser, 4th Thurs, 4pm

A. Riford Center Façade – *Pulled by Trustee Bond*

PDO ACTION: 1) signage conforms to the PDO; 2) materials and colors are in keeping with the existing community character and conform to the PDO; 3) all other proposed façade changes conform to the PDO; 4) the proposed at-grade access to the building’s side entrance conforms to the PDO. 6-0-0

6811 La Jolla Boulevard - ADA access ramp, facade and paint

B. Westime Signage

PDO ACTION: motion to approve signage 7-0-0.

1227 Prospect Street – new signage

C. 9721 Blackgold Road

DPR ACTION: Motion that findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing single-family residence and construct a tennis court at 9721 Blackgold Rd. 5-0-0

9721 Blackgold Rd. - Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing single family residence and construct a tennis court on a 0.95 acre site.

D. Lundberg Addition

PRC ACTION: Findings can NOT be met that the project is in Substantial Conformance with the original CDP and SDP, 3-2-1

PRC ACTION: The city should review the issue on whether the existing driveway wall conforms to the driveway visibility triangle requirements in the municipal code. 5-0-1

7820 Lookout Drive - add 537 square feet on the second floor, partially over the garage of an approximate 5,770 square foot single family residence on a 0.326 acre site

E. T-Mobile N Torrey Pines Road

PRC ACTION: Findings can be made for a CUP 5-0-1

2849 1/3 La Jolla Village Drive - Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) in the public right-of-way consisting of 3 panel antennas mounted to a replacement light standard with above-ground equipment

F. Nooren Residence (5th review by PRC) – *Pulled by LJCPA Member Janie Emerson*

PRC ACTION: Findings can be made for a SDP and a CDP 3-2-1

8001 Calle de la Plata - Demolish an existing single family residence and construct a 2,725 square foot, two-story single family residence over a 656 square foot garage on a 0.10 acre site. Eliminate subterranean garage and basement.

NEW: substituting a parapet building sides and short walls parallel to street frontages.

Approved Motion: Motion:

To accept the recommendation of the Planned District Ordinance Committee: (B) Westime Signage: Approve signage, and forward the recommendation to the City.

To accept the recommendation of the Development Permit Review Committee: (C) 9721 Blackgold Road: Findings can be made for a CDP to demolish existing single-family residence and construct a tennis court at 9721 Blackgold Rd., and forward the recommendations to the City.

To accept the recommendations of the LJ Shores Permit Review Committee: (D) Lundberg

Addition: Findings can NOT be made that the project is in Substantial Conformance with the original CDP and SDP, and the City should review the issue on whether the existing driveway wall conforms to the driveway visibility triangle requirements in the municipal code.; (E) T-Mobile N Torrey Pines Road: Findings can be made for a CUP, and forward the recommendations to the City.

(Fitzgerald/Costello, 14-0-1)

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Whittemore, Weiss.
Abstain: Crisafi.

11. Reports from Other Advisory Committees - Information only

A. La Jolla Community Parking District Advisory Board – Inactive

B. Coastal Access and Parking Board - Meets 1st Tues, 4pm, La Jolla Recreation Center

Trustee LaCava announced there will be a meeting September 6th.

C. Community Planners Committee – Meets 4th Tues, 7pm, 9192 Topaz Way, San Diego

Trustee LaCava reported that at the last CPC meeting they discussed the SANDAG 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. There was conflict between priority for expanded transit and priority for freeway widening and improvements. The CPC voted supporting transit, "weakly".

12. La Jolla Art & Wine Festival – Action Item

October 1 -2 from 10 am – 6pm. Street closure of upper Girard from Pearl to Genter - 4pm Friday, Sept 30th through Sunday Oct. 2nd 10pm.

LJCPA member **Sherry Ahern** and community member **Mary Goldman** presented the proposal. This event will be arranged and conducted as previously, with the exception that the La Jolla Elementary schoolyard and playground will not be utilized. There will be sidewalk access to merchants. There will be shuttle vehicles from three remote locations and valet parking service. **Trustee Gabsch** noted that this was presented to T&T and was approved at their 28 August meeting.

Approved Motion: Motion to approve the La Jolla Art & Wine Festival plan as presented, (Gabsch/Brady, 14-0-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Whittemore, Weiss.
Abstain: Little, Crisafi.

13. Via Rialto Emergency Storm Drain Repair Project – Action item

7435 Via Rialto and west of 7435 Cto. Rialto and SW to adjacent canyon - Slope repair and storm drain improvements on environmentally sensitive lands.

PRC Action (Aug '11): To continue this item until the property owners or homeowners association have been noticed or contacted. 4-1-1

James Arnhart and **Ron Fox**, from the City of San Diego Engineering and Capital Projects Department, presented. Following a 2005 drain failure emergency repairs were made and then reworked in 2010. The issue now is approval of the revegetation plan and access ways for the revegetation. The homeowners' association has been consulted and has no concerns.

Approved Motion: Motion to approve the Via Rialto Emergency storm drain revegetation plan presented, (Thorsen/Lucas, 14-0-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Whittemore, Weiss.
Abstain: Little, Crisafi.

At this point President Crisafi recused himself and left the room. Vice President Whittemore assumed the chairmanship of the meeting.

14. 1912 Spindrift

1912 Spindrift - Demolish existing residence and construct a 3,475 sf, two-story single family residence on a 13,511 sf parcel. La Jolla Shores PDO. *NEW: Adding garage to accommodate two cars in tandem to address reasons for LJCPA denial.*

PRC Action (Jan '11): The findings for a CDP and SDP can be made, 4-3-0.

CPA Action (Feb '11): Hearing of Feb '11 set aside, call for rehearing by the President

CPA Action (April '11) Recommend denial: Findings cannot be made for a Site Development Permit and a Coastal Development Permit, 9-5-1

CPA Action (Aug '11): To appeal the decision of the Hearing Officer regarding 1912 Spindrift to the Planning Commission, 8-4-1

PRC Action (Aug '11): Findings can be met for a SDP and CDP for the revised design with the attached garage and stepped back second story, dated 8/11/2011. 4-1-1

Vice President Whittemore read a letter from Trustee Merten. In the letter Trustee Merten explained that he met with the applicant's representative to review a proposed change to the project. The change addresses the LJCPA's objections by adding a garage with auto lift behind the front building line. This change removes the off-street parking from the "front yard". This change also provides additional articulation to the overall building. In light of these changes Trustee Merten urged the trustees to support the revised project. In response to issues raised earlier under Trustee Comments, **Vice President Whittemore** noted there was no appeal filed, although LJCPA Trustees voted last month to do so, and consequently the City has given final approval. **Trustee Burstein** stated that the matter had already been decided and no further action is in order. **Matthew Peterson**, representative of the owner and applicant, proposed that it would be useful to have a final advisory vote. **Trustee Fitzgerald** welcomed input but expressed that there is no further action to be taken. **Mr. Peterson** briefed on the changed plan. He stated that he met with Trustee Merten to discuss the change, but the matter of the appeal was not raised. The PRC was presented with the changes and decided findings could be met for a SDP and CDP for the revised design. There was additional discussion by Trustees on whether to take no action or to let the matter go with a commendation to the applicant for cooperation in the process.

Approved Motion: To close debate and proceed to vote on the pending motion, ("Call The Question"), (Weiss, 12-1-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Weiss.
Against: Thorsen.
Abstain: Whittemore.
Recused - out of room: Crisafi.

Approved Motion: La Jolla Community Planning Association commends the applicant for the changes made to the project, (Weiss/Fitzgerald, 7-6-1).

In favor: Brady, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Lucas, Weiss.
Against: Allen, Bond, Burstein, Little, Manno, Thorsen.
Abstain: Whittemore.
Recused - out of room: Crisafi.

At this point President Crisafi returned to chair the meeting.

15. Ad Hoc Committee on Operating Procedures – Action item

Ad Hoc Action: Recommend that the LJ Community Planning Association adopt the Appeal Procedures created by the ad hoc committee.

Trustee Burstein presented the committee's four recommendations, which were provided as an attachment to the agenda. There was discussion on the status and structures of the joint committees, particularly from LJCPA member **Marengo** and **Trustee Whittemore**. The discussion then considered the first of the four recommendations, and **Trustee Whittemore** pointed out that the plan would be to eventually put all the policies into the By-Laws.

Approved Motion: The La Jolla Community Planning Association shall retain the flexibility to use operating policies, adopted by a majority vote of the Trustees, and submitted by the President to the City for review and approval, (Whittemore/Manno, 14-0-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Whittemore, Weiss.

Abstain: Crisafi.

The discussion then considered the second of the four recommendations, and **Trustee LaCava** emphasized that some of the policies proposed to be deleted were productive. It was pointed out that the policy of March 6, 2008 was redundant.

Approved Motion: Approve The La Jolla Community Planning Association eliminates the policy of March 6, 2008, (LaCava/Costello, 14-0-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Whittemore, Weiss.

Abstain: Crisafi.

The Trustees further considered and discussed the second and third of the four recommendations. These are to delete requirements on process coming from the LJCPA and ask the joint committees to develop their own policies.

Approved Motion: To table Ad-Hoc committee recommendations #2 and #3 for consideration at the next meeting, (Fitzgerald/ Burstein, 12-2-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Fitzgerald, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Whittemore, Weiss.

Against: Costello, Gabsch.

Abstain: Crisafi.

Discussion moved on to the fourth proposal, which concerns appeal procedures, a draft of which was also in the agenda package. **Trustee Lucas** suggested adding that the "acting president" could also make appeals, in such case as recently when the Vice President was chairman when the Trustees considered an appeal because the President had recused himself. **Trustee Little** was critical of the report. **Trustee Costello** provided copies of a mark-up of the proposals.

Approved Motion: To close debate and proceed to vote on the pending motion, ("Call The Question"), (Weiss, 12-2-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Weiss, Whittemore.

Against: Costello, Little.

Abstain: Crisafi.

Approved Motion: La Jolla Community Planning Association adopts the following Appeal Procedures. Any and all prior Appeal Procedures, whether or not specifically titled as such, are hereby superseded and no longer in force:

Circumstances in which the Appeal Procedures Apply

The LJCPA may appeal any adverse decision. The LJCPA Appeal Procedures apply when there has been a City of San Diego (Staff, Process 2; Hearing Officer, Process 3; Planning Commission, Process 4) decision that is in opposition to a LJCPA recommendation and/or finding (hereafter, an "adverse decision"). Examples of adverse decisions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) The LJCPA recommends that a project be denied and the City approves the project.**
- (2) The LJCPA determines that findings cannot be made and the City disagrees.**
- (3) When a project has significantly changed after review by the LJCPA, such that the project heard by the City is materially different than the project heard by the LJCPA, then, if the City approves the project, the LJCPA may determine this to be an adverse decision.**
- (4) An environmental document is certified by the City that the LJCPA determines should not have been certified.**

Procedures for Appeal of Adverse Decisions

When there has been an adverse decision and the period within which to file an appeal does not expire before the next regularly scheduled LJCPA meeting, the question of whether to appeal shall be placed on the agenda for that meeting and voted on by the Trustees after voting on the matter. If a majority of the voting Trustees vote to appeal the adverse decision, the LJCPA President (or acting President) shall file the appeal and cause it to be pursued.

When there has been an adverse decision and the period within which to file an appeal expires before the next scheduled LJCPA meeting, the LJCPA President (or acting President) shall timely file an appeal of the adverse decision to ensure the appeal is not waived. Thereafter, the question of whether to ratify the appeal shall be placed on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled LJCPA meeting and voted on by the Trustees after hearing the matter. If a majority of the voting Trustees vote to ratify the appeal, it shall be pursued. If not, the LJCPA President shall inform the City that the LJCPA wishes to withdraw the appeal.

Appeal of Environmental Documents

Appeal of an environmental document, such as a CEQA exemption, negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or an EIR, shall be considered a new appeal. The question of whether to appeal an environmental document approved by the City shall be placed on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled LJCPA meeting and voted on by the Trustees. If a majority of the voting Trustees vote to appeal the environmental document, the LJCPA President (or acting President) shall file the appeal and cause it to be pursued.

When the period within which to file an appeal of the environmental document expires before the next scheduled LJCPA meeting, the LJCPA President (or acting President) shall timely file an appeal of the environmental document to ensure the appeal is not waived. Thereafter, the question of whether to ratify the appeal shall be placed on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled LJCPA meeting and voted on by the Trustees. If a majority of the voting Trustees vote to ratify the appeal, it shall be pursued. If not, the LJCPA President shall inform the City that the LJCPA wishes to withdraw the appeal.

WHEREAS, The LJCPA Trustees wish to have the opportunity to determine, at a regularly scheduled meeting, whether to file an appeal, the LJCPA President shall urge applicants and City Project Managers to schedule City hearings only on days that will allow a regularly scheduled meeting of the LJCPA to occur before the appeal period has expired in order to prevent the automatic filing of an appeal.

Continuation of Appeals

When the LJCPA appeals an adverse decision or an environmental document, and, as a result, one body of the City sends the project back to a lower body for further review, if the project is again approved by the lower body, the LJCPA may continue with its previously filed appeal without a new meeting to reconsider the question. The applicant, however, may request to come back before the LJCPA for further discussion on whether to pursue the appeal. If such request is made, the item shall be placed on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled meeting.

LJCPA Participation in Appeals

The Trustees of the LJCPA believe it is important to participate in any appeal that the LJCPA has voted to pursue. Thus, when the LJCPA votes to appeal or ratifies an appeal, if the LJCPA President cannot or chooses not to appear at the appeal hearing, he or she shall appoint a Trustee, who voted to appeal or ratify the appeal, to appear at the hearing.

At any appeal hearing, the LJCPA President or appointed Trustee shall state that he or she is representing the LJCPA and shall advocate for the LJCPA's recommendation(s) and/or finding(s). Only the President or the appointed Trustee may appear as the official representative of the LJCPA, although other Trustees are encouraged to attend appeal hearings in their personal capacities.

Questions Not Specifically Answered.

If a question or issue regarding Appeal Procedures arises that is not specifically addressed herein, the LJCPA Trustees should decide the question or issue in accordance with the spirit of these written Appeal Procedures.

(Whittemore/Manno, 12-2-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Weiss, Whittemore.
Against: Costello, Little.
Abstain: Crisafi.

16. Formation of Ad Hoc Committee to Review Joint Committee Policy – Action item

Whether to form an Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate current joint committee policy and make recommendations to transform policy into LJCPA bylaws.

Trustee LaCava proposed as an alternative that the joint committees bring their suggested recommendations for changes to the current committee policies to the Trustees. **Trustee Gabsch** stated concern about joint committees making significant undesirable changes to their policies and/or procedures independent of the Trustees.

Postponed Motion: To direct the joint committees to bring any suggested recommendations for changes to their current committee policies to the Trustees, (LaCava/Burstein)

Approved Motion: To postpone the pending motion for consideration at the next meeting, (Whittemore/Burstein, 13-1-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Lucas, Manno, Thorsen, Weiss, Whittemore.
Against: Little.
Abstain: Crisafi.

17. Adjourn at 9:35 PM. Next Regular Monthly Meeting, October 6th, 2011, 6:00 pm.

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE LA JOLLA
PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE
September 12, 2011**

Formatted: Top: 0.8", Bottom: 0.8"

Present: Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Fortune, Parker, Marengo, Berwin. A quorum was established at 4:15 pm. By Vice Chair Fitzgerald. Also present: numerous members of the public and press; sign-in sheet circulated and collected by the secretary.

Agenda – Motion to approve the agenda - Parker/Berwin passed 6/0/0

Minutes - Amendments to the minutes on the presentation on the Riford Center were presented by the VC Fitzgerald.

Motion: To approve the August, 2011 minutes as amended - Berwin/Fitzgerald 2/0/4 Marengo, Gabsch, Fortune, Parker. Note: Fitzgerald will provide a copy of the amended Minutes to the Committee Chair and and to the Secretary.

Agenda Modification: Chair Report moved to the end of the meeting

Public Comment:

None

Agenda Items:

**PROJECT NAME: EMRICH BUILDING TENANT IMPROVEMENTS -
FAÇADE, LOBBY AND ELEVATOR UPGRADE
SCOPE OF WORK: Façade Renovation and Tenant Improvement**

Minor façade changes were presented, which included a window being changed to a door to create a shared lobby with an elevator for access to the second and the addition of two windows on the rear exterior of the second floor. One exterior awning will be the extended over the new entry.

No intensification or change of use.

Motion – Façade changes conform to the PDO Gabsch/Fortune 6/0/0

Project Name: Jersey Mikes
Scope of Work: Tenant improvement, Trash enclosure and shared parking agreement (note the City informed the applicant in writing that the use of the space as a restaurant was not a change in use. Based on this determination the applicant has proceeded with a substantial financial investment)

Committee had a long discussion with applicant regarding PDO requirements (including the impact of a change in use on required parking and the allowable amount of signage), shared parking agreements, and the community review process.

Item was tabled and will be on October 2011 agenda

Project Name: Hennessey's Sidewalk Cafe
Scope of Work: Neighborhood Use Permit

Applicant presented the addition of a corralled sidewalk café in front of the restaurant to include wrought iron rail with 5 tables. Applicant will maintain 8 foot clear path of travel.

Motion – Sidewalk Café Use conforms with the PDO Marengo/Parker 6/0/0

Project Name: Larisa Hall
Scope of Work: Signage (“Your sign at 32 square feet is under your allowed 42 square feet. So I would like to bring it to the PDO as just an information item to acknowledge that you have been reviewed and found in conformance.” Quote from email Ione Stiegler sent to applicant)

Applicant did not appear before the committee.

Chair Report/Board Discussion:

Since the Chair was not present, this item will be moved to October 2011 Committee meeting.

Committee did have a brief discussion regarding the PDO and the city’s lack of enforcement.

The meeting was adjourned at about 5:30 p.m. The next PDO meeting is scheduled for October 10, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. at the La Jolla Recreation Center, Room 1.

Respectfully Submitted

Deborah Marengo, Acting Secretary

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

**COMMITTEE REPORT
FOR
SEPTEMBER 2011**

9/12/2011 Present: Benton (Chairman), DuCharme-Conboy, Costello, Hayes, Thorsen

9/20/2011 Present: Benton (Chairman), DuCharme-Conboy, Costello, Gaenzle, Hayes, Liera, Thorsen

1. FINAL REVIEW 9/13/11

Project Name: **Hennessey's Sidewalk Café**

| | | |
|-----------------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 7811 Herschel Avenue | Permits: | Neighborhood Use Permit |
| Project #: PO# 243179 | DPM: | Glenn Gargas 619-446-5142 gargas@sandiego.gov |
| Zone: LJPD - 1 | | Applicant: Damian Gulak 619-840-7385 |

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Neighborhood Use Permit for a 180 SF sidewalk café (approximately 6 FT x 30 FT) within the public right-of-way for an existing restaurant located at 7811 Herschel Avenue, in Zone 1 of La Jolla Planned District, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, Transit Area Overlay Zone and within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

Applicant plans an enclosed decorative corral area with 3 ft high rail, 6 ft out from building, proposed to provide an outside café. Have some plants and lighting. Sidewalk would still have an 8 ft clear path.

Provided for this REVIEW:

Applicant reply in italics

- a. Please go before the LJPDO Committee for a recommendation, then return to us for Final Review. *LJPDO approved plan on 12 Sept 2011*
- b. Provide 8 ft clear path. *Provided on drawing.*
- c. Provide the Encroachment Maintenance and Removal Agreement. *Provided*
- d. Consider providing parking, i.e., shared parking agreement. **“Not addressed at this time.”**
- e. Is the older part of the sidewalk historic? *According to PDO, “no”.* **DuCharme:** Angeles did say not to drill holes in the “Historic” sidewalk. IE, that dark gray center strip. **1922 is stamped in concrete.** **Thorsen:** I think Historic just wants to preserve the stamp. **Benton:** We want to see this historic band preserved.

DISCUSSION:

DuCharme: A clear sidewalk and trees has a charming effect, how about moving the tables to the South by the curb? Preserve the straight away.

Benton: Yes, you could place the tables and chairs at the curbside between the trees. There are several examples of this in La Jolla.

Thorsen: How about decorative lighting on and up in the trees?

Applicant: Will ABC allow this discontinuity for waitresses to bring beer across open sidewalk?

Applicant: There is the EMRA (Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement) so drilled holes would be repaired if abandoned.

Costello: If you position to the curb there is no concern about drilling into the historic portion of the sidewalk.

DuCharme: confirmed dimensions on the EMRA, moving tables keeps drill holes out of older sidewalk..

Chairman Benton: recommends that the Applicant withdraw the Project. Drawings are not very well advanced. Return with a plan that has the tables near the curb, and leaving the center of the sidewalk clear.

Applicant: agrees and will ask the City Staff if they can do the above.

APPLICANT REQUESTS CONTINUANCE.

2. FINAL REVIEW 9/13/11

Project Name: **La Jolla Boulevard Mixed Use**

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 7401 La Jolla Boulevard | Permits: | CPD & SDP |
| Project #: PO#241056 | DPM: | Glenn Gargas 619-446-5142 ggargas@sandiego.gov |
| Zone: LJPD - 4 | Applicant: | Ariadne Milligan, Island Architects 858-459-9291 |

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to construct a mixed use building with 5,400 SF commercial space and a 4,600 SF single-family residence on a vacant 0.23-acre site. The property is located at 7401 La Jolla Boulevard in Zone 4 of La Jolla Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan area, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. Council District 1.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

Applicant passed out a statistical sheet about the Project. Applicant announced that they will pull back their wall 1 ft more from the East, jogging the profile of the ground floor and really jogging the profile of the residential floor. Move the Project back, provide a great deal of articulating, and open the second level court yard to give the East neighbors more light and space. Gives a 5 ft wide egress space between retaining wall and building.

Provided for this REVIEW:

Applicant reply in italics

- Consider angling the wall separating the Marine St Townhouses and LJ Blvd Mixed Use Project. *Some articulation and opening done on the second level.*
- Consider moving the Project closer to La Jolla Boulevard, to enlarge East setback. *East side setback increased.*
- Consider installing pedestrian crosswalk in-pavement flashers on La Jolla Blvd.
- Email section and site plan to Ms. Knepp to be forwarded to DPR Members. Members have assignment, from Chair, to visit site and observe setbacks and relationship to neighboring property. *Done: Drawings emailed, Members visited site.*

DISCUSSION:

Applicant reply in italics

DuCharme: Windows and some other things left out. What are windows and what openings? *Applicant explained differences.*

DuCharme: had a prepared list of questions.

- Parking: 9 retail, 2 residential. But what about the 2nd residential unit? And the separate unit (1 bedroom, no kitchen)? Is that guest quarters?
- FAR: What is the big space in the middle? Not “enclosed”??
- Is the mezzanine with kitchen Commercial or Residential?
- What is the dead end space at the South end?
- What materials at the South end of the lot?
- Landscape shows a ramp. Floor plan says nothing.
- Section shows 6” thick, at grade, explain.
- South end of South commercial space – Glass?
- Elevations
 - Balconies not shown
 - What materials?
 - Where is the East elevation?
 - Show street elevation compared to neighbor to the East?

Costello: If the garage is lowered 4 ft to the LJ Blvd street level, slope the roof more, then the East neighbors will have their ocean view. *The lot topography is actually more complicated, plus that much excavation will trigger paleontological - archaeological monitoring.*

DuCharme: Expressed concern for personnel’s security in such an isolated, long narrow location.

Rick Dengler (neighbor from townhouses at East) asked for: 1. more setback on the East side, 2. reduced sq ft, bulk, and 3. lower building height to preserve ocean views, 4. employees loitering in that 5 ft space, smoking, noise, 5. restricted hours of use.

Benton: Can you fill in this 5 ft wide space to make the elevation level, more secure area? You don't need it for egress.

Benton: Thanks to Laura for identifying the windows and doors problems. We do deserve a proper rendering. You don't want to go closer to the Blvd, there may be a Bulk & Mass issue. There is a need to fill in that scary arcade.

Please provide for next FINAL REVIEW:

- a. Coordinate window & doors between the plans, elevations.
- b. Develop the landscape plan to show landscape concepts, accents, & screening on the property.
- c. Confirm that the access passageway at the East property line is needed. Filling this area may improve relation to the property to East.
- d. Provide elevation study showing relation to the existing building to the East. Have a photomontage of both buildings and their elevations.
- e. Re-evaluate uses, proportions & spaces at the South arcade to provide safe and useful space.
- f. Reconsider arcade proportion and scale – size
- g. Verify structural dimensions at ceiling of arcade to confirm floor elevations. How many levels above garage door?
- h. Is the garage door solid? If closed will cars safely stack in street? Is garage door solid or not, will ventilation work open/closed?
- i. Summary statement take a close look at grade separation, retaining walls.
- j. Verify structural dimensions, specifically the deck, ramp.
- k. Can we share Island Architects' drawings?

APPLICANT REQUESTS CONTINUANCE.

3. PRELIMINARY/FINAL REVIEW 9/13/11

Project Name: **ENCORE TRUST RESIDENCE**

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 9872 La Jolla Farms Road | Permits: | CDP & SDP |
| Project #: PO#237107 | DPM: | Glenn Gargas 619-446-5142 gargas@sandiego.gov |
| Zone: RS-1-2 | Applicant: | Julia Metcalf 858-945-8486 |

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to construct a 21,592 SF single family residence and 2,149 SF guest quarters on a vacant 1.52 acre site at 9872 La Jolla Farms Road in the RS-1-2 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking. Council District 1. Notice Cards=1.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

Applicant handed out an 83-page booklet explaining the Project Site History, Compliance Analysis, Neighborhood Character, Existing Conditions, and Graphic Simulations. Will preserve 15 ft View Corridor that is a tangent to Blackgold Rd. Will preserve View Corridor to the South (with the other parcel). Will preserve the surfers' trail as is, even as it encroaches on their property where they are not required to preserve. 23, 606 SF of structures on 66, 256 SF lot. Allowed FAR = 0.45, actual FAR = 0.356, very worst case FAR = 0.437. Talked to all the neighbors, shown photos / simulations.

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: to merge Preliminary and Final Reviews.

(DuCharme/Hayes 5-0-0)

In Favor: Benton, Ducharme-Conboy, Costello, Hayes, Thorsen

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion Passes

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to construct 21,592 SF single family residence & 2,149 SF guest quarters on vacant 1.52 acre site.

(Thorsen/DuCharme 5-0-0)

In Favor: Benton, Ducharme-Conboy, Costello, Hayes, Thorsen

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion Passes

4. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION: Beautification of Coast Boulevard 9/20/11

Invited Members and others to a community outreach workshop, "*Beautification of Coast Boulevard Walkway at Children's Pool Park, Casa Beach*". Workshop will meet at the lifeguard station at 8 am, Saturday, October 1. Results from an observation-based questionnaire and discussion period will then instruct the new design from Landscape Architect, Jim Neri. The goal is to rebuild this sadly blighted area and restore its former welcoming environment. Please join us! Contact Phyllis at pminick@aol.com or 858-459-5939.

5. FINAL REVIEW 9/20/11

Project Name: **SHAHBAZ RESIDENCE**

6412 Avenida Manana

Project #: 216575

Permits: CDP

DPM: Tim Daly 619-446-5356

tdaly@sandiego.gov

Zone: RS-1-5

Applicant: Chris Martin, Bejan Arfaa Architects

619-293-3118 cm.aarch@pacbell.net

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing 3,869 SF residence and construct an 7,884 SF two story single family residence and an attached 3 car garage on a .57 acre site in the RS-1-5 Zone in the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area.

Provided the following for Final Review:

Applicant response in italics.

- a. Clarify issue/wording “a 24 ft wide driveway where a maximum driveway width of 12 ft is permitted per SDMC” from Cycles Letter pg 2. *That’s a City Staff error, 24 ft driveway OK*
- b. Photograph the view from the bike path *Done*
- c. Project’s footprint and footprint of the houses all around it *Done*
- d. Street scene elevations with homes on both sides of the street, sections. Show relationship to neighbors’ roofs from street scene, and relationship in height. *Photo Simulations not accurate*
- e. Show how side yard issues relate to the two homes on either side *Done*
- f. Are there ocean views through side yards from the street? *No*
- g. Pull tax rolls to provide neighboring F.A.R.s *Neighboring FARs Not Provided, Project FAR = 0.313*

DISCUSSION:

Applicant response in italics.

Hayes: questions the photo of the current house and the simulated stick drawing of the proposed house, the ridge height. Can’t really follow your actual ridge line.

Liera: yes, your third dimension is wrong. It is the prospective that is wrong.

DuCharme: the prospective is wrong! If you come back show that corrected.

Costello: What about the story poles? Can we go out and see them? How about simply photographing them with the current house in place? *Story poles were removed.*

Thorsen: Last time we needed to see better clarification. The roof line going out there is a question of Community Character, which is just as important as anything in the Municipal Code. This is unlike anything around there. The Bulk & Scale is very different from anything around it. It seems that one wall goes out past. It does not fit in the Community Character to have that wall go out like that.

Liera: What are the dimensions in relation to the property next door? Those things are important to show how a project fits into a neighborhood. The three-dimensional aspects are not clear.

Costello: How much of lot is on slope and how does that relate to the overall FAR?

Gaenzle: Are there any two-story houses in the neighborhood? *CC&R Architectural Jury approved project.*

Benton: Reminder that we don’t review protection of private views, or CC&Rs. We review the discretionary aspects, Coastal permitting, neighborhood character, Bulk & Scale, materials and the over all appearance.

Leon Pawinski (neighbor): Mostly concerned about Bulk & Scale. Assembled a list of neighborhood floor areas. The large house to the South is 3,678 ft², it is below the visual horizon. The house across the street is 2,600 ft². Neighborhood average (n=34) = 2,559 ft². Much larger in scale than anything else in neighborhood, about 50% increase.. Extending out to property lines. The Shahbaz project will, by comparison, be a “Big Tall Box”. Looks like nothing else in area, windows, roof, architecturally different.

Allyson Van Os (neighbor): What is proposed is a mammoth structure that will detract from the open – air feel of our neighborhood. There is no architectural similarity in the neighborhood. We will lose our ocean view. This is out of bulk and scale with the neighborhood. Objects to the 2nd story. Previously this property has had slope slides where a hot tub was lost. Objects to the geological instability. Will change the whole character of lower Muirlands.

Thorsen: How this house will look from the bike path, a public space, is an issue of neighborhood character.

Benton: That's a valid point.

Liera: We need an exhibit of how this will look from the bike path.

Leslie Learn (neighbor): The large house to the South is below the horizon, so you can't see it. Will affect the ambiance of the whole neighborhood. This will be the beginning of the deterioration of the character of our community. The character and charm of La Jolla that we fell in love with will be lost to larger buildings one at a time.

Liera: The overall character is pitched roofs, ranch style.

Benton: Simulations do not appear to represent the true condition of proposed house to the existing house.

Benton: geology is not our issue. Neighborhood Character, mass, Bulk & Scale is.

DuCharme: Is this a wall around the pool? What are heights? How does this West elevation look from the bike path? It is hard to tell if this is a pool or just a retaining wall. What is the railing, character of rail? Clarify the west elevation. And should show sections with materials and colors, safety railing.

Liera: Where is a landscaping plan? You need it anyway, what type fencing, "street furniture"?

Costello & Liera: Would like to see the updated geotechnical report, please email

Hayes: The view of the deck and swimming pool wall will be more severe than represented from your South elevation.

Please provide the following for Final Review:

- a. Provide heavy black dashed dark lines for elevations, such as sections A, B, A2, A3, others.
- b. Complete West wall elevations (by the pool area). Show what is retaining wall, where retaining wall meets grade, clear indication of railing, glass rail, heights.
- c. Provide accurate photo simulations, view from the bike path, proper prospective.
- d. Provide accurate photo simulations, view from the street, proper prospective.
- e. Provide an accurate photo simulation showing materials and colors.
- f. Please replace story poles, and photograph, notify LJDPR members so they will visit.
- g. Please provide a landscaping plan, include backyard, plants, fences. In front yard, some rails or fencing by stair tower, a safety railing or landscaping.
- h. Clarify lines of building encroaching into front yard setback.
- i. Please provide updated Cycles Issues Letters and Geotechnical Reports.
- j. Provide more information about Community Character, including a neighborhood FAR survey.
- k. Explain how the lot slope relates to the overall FAR.
- l. Clarify which are retaining walls or raised decks.

APPLICANT REQUESTS CONTINUANCE.

6. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 9/20/11

Project Name: **SOLEDAD AVENUE SLIDE REPAIR**

1760, 1796, 1840 Soledad Avenue

7750 Sierra Mar Drive

Project #: 241275

Permits:

DPM:

CDP for previous emergency CDP

Tim Daly 619-446-5356

tdaly@sandiego.gov

Zone: RS-1-5

Applicant:

Dan Valdez, Coffrey Engineering

858-831-0111

dan@coffreyengineering.com

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit for previous emergency CDP on 4 properties at 1760, 1796 and 1840 Soledad Avenue and 7750 Sierra Mar Drive in the RS-1-5 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non appealable), Coastal Height Limit.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

Applicant distributed 13 page handouts of labeled photographs describing the Project. Repair needed because of a broken irrigation line causing the slope failure in Jan. 2008. Storm drain repaired as part of same Project. Emergency CDP issued in April 2011. Construction started in May 2011, completed in Aug 2011.

DISCUSSION:

Applicant response in italics.

Costello: Why so long for an “emergency repair”? *Because of complications having four homeowners involved and the insurance company.*

DuCharme: Where does water go after it hits the riprap energy dissipater? *Into the drainage system already in place.*

DuCharme: Is the problem actually solved, or placed on property downhill? *The water travels about 800 ft to Amalfi, then into storm drain system.*

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: to Merge Preliminary and Final Reviews.

(Hayes/DuCharme 7-0-0)

In Favor: Benton, DuCharme, Costello, Gaenzle, Hayes, Liera, Thorsen

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion Passes

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Findings can be made for an emergency Coastal Development Permit at 1760, 1796 and 1840 Soledad Avenue and 7750 Sierra Mar Drive to repair slide damage.

(Costello/DuCharme 7-0-0)

In Favor: Benton, DuCharme, Costello, Gaenzle, Hayes, Liera, Thorsen

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion Passes

Please contact the LJ DPR Committee coordinator at alexisknepp@sbcglobal.net or at 858-459-0805 with questions or comments.

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee – Minutes

Tuesday September 27, 2011

Committee in attendance: Helen Boyden (chair), Dolores Donovan, Janie Emerson, Tim Lucas, Phil Merten, Michael Morton, Dale Naegle, John Schenck. None absent

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment - None

2. Chair Comments

---To date we have no information on when Gaxiola wants to schedule. Also in this category is a Torrey Pines Road slope repair between Little and Roseland, southeast side of road

---Cto Bello has deferred until they make another submission to the City.

---Palazzo project was withdrawn and therefore there will be no appeal to City Council

---LJCPA voted to appeal 8490 Whale Watch

---LJCPA approved on consent the T-Mobile approval and the Lundberg denial. The City approved the Lundberg SCR the next day and an appeal has been sent and according to recently passed LJCPA appeals procedures the LJCPA will hold a hearing to ratify or not on October 6.

---Nooren-8001 Calle de la Plata was pulled from the LJCPA consent and will have a full hearing at the LJCPA October 6 meeting

---LJCPA President Crisafi elected to hear the Rialto Storm drain as a full hearing at the Sept. 1, CPA meeting and it passed, the president of the HOA having been contacted.

---Hillel Student Center, NOA dated August 11-applicant asked for October 25th PRC hearing

---An NOA has been issued to replace and install storm drain, and sewer main and water main. The project area is in the public right-of-way along Avenida De La Playa from Paseo Del Ocaso west to the seawall adjacent to the beach. No other information as of 9/28/2011

---Plans received for a 10,755 sf residence at 8440-8450 Whale Watch Way—appears to have 5201 sf additional applied to GFA- #254765-Notice not received in the mail as of 9/29/2011

---LJCPA adopted a new appeals process – see September 1, 2011 LJCPA minutes

---LJSPRC potential procedure revisions will be deferred until after LJCPA action on recommendations of Ad Hoc Committee—tabled to October 6 LJCPA meeting

---the LJS PDO AB recommended three projects for Process One, stating reasons. One was a resubmittal of 8814 Robinhood Lane, adding ca. 800 sf, most of which went to enclosing portico between home and garage and extending 2nd story toward the middle of the house. LJSPDO AB recommendation amounted to not requiring SCR or amendment or new SDP.

---Review of current LJSPRC operating procedures/bylaws and meeting procedures

3. Project review

A. Chao Residence

- Project No. 242106
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8289 La Jolla Scenic Drive North
- Project Manager: Jeff Peterson; 619-446-5327; japeterson@sandiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Sasha Varone, Golba Arch.; 619-231-9905; svarone@golba.com

Project Description: Demolish existing 1-story single family residence. Construct new 4,655 sf 2-story single family residence with basement. Construct new hardscape and landscape including pool. [applicant] The proposed project will conform to the Council Policy 900-14 criteria by generating 50% or more of the projected total energy consumption on site through renewable energy resources (i.e. photovoltaic). . . . Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, Airport Influence Area-Review Area 2 for MCAS Miramar, and Council District 1. The project site is not located within the Coastal Overlay Zone. [City]

Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP)

The chair stated that she lived about ¼ mile from the project and walked by frequently.

Presented by: Tim Golba, Jim Neri

Tim Golba gave a general overview of the project:

- House is located on a 10,000 sq ft parcel.
- The neighborhood is predominantly 2-story homes.
- 2-story over a basement plus underground garage (5 spaces)
- FAR is .46, which conforms to zoning requirements anywhere in the city.
- Project sits in zone 52 in city geology survey – stable zone.
- House sets back from the top of the bluff.
- Six bedrooms total.
- Not in campus impact parking zone.
- Project is a sustainable expedite project.
- Cycle issues are clear with the city.

Landscaping and outside features presented by Jim Neri:

- Palm trees exist at site. Additional palm trees will be planted in front lining the street.
- They will try to retain existing trees on the property.
- The design has 34% greenscape.
- Driveway site lines will be clear – no landscaping will block visibility.
- Hanging plants will be lining the garage driveway
- Underground trash containers will store containers out of sight. They will need to be pulled up the sloping driveway.
- The pool equipment will be located in a subterranean vault on the property line.

Committee questions:

Donovan: Are there any views that will be blocked by the installation of the palm trees or other plantings? *Response: No. The palm trees in front will have no impact on views from the neighbors. The other plantings will not affect views. The houses on either side do not have side windows, so they will not be affected.*

Emerson: How wide is the driveway? *Response: driveway is 16' wide.* Q: What is the slope of the bluff in the rear? *Response: the grade is about 1 to 1. According to city geology report the grade varies from 38 to 42%.*

Naegle: There are drainage issues and slope stability issues elsewhere in this area. What is the drainage plan? *Response: The drainage plan was shown and explained to the committee. They will capture all runoff from top edge of the slope to the front of lot and sent it to the street in front. Currently falling in the yard and rear of the house runs down the rear slope. This will cut down on the slope stability issues as less water will run into the slope. Pumps will be used at the bottom of the garage driveway to pump the water to the street.*

Morton: Can you describe the location and layout of the pool pumps and equipment. *Response: Above ground pool equipment needs to be at least 3' back from the property line to meet code. Pool equipment underground can be located on the property line. The pool equipment will be located in an underground vault along the property line.*

Lucas: How will the pool water be drained? *Response: The pool will drain through sewer pipes. The equipment vault will have a connection to the sewer.*

House presentation: Tim Golba

- Elevations of structure were shown to the committee.
- There is a hidden roof deck not visible from the street.

Boyden: Houses in the 8400 block had drainage issues and slope stability issues – does this parcel have issues? *Response: The other lots had cuts into the bluff, but did not protect the cuts. For this project, most of the rear yard will be covered and drains to the street. There will be less drainage going to the bluff than there is now.* Question: The driveway has imposing utility boxes: cable, telephone, power on the south of the driveway restricting the ADA aspects of the sidewalk. The city pointed this out in the cycles? *Response: They discussed this with the City. It was not feasible and very costly to relocate those utility boxes that serve the neighborhood. The City has approved an alternate, keeping sidewalk as is and not disturbing the utility boxes.*

Merten: The aerial photographs show side setbacks are closer to neighbors than before and do not mirror the neighbors. How do the proposed setbacks fit in with the neighborhood? *Response: Neighbors have a deck on the north side that is hard to see in the photos. The current garage on this property is only 2' feet away. The new design has the garage farther away. On south side there is a lot of planting and cover that preserves privacy. The second floor is stepped back as well. The neighbors have blank walls on their second stories as well so this should not be an issue. Setbacks at minimum points: North: 5' 2"; South: 4' 2".*

Morton: Using the 300' survey, what is average side setback for the neighborhood? *Response: They didn't tabulate that. Boyden, referring to chart that doesn't have averages on it but doing some quick math: approximate average for LJ Scenic homes is about 6', Sugarman Drive is about 5'.* Question: Explain how the pool will be supported? *Response: The pool structure has not been designed yet, but will be supported by at least 4 caissons. The pool dimensions are: 12' x 20' max depth is 5'. The spa to the side is slightly raised above the pool.*

Boyden: She has calculated FARs for neighborhood properties. The lots are of similar size. Out of all the 29 houses, five are in the range .30 to .35. The other, this project, is .46 which is substantially larger than the average? *Response: You have to look at this from the standpoint of bulk and scale, not just a FAR number. This house fits in with the other houses in the neighborhood, especially since it is pushed back from the street. Photographs of homes in the neighborhood were shown and compared to the proposed design. The remaining older houses in the neighborhood are smaller and outdated. The more recent houses are much larger.*

Morton: Just to remind the committee, FARs do not apply to LJ Shores. A discussion of FARs is irrelevant. Bulk and scale is relevant. Question: What are the relative roof heights in the neighborhood? *Response: Relative heights 26', this project is 26.5', with max height of 28.6' for chimney. Other roof heights were pointed out on the photographs of neighboring properties.* Question: What are the heights of the rotunda? *Response: The rotunda is 21' high to eaves, 26' to the peak.*

Morton: Had further questions on front yard hedge and trees. The bulk and scale is reduced because house is back from street. The rotunda is the biggest feature in front.

Naegle: Is concerned about the mass of the house. FAR is an important mathematical method of viewing the size and bulk of a project. The front elevation shows the rotunda, and it is too massive. It can be narrowed somewhat, as most of the enclosed space is not used. He thinks that this could be reduced to be more compatible with the neighborhood.

Merten: Agrees with Naegle. The "Romanesque" tower in front looks like it is a different scale from the rest of the building. It is so dominant that you expect that the rest of the house should also be Romanesque, but it isn't.

Public Comment: None. No neighbors present.

Schenck: Where is the stairway to the roof deck? *Response: It is located in center of the house and is not visible from the street. It was shown on the plans.*

Lucas: Had questions on the sustainable expedite and the proposed solar panels. He has concerns that the space allotted for the panels won't have enough area to meet the goals? *Response: The solar array hasn't been designed yet. The sustainable expedite mandates that 50% of the load for the house be generated by alternative sources. There will be enough area for solar panels to meet the requirements. The array will be for photovoltaics only. There will be no solar water heating for the pool.*

Donovan: Agrees that the FAR can be a good indicator of bulk and scale. Responds to comments that the older houses in the neighborhood being small is not necessarily bad. Small houses in a neighborhood should not be denigrated.

Emerson: Visually this looks massive because of the turret (rotunda).

Merten: Not so troubled by the FAR, due to breaking up the facade and stepping back of the second floor. There are still bulk and scale issues. The circular, squatty, Romanesque rotunda needs to be changed a bit to better fit in. He also has concerns on the proposed setbacks and their relation to the neighboring properties. The first floor roof overhang comes within 20" of the property line.

Morton: The rotunda feature can probably be changed in some way to mitigate the effect. Approaches such as, materials changes, different eaves, softening the recessed opening, different shapes windows... could all be used to make the rotunda fit in better.

Motion: Morton **Second:** Emerson

To continue the project. The committee would like to see next time:

- Calculated summary on setbacks for the neighborhood.
- FAR calculations for the neighborhood.
- Look to mitigating the bulk and scale, in particular the entry tower appearance.
- Materials board or display.

Motion carries: 7-0-1

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; **Oppose:** None; **Abstain:** Boyden (chair)

B. Undergrounding Residential Block 1J West

- Project Number: 216751
- Type of Structure: Undergrounding of overhead utility lines and poles
- Location: See description below and map at hearing
- Project Manager: Helene Deisher; 619-446-5223; hdeisher@sandiego.gov
- Applicant: Mario Reyes, PM , City Utilities Undergrounding Program; 619-533-7426; mreyes@sandiego.gov

Project Description: Undergrounding of approximately 13,300 l. f. of overhead utility lines and poles in an area roughly described as north of Avenida de la Playa to SIO, west of La Jolla Shores Drive to the ocean. This description delineates a district and some lots already have undergrounding.

Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP) and Coastal Development Permit (CDP)

Presented by: Mario Reyes, City of SD

- The California PUC has mandated undergrounding. The program is for streets that would benefit from the undergrounding of utilities. \$10 million a year grants are provided for some areas.
- A surcharge is being added to the utility bill for undergrounding areas not covered by grants.
- This undergrounding district is being created to prevent further poles from being installed in the district by other providers.
- During the preliminary phase, there were some native artifacts and remains found during sampling, so this project is going through the SDP and community review process.
- For some areas they will have a Native American monitor.
- A community forum will be held to discuss the process

Merten: Questions on undergrounding on the public right of way. Response: *Before 2003 the owners were responsible for the hookup from the right of way to the home. After 2003, the surcharge covers it all, and the power company will install to house. They will do the actual connection if the panel accepts feeds from underneath. If panel is recessed into the house, they can not touch a wall, but will install an adapter to link to the box or the homeowner can relocate the panel at their expense. If they have an undersized panel, the homeowner will be required to upgrade before the city can re-connect to the house.*

Merten: What if remains are found trenching on a homeowners property? Response: *The project will handle any remains found on a homeowner's property. An archeologist is always present during digging or trenching.*

Morton: Timeline for project? *A typical project takes 2 years in design and approval. After approval and additional 1.5 years is typical for construction. This project is projected for construction starting in 2013. Panels on houses will be upgraded first, which is independent of trenching.*

Naegle: There are other projects going on in the Shores: Sewer, storm water etc. Will the undergrounding be coordinated to minimize impacts? Response: *they will be coordinating through the city.*

Public comment:

Mark House, local architect: Cost to replace a pole? *Can't calculate it per pole, more of per house calculation. Usually around \$10,000 a house. What about street lights currently mounted on wooden poles? Streetlights will be replaced. The community will be contacted and trees will be planted.*

Mario Reyes : City-wide, there are 1100 miles of undergrounding to be done and it is a big task. Complete undergrounding of the city is scheduled to be completed in 2064. Community forums will be held and issues such as panel requirements, excavation schedules, tree replanting, streetlights, and other issues will be discussed.

Motion: Naegle; Second: Schenck

Findings can be made for a Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands and a Coastal Development Permit for the Undergrounding of Utilities Project 1J West. [properties not yet undergrounded in the district: Avenida de la Playa north to SIO and La Jolla Shores Drive west to the ocean with some outliers]

Motion carries: 7-0-1

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; **Oppose:** None;

Abstain: Boyden (chair)

C. Hooshmand Residence –Fifth Review-Approximately 3rd version

- PROJECT NUMBER: 198459
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
- LOCATION: 2480 Rue Denise
- PLANNER: Glenn Gargas; Ph: 619-446-5142; ggargas@san Diego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Scott Spencer; 858-8898; scottspencerarchitect@yahoo.com

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: An addition and remodel to an existing residence (Applicant)

Note: The NOA dated December 28, 2009 cites a (PROCESS 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for a 4,463 sq. ft. addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.29 acre site at 2480 Rue Denise in the SF Zone of La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone. Current revisions

Revised values for this July 27, 2011 version are listed below, does not add correctly because of some underfloor values.

- Lot Size: 12,660 sf. or 0.29 acres
- Existing Sq/Ft: 2015 sf plus 420 garage
- Proposed Addition: Main level 1504 sf
- Proposed Main Level Total: 3939 SF
- Proposed Addition Lower level: 2158 sf
- Total Sq/Ft 6173 sf includes garage

Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP) and Coastal Development Permit (CDP)

Previous action March 23, 2010. See March 23, 2010 PRC minutes for more information
Continued the item

Previous Action May 25, 2010 Please see May 2010 PRC minutes for community and committee actions.

Motion: Furtek; Second: Lucas – amendment by Merten accepted. Motion to deny. Project does not conform to LJS PDO section 1510.0301(b): Specifically: “Conversely, no structure will be approved that is so different in quality, form, materials, color, and relationship as to disrupt the architectural unity of the area.”

It also does not abide by the three principles on Page 4, three on Page 5, and the first principle on Page 6 of LJ Shores Design Manual. The perceived bulk and relationship of the northward (rear) expansion and extension of the house in relationship to the development on adjacent properties disrupts the architectural unity of the area.

Motion carries: 7-0-1; Approve: Furtek, Morton, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Lucas, Schenck; **Oppose:** None; **Abstain:** Boyden (chair)

Previous action: Please see LJSPRC minutes for June 22, 2010 for additional info on another revision which was out of sync.

Previous Action: March 22, 2011 Please see meeting minutes for meeting discussion

Motion: Merten Second: Naegle.

The Findings for a SDP cannot be made because the relationship of the proposed development to its site is so different from that of structures on adjacent parcels that the proposed development would disrupt the architectural unity of the area.

(LJSPDO 1510.0301 (b) and LJSPD Design Manual p. 2). The Findings for a CDP cannot be made because the bulk and scale of the proposed structure when viewed from the rear (north) of the property is so different from that of older development on adjacent properties that it does not comply with the community character provisions of the residential element of the LJCP.

Motion carries: 4-1-1; approve: Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Schenck; oppose: Lucas; abstain: Boyden. (Morton took part in discussion but had to leave before the vote)

Presented by: Scott Spencer

The project was originally presented as a single level, house on stilts. The neighbors and committee were concerned with appearance, bulk and scale, and view blockage issues. The sloping lot is better for split level house than a single story house, so they have redesigned the project.

The design goal was to reduce the top story, and reduce its projection out. For the lower level to look proper, as was pointed out by the city staff, it should extend beyond the upper level. They now have an overall larger house, but if you included the covered area of the original design, the house size is about the same.

They have worked with the neighbors the Luetzows and the Cutler/Shaws on the design. This project is now the same height as present house on Rue Denise. The hedge has been the biggest issue and blocks public views. The hedge on the northeast will be cut down to 3'.

The master bedroom was narrowed by 2' (steps in from first floor). Lower level is still on stilts, but not enclosed, the slope will not be changed, and it will not count in Gross Floor Area. They have worked carefully on the design issues with Mr. Gargas and Mr. Stanko at the city.

Naegle: They should consider an elevator? *Response: The cost of an elevator is \$25,000. The elevator may be added later.*
Naegle: They should design a 5' pantry above and below for future expansion of an elevator. **Naegle:** Is very pleased with this design. It better fits the lot, and they have added a lot of value to their house.

Morton: Thinks this design is much improved. Wants to see the elevations and the materials. *Response: The lower level has some stonework to better fit in.*

Merten: Also thinks that this design is much improved, and appreciates the changes the owner has made. Doesn't think that the stone on lower level adds to the house, and it would probably better blend in to the slope if it was a plain stucco or similar material. *Response: Owner is willing to do that.*

Public Comment:

Bill Luetzow: Has questions about the ledge on the lower level west side. *Response: without the step-in there is an 18' unbroken high wall. This helps to break that up. The indent should help their view.* Luetzow: They don't think that this design helps their view. The original design was a bit more open on the lower level. Dr. Hooshmand response: The view corridor is improved because the balcony that used to stick out 9' is no longer there.

Boyden: The committee only considers public views.

Further committee discussions with architect were made looking at the various revisions of the plans, and how the new design sits. A roof plan was shown. The roof is asphalt composition tile.

Schenck: Does this design have 2,000 more space? *Response: the previous design had 4,800 sq. ft. of house and garage. This design is 6,100 ft now, so about 1500 feet larger. Considering the other design with the covered space under the stilts, this design has about the same footprint and mass.*

Donovan: Recommends that the landscaping on the slope blend in with the surrounding area and not block views.

Merten: Feels that the project has been improved to the point where it complies with the LJSPDO.

Motion: Merten Second: Naegle

Findings can be made for a Site Development Permit and a Coastal Development Permit.

Motions Passes: 6-0-2

Approve: Donovan, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; **Oppose:** None; **Abstain:** Emerson, Boyden (chair)

La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Board: Minutes of Meeting, September 29, 2011

Election of Officers

A vote was taken on nominations made at the August meeting. On unanimous vote, the following officers were elected to office:

Todd Lesser, Chair

Tom Brady, Vice Chair

Van Inwegen,

The Board extends its heartfelt gratitude to these community members for their tireless efforts to make our community a finer place to live and work. Thank you.

Voting Agenda Items

1. After discussion, Joe Dicks moved, Keith Kelman seconded and the board unanimously resolved that:

The Directors of the La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Board believe it is in the best interests of the La Jolla Community that any request for the installation, modification or removal of an On-Street Parking zone within the La Jolla footprint shall be presented first to the La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Board, and second, to the La Jolla Community Planning Association for review and approval prior to the implementation of said installation, modification or removal.

2. After discussion, Joe Dicks moved, Keith Kelman seconded and the board unanimously resolved that:

The Directors of the La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Board approve Draft City Counsel Policy dated August 30, 2011, dealing with the installation, modification or removal of an On-Street Parking zone, modified as follows: **“It is the policy of the Counsel that any request for the installation, modification or removal of an On-Street Parking zone shall be presented to the appropriate Community Planning Groups for approval. If the appropriate Community Planning Group(s) makes a recommendation concerning a request, that recommendation shall be included in the final recommendation presented by the Traffic Engineer and considered by the appropriate decision maker as an additional factor in granting, denying or modifying the request.”** The Directors of the La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Board believe that the references to “Community Parking District Advisory Boards” is unnecessary, as if a community decides that it wishes to have such an Advisory Board, such a Board would fall under the definition of an “appropriate Community Planning Group.”

Public Comment

Comment was heard on the on-street parking issues in and around the Darlington House on Olivetas Avenue. No action item was calendared as a result of said discussion.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OPERATING POLICIES
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION
August 2011

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

After significant review and discussion, the ad hoc committee on operating policies and procedures offers the following recommendations to replace the policies currently in effect, which appear on the LJ Community Planning Association website:¹

1. The ad hoc committee recommends that the LJ Community Planning Association retain the flexibility to use operating policies, adopted by a majority vote of the Trustees, and submitted by the President to the City for review and approval. (LaCava/Boyden 5/0/0).
Sept 2011: Approved by La Jolla Community Planning Association, 14-0-1
2. The ad hoc committee recommends that the LJ Community Planning Association eliminate the policies of January 8, 2009 and March 6, 2008, and leave it to the Community Joint Committees and Boards to develop their own policies and procedures. (Boyden/Conboy 5/0/0).
3. The ad hoc committee recommends that the LJ Community Planning Association eliminate the policy of January 4, 2009, and leave it to the Community Joint Committees and Boards to develop their own policies and procedures. (Whittemore/LaCava 4/1/0).
4. The ad hoc committee recommends that the LJ Community Planning Association adopt the Appeal Procedures created by the ad hoc committee. (Whittemore/LaCava 4/0/0) (These procedures are set forth in full in the Sept. 2011 La Jolla Community Planning Association minutes).
Sept 2011: Approved by La Jolla Community Planning Association, 12-2-1

¹ References to prior policies by date refer to the manner in which they are listed on the LJ Community Planning Association website: