



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

President: Joe LaCava
Vice President: Tony Crisafi
Treasurer: Jim Fitzgerald
Secretary: Nancy Manno

La Jolla Community Planning Association

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

Thursday, 3 February 2011

D R A F T AGENDA – REGULAR MEETING

6:00p

1. Welcome and Call To Order: **Joe LaCava**, President
2. Adopt the Agenda
3. **Elected Officials Report** – Information Only
 - A. Council District 2 – Councilmember Kevin Faulconer
Rep: **Thyme Curtis**, 619.236.6622, tcurtis@saniego.gov
 - B. Council District 1 – Councilmember Sherri Lightner
Rep: **Erin Demorest**, 619.236.7762, edemorest@saniego.gov
4. **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/>
5. **Meeting Minutes Review and Approval**: 6 January 2011
6. Officer Reports
 - A. **Secretary**
 - B. **Treasurer**
7. **Candidate Statements**
Candidates present their qualifications and reasons for running (2 minutes each).
Last opportunity to announce your candidacy.
8. **President's Report** – Action Items Where Indicated
 - A. Community Planners Committee – No action
 - B. Bishops Library – 3-2 vote to support the appeal was deemed a rejection of the appeal after the fact.
 - C. 8490 Whale Watch Way – Hearing Officer Hearing changed to Feb 9.
 - D. Whitney Mixed Use – Planning Commission Unanimously Approved, LJCPA appealed to City Council.
 - E. La Jolla Shores Advisory Board – “minor in scope” review, discussion continues on Feb 15.
 - F. Torrey Pines Road Corridor – Community forum continues, Thurs, Feb 24. See info at lajollacpa.org
 - G. Traffic & Transportation Board Appointment – Orrin Gabsch to fill the balance of term - Ratify
 - H. Elections – Running for a 3-year seat with only 2 years of eligibility > Allowable but disclose to voters
 - I. **Elections – Thursday, March 6, 3:00 pm to 7:00 pm**
 - J. **Annual Member Meeting – Thursday, March 6, 6:00 pm**

If a Sign Language Interpreter, aids for the visually impaired, or Assisted Listening Devices (ALDs) are required, please contact the City's Disability Services Coordinator at 619-321-3208 at least (5) five work days prior to the meeting date to insure availability.

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. Everybody Luvs Chocolate

PDO ACTION: The two signs conform to the PDO, 8-0-1.

5628 La Jolla Boulevard - Change in use from vacant retail to retail/confectioner; signage.

B. Valet Parking Spaces on Prospect Street

T&T ACTION: For the interested parties to conduct a study or survey that will indicate the number of businesses and residents for or against the options, 5-1-0.

Prospect Street between Cave Street and Herschel - Possible reconsideration to either maintain the existing valet zone, shift the existing zone 4 spaces to the east, or relocate 3 of the spaces to a separate location a half block east.

C. Trevino Residence

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit, 8-0-0.

5342 Chelsea Street - Demolish existing residence and construct a new sustainable, 3,563 SF, two story over basement, single family residence on a 0.14 acre site in the RS-1-7 Zone.

D. 1912 Spindrift (See also Item #14)

PRC ACTION: The findings for a CDP and SDP can be made, 4-3-0.

1912 Spindrift - Demolish existing residence and construct a 4699 sq. ft., two-story single family residence on a 13,511 sf parcel. La Jolla Shores PDO.

E. Rosen Residence

PRC ACTION: The findings can be made for plans modified from those presented to the City and dated 1-27-2011, 3-1-0.

8814 Robinhood - Remodel of existing 1726 sf single family residence including an 858 sf second-story addition on an 8,550 sf lot.

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

11. Friedman Residence

6318 Muirlands Drive - Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing residence and construct a 6,904 square foot single family residence on a 0.35-acre site in the RS-1-2 Zone.

Previous ACTION (Jan '11): Pulled by applicant from Consent Agenda.

Previous DPR ACTION (Dec '10): Findings can not be made for Coastal Development Permit. 8-0-0.

12. Fire Lane north of 2100 Block of Avenida de la Playa, One-way Eastbound

CPA approved (May 2010) original proposal to change this lane from two-way to one-way westbound. This direction conflicts with city refuse collection so revised proposal is for one-way eastbound.

Previous Action (Jan '11): Pulled from Consent Agenda

Previous T&T Action (Dec '10): Approve as one-way eastbound, 6-0-2.

Previous Action (May '10): Approved T&T recommendation on consent.

Previous T&T Action (Apr '10): Approved as one-way westbound.

13. Charlotte Public Beach Access – Possible Action

7957 Princess Street – The California Coastal Commission (CCC) is reportedly proposing to withdraw its previous requirement for public access across the subject address as part a resolution of a long-standing litigation re violations of the Coastal Act on the property; “lifeguard emergency” access would be restored. Further a \$3.3 million mitigation fee is being proposed in light of the previous violations. There are other modest requirements being considered by the CCC but those are not part of this agenda item. The Community Plan calls out this trail as “Princess Street (emergency access)”.

Note: Coastal Commission Hearing, Thurs, Feb 10th, Chula Vista Council Chambers.
Previous Action (Aug '08): Conditional Approval of minor alterations and amendment to SDP, 6-5-0.

14. 1912 Spindrift Residence

Will be heard only if pulled from the Consent Agenda

1912 Spindrift - Demolish existing residence and construct a 4699 sq. ft., two-story single family residence on a 13,511 sf parcel. La Jolla Shores PDO.

PRC ACTION: The findings for a CDP and SDP can be made, 4-3-0.

15. CPA Bylaw Amendment – Recommendation to Members

Consideration and possible recommendation to Members to amend the bylaws at the March 2011 Annual Meeting.

16. Adjourn to next Annual Member Meeting, March 3, 2011, 6:00 pm

17. Adjourn to next Regular Monthly Meeting, March 3, 2011, 6:10 pm

Looking ahead to our March meeting:

- *Elections – Polls open from 3:00 pm to 7:00 pm for Members to vote. Bring photo ID*
- *Annual Member Meeting – Need 20% for quorum.*
- *Regular Monthly Meeting immediately following, including announcement of election results.*



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

President: Joe LaCava
Vice President: Tony Crisafi
Treasurer: Jim Fitzgerald
Secretary: Nancy Manno

La Jolla Community Planning Association

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

Thursday, 6 January 2011

D R A F T MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING

Present: Michele Addington, Tom Brady, Devin Burstein, Michael Costello, Laura Ducharme Conboy, Tony Crisafi, Jim Fitzgerald, Joe LaCava, David Little, Tim Lucas, Nancy Manno, Phil Merten, Greg Salmon, Rob Whittemore, Ray Weiss.

Absent: Dan Courtney, Orrin Gabsch, Glen Rasmussen

1. Welcome and Call To Order: **Joe LaCava**, President @ 6:04 PM.

2. Adopt the Agenda

Approved Motion: Motion to adopt the Agenda, (Merten/Addington 13/0/1)

In favor: Addington, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Rasmussen, Weiss.

Abstain: LaCava.

3. **Elected Officials Report** – Information Only

A. Council District 2 – Councilmember Kevin Faulconer

Rep: **Thyme Curtis**, 619.236.6622, tcurtis@sandiego.gov

Ms. Curtis was not present.

B. Council District 1 – Councilmember Sherri Lightner

Rep: **Erin Demorest**, 619.236.7762, edemorest@sandiego.gov

Ms. Demorest was present and deferred to **District One Councilmember Sherri Lightner's** report and comments.

Councilmember Lightner reported on San Diego City Council committee assignments: **Ms. Lightner** will chair: Land Use & Housing committee: will serve on: the Budget committee, the Rules committee, and will continue to serve on the Natural Resources & Culture committee. Additionally **Ms. Lightner** continues to serve on outside Boards and Commissions: Joint Powers Authority for San Dieguito River Valley, (Chair Elect), MTS, SANDAG and the Penesquitos Task Force.

Councilmember Lightner noted there would be an informational meeting, hosted by **Ms. Lightner's** office, for the Torrey Pines Corridor Project. There will be a follow-up meeting, scheduled for February 04, 2011 at the La Jolla Traffic and Transportation meeting where questions and comments, generated by the previous Torrey Pines Corridor Project "Information Meeting," will be solicited from interested community members.

Councilmember Lightner graciously thanked those community members who stayed with the Children's Pool issue and participated in the Children's Pool hearing at the Planning Commission, and expressed her pleasure and acknowledged the communities' pleasure at the successful outcome of the hearing.

Trustee Merten, in reference to **Councilmember Lightner's** Chairmanship of the Land Use & Housing Committee commented: "I cannot think of a better person to chair the Land Use & Housing Committee." Voicing agreement with **Trustee Merten's** comment, there was a spontaneous burst of applause from the Trustee's and the community audience.

4. 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 was present and reported: Monthly updates available on the UCSD Community Planning Newsletter and Website.

Michelle Fulks, Bird Rock Community Council member, co-chair of the Fifth Annual Bird Rock Home Tour, thanked Community Sponsors and invited the La Jolla community to participate in the January 29 tour, benefiting the Bird Rock Elementary School.

Ms. Esther Viti, Chair of the Nell Carpenter Beautification/Streetscape Clean Up Committee, of the La Jolla Town Council, invited the Community to continue to participate in the monthly La Jolla clean up. Ms Viti thanked the company "Junk MD" for their continuing, extraordinary support and participation in the monthly community "Clean-Up."

Trustee Tim Lucas noted his concern re the proposed Scripps Oceanography MESOM, (Marine Ecosystem Sensing, Observation and Modeling), building. **Trustee Lucas** urged the community to research this project and consider contacting the California Coastal Commission to express an opinion on the impact this proposed project will have on the view corridor along Torrey Pines Road.

Joe Dicks, Chair, La Jolla Shores Association noted the ongoing controversy regarding Princess Street Beach/Coastal Access: specifically restoring public access to the beach. **Mr. Dicks** advocated for restored public access and suggested the La Jolla community contact the California Coastal Commission, asked that the LJCPA consider sending a letter to the Coastal Commission in support of restored access and suggested the San Diego City Attorney consider enforcing the public right for beach access.

Trustee Merten, referring to the December LJCPA meeting, and a comment from a community member stating that **Trustee Merten** misrepresented the FAR of the Whitney Project, in his comments at San Diego City Council; presented a documented response: "Parking Structures and Carport Areas included in Gross Floor Area, An excerpt from the Land Development Code, The FAR Tabulation/Calculation based on the Whitney Mixed Use drawings, A Plot Plan, An Elevation and A Partial Elevation. This six-page document is attached to the Minutes.

Trustee Michelle Addington announced that she must, regretfully, resign as A LJCPA Trustee at the conclusion of this January meeting. **Ms. Addington** is in the process of moving from La Jolla to Downtown San Diego. **Ms. Addington's** contributions to the La Jolla community have been extraordinary and she will be sorely missed.

5. Meeting Minutes Review and Approval: 02 December 2010: (Deferred until after Agenda item #10 presentation).

Approved Motion: Motion to approve the December 02, 2010 Minutes, (Brady/Addington 12/0/2).

In favor: Addington, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Salmon, Weiss.

Abstain: LaCava, Whittemore

6. Officer's Reports

A. Secretary: Nancy Manno

Presented by **President LaCava**, for secretary **Nancy Manno**: If you want your 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. Eligible non-members wishing to join the LJCPA must have recorded attendance for one meeting and must submit an application, which is available at the membership table and on-line.

B. Treasurer: Jim Fitzgerald

Beginning Balance: \$223.40 + Income \$175.56 – (Expenses \$374.93)= Ending Balance: \$24.03.

Expenses include: Rec. Center rental, (six months @ \$47.00 per month = \$282.00). Printing, telephone.

Trustee Fitzgerald commented on the generosity of the Membership 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.

10. Water Purification Demonstration Project: *Heard out of sequence: Time certain @ 6:30 PM*

As part of the City of San Diego's efforts to pursue locally controlled, sustainable water supply options, the Public Utilities Department has launched a Water Purification Demonstration Project. This project examines advanced water purification technology on recycled wastewater. Tonight's presentation is a component of the city's public outreach and opinion gathering efforts.

Presented: **Ms. Amy Dorman**, Senior Civil Engineer, Long Range Planning & Water Resources, City of San Diego and Senior Project Manager, Recycled Water Studies, introduced the LJCPA and community members to this innovative program, narrated a Power Point presentation, and responded to questions and comments from Trustees and community members.

7. President's Report – Action Items Where Indicated

A. Community Planners Committee – no report

There was no meeting in December.

B. Children's Pool Rope Barrier – Appeal successful on a 7-0 Planning Commission vote.

President LaCava noted, with pleasure, the LJCPA appeal prevailed.

C. Bishops Library – Appeal Continued by Planning Commission to January 20.

President LaCava noted this Project was heard in December/continued to 01/20/2011.

D. 8490 Whale Watch Way – Commented on Neg. Dec; Hearing Officer Hearing is Jan 26, (LJCPA rec. denial).

President LaCava commented: Project was recommended for denial at Sub-Committee, and on LJCPA Consent Agenda. **President LaCava** did respond to the Negative Declaration. Interested community members/Trustees: contact **Ms. Helen Boyden** and/or **Trustee Merten** for information regarding this unusual proposed project.

E. La Jolla Shores Advisory Board – Agenda item: "minor in scope" review, Tues, Jan 18, 9am, Rec. Center

President LaCava suggested this is a particularly important and significant meeting. Currently there is no specific guidance for a "Minor In Scope" designation in the LJ Shores PDO. San Diego City has directed the LJ Shores Advisory Board to recommend specific designations. The LJ Shores Board will debate whether to continue to provide recommendations. **President LaCava** urged community members to attend the Board meeting and speak to the issue.

F. Torrey Pines Road Corridor – Informational Forum, Wed, Jan 19, 6pm, Rec. Center

Previously noted by **Councilmember Lightner**, (#3 Elected Officials Report). **President LaCava** urged interested community members to attend.

G. Designating Your Home as Historical Workshop – Sat, Jan 15, 9a, www.lajollahistory.org > [Events](#)

H. "Contemporary Architects Making History" Lecture Series – www.lajollahistory.org > [Events](#)

President LaCava recommended attendance at these interesting and relevant lectures.

I. Brown Act – Information Item: Discussion deferred until the March or April LJCPA meeting

J. Elections – Must announce your candidacy by no later than our February Meeting. There will be seven Trustee seats open.

K. Membership – If your membership is expiring, February meeting is your last chance to renew.

L. Elections Committee: **Trustee Lucas** very graciously agreed to chair the Election Committee again, with the appreciation of the Trustees. **President LaCava** will appoint a Co-Chair to assist **Trustee Lucas**.

Late additions to the Presidents Report:

President LaCava reported, as required by the La Jolla Community Planning Association Bylaws: **Trustee Glen Rasmussen** has been disqualified as a Trustee, as of January 2011, because of four absences. This seat will remain vacant until the March 2011 election.

President LaCava reported: Re the Whitney Mixed Use Project: Will return to the Planning Commission. Under current San Diego City Municipal Code: appeals heard at City Council are remanded to the lower body, i.e., the Planning Commission, for what is essentially an entirely new hearing.

8. 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

PRC – No meeting in December

A. Bird Rock Surf Shop

PDO ACTION: 1. Committee findings can be made and conforms with the PDO - building stucco color light earth tone grey, trim and awnings black provided it does not exceed 10% of the building façade, 6-0-1. 2. Committee finds that the signage does not conform to the PDO, however the city has issued a permit to the applicant for signage presented without PDO review, 7-0-0.

5509 La Jolla Blvd – New façade and signage for existing building.

B. 311 Dunemere Residence: *Trustee Crisafi: Recused*

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit & Site Development Permit to demolish existing house, and construct an 8,105 sq ft SF residence. 7-0-0.

Coastal Development Permit & Site Development Permit to demolish an existing residence and construct a 8,105 square foot single family residence including hardscape, retaining wall, and relocation of driveway on a 0.41-acre site in the RS-1-7 Zone.

C. Friedman Residence: *Pulled: Applicant*

DPR ACTION: Findings cannot be made for Coastal Development Permit. 8-0-0.

See DPR's Dec '10 report for detailed motion describing why findings can not be made.

6318 Muirlands Drive - Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing residence and construct a 6,904 square foot single family residence on a 0.35-acre site in the RS-1-2 Zone

D. Paperin/Villa del Teatro Residence

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing house, and construct a 5,425 sq ft SF residence. 7-0-0.

6540 Camino del Teatro - Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing residence and construct a 5,425 square foot single family residence on a 0.33-acre site in the RS-1-4 Zone

E. The Heritage on Ivanhoe

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit & Site Development Permit to demolish 5 existing residential units with 3 existing cottages to remain (2 on Ivanhoe to remain, one to be relocated to Ivanhoe frontage) and construct 8 residential units on Flint for a total of 14 units. There will be a minimum of 28 subterranean parking spaces. Photovoltaic will be used for part of the electrical power. 6-0-0.

7720 Ivanhoe Ave - Coastal Development Permit to demolish 5 existing residential units with 3 units to remain and construct 8 residential units for a total of 14 for-rent units on a .72 acre site, RM-3-7 Zone.

F. Road Humps on Van Nuys

T&T ACTION: Approve item as presented. 6-0-2.

Placement of 2 speed humps (not bumps) between La Jolla Mesa and the alley to the west.

G. Restrict U-Turns on Nautilus at All Hallows Church & School

T&T ACTION: Approve item as presented. 6-0-2.

Drivers using westbound loading zone depart and make mid-block u-turns conflicting with eastbound traffic on the 40mph roadway. No U-turn sign to be installed, existing loading zone to be extended 20 feet.

H. Fire Lane north of 2100 Block of Avenida de la Playa, One-way Eastbound:

Pulled: Mr. Brandon Price.

T&T ACTION: Approve item as presented. 6-0-2.

CPA approved (May 2010) original proposal to change this lane from two-way to one-way westbound. This direction conflicts with refuse collection so revised proposal is for one-way eastbound.

I. Change Hours of 15-minute Parking Zone, Eads Avenue

T&T ACTION: Maintain (2) 15-minute parking as currently exists. 7-0-1.

Two existing on-street parking spaces on west side of Eads Avenue just south of Pearl Avenue; current signage limits 15-minute parking to 8am-6pm, proposal is to extend until 2am or for 24 hours.

J. Change in Parking Time Limits at 7427 Fay Avenue

T&T ACTION: Create a 3-minute loading zone, Mon-Fri, 7:30am-4:00pm. 6-1-1.

Currently a signed No Parking Zone (no red curb) 8am-6pm. Loading zone would serve Montessori and Gillespie Schools and allow public parking during non-school hours

Approved Motion: Motion:

To accept the recommendation of the Planned District Ordinance Committee: (A) Bird Rock Surf Shop, 5509 La Jolla Blvd: 1. Committee findings can be made and conforms to the PDO: New façade and signage for existing building, and forward the recommendation to the City.

To accept the recommendation of the Development Permit Review Committee: (D) Paperin/Villa del Teatro Residence, 6540 Camino del Teatro: Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing residence and construct a 5,425 square foot single family residence on a 0.33-acre site in the RS-1-4 Zone, and forward the recommendation to the City.

To accept the recommendation of the Development Permit Review Committee: (E) The Heritage on Ivanhoe: 7720 Ivanhoe Ave: Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit & Site Development Permit to demolish 5 existing residential units with 3 existing cottages to remain (2 on Ivanhoe to remain, one to be relocated to Ivanhoe frontage) and construct 8 residential units on Flint for a total of 14 units. There will be a minimum of 28 subterranean parking spaces. Photovoltaic will be used for part of the electrical power, and forward the recommendation to the City.

To accept the recommendation of the Traffic and Transportation Committee: (F) Road Humps on Van Nuys: Placement of 2 speed humps (not bumps) between La Jolla Mesa and the alley to the west, and forward the recommendation to the City.

To accept the recommendation of the Traffic and Transportation Committee: (G) Restrict U-Turns on Nautilus at All Hallows Church & School: Drivers using westbound loading zone depart and make mid-block u-turns conflicting with eastbound traffic on the 40mph roadway. No U-turn sign to be installed, existing loading zone to be extended 20 feet, and forward the recommendation to the City.

To accept the recommendation of the Traffic and Transportation Committee: (I) Change Hours of 15-minute Parking Zone, Eads Avenue: Maintain (2) 15-minute parking as currently exists: Two existing on-street parking spaces on west side of Eads Avenue just south of Pearl Avenue; current signage limits 15-minute parking to 8am-6pm, proposal is to extend until 2am or for 24 hours, and forward the recommendation to the City.

To accept the recommendation of the Traffic and Transportation Committee: (J) Change in Parking Time Limits at 7427 Fay Avenue: Create a 3-minute loading zone, Mon-Fri, 7:30am-4:00pm. Currently a signed No Parking Zone (no red curb) 8am-6pm. Loading zone would serve Montessori and Gillespie Schools and allow public parking during non-school hours, and forward the recommendation to the City.

(Crisafi/Addington 14/0/1)

In favor: Addington, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Salmon, Whittemore, Weiss.

Abstain: LaCava,

Approved Motion: Motion to accept the recommendation of the Development Permit Review Committee: (B) 311 Dunemere Residence: Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit & Site Development Permit to demolish existing residence and construct an 8,105 square foot single family residence including hardscape, retaining wall, and relocation of driveway on a 0.41-acre site in the RS-1-7 Zone, and forward the recommendation to the City. (Conboy/Addington 13/0/1).

In favor: Addington, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Salmon, Whittemore, Weiss.

Abstain: LaCava,

Recused: Crisafi

9. 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

President LaCava stated there were no reports submitted for either of these committees.

10. Water Purification Demonstration Project – Information Only:

Heard out of sequence: Time certain, see above:

As part of the City of San Diego's efforts to pursue locally controlled, sustainable water supply options, the Public Utilities Department has launched a Water Purification Demonstration Project. This project examines advanced water purification technology on recycled wastewater. Tonight's presentation is a component of the city's public outreach and opinion gathering efforts.

Presenter: City of San Diego

11. Bishop School Library & Learning Center – Information Item

Planning Commission continued appeal of Hearing Officer's approval until Jan 20 and directed applicant to provide additional material in support of their contention that Variance is required to allow "reasonable use" and to deliver that material in time for the planning group's consideration.

7607 La Jolla Blvd. – Variance to allow a maximum building height at 32'-1" where 30' is allowed by the PDO in Zones 5 & 6.

Reference: <http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter12/Ch12Art06Division08.pdf> (Variance Procedures)

Previous CPA ACTION (Nov '10): To appeal the Hearing Officer's approval. 8-6-1.

Previous CPA ACTION (Sep '10): Recommend denial of the Project because findings cannot be made. 8-5-1.

President LaCava presented a summary of the issues surrounding the Project, and a history of the Project; expressed gratitude to the Applicants for their efforts in providing additional support material for review, prior to the LJCPA January 06 meeting.

Trustee Crisafi, Trustee Laura Ducharme Conboy, Trustee Merten met and reviewed the additional exhibits, and prepared a response to Applicants submittal. **Trustee Crisafi** presented a summary of issues, prepared with the assistance of **Trustee Merten, Trustee Conboy**:

Response To Applicant's Submittal Of Additional Information For Bishops School Library

Rebuttal of Applicant's Variance Request

1. Applicant reasons for ten-foot high classroom ceiling height for entire building, however, classrooms are located only in the southeast section of the library where the height variance is not requested. In fact applicant's Exhibit K shows this area to be one to two feet below the zoning height limit.
2. Applicant request variance for northwest portion of the building, which is, identified office, reading and stack areas. Applicant has never presented requirement for ten-foot high ceilings in these areas, per drawing A 1.4 section B 2 only parapet is in violation of zoning height limit. Parapet and roof can be designed with a lower profile in this area.
3. Applicant's reasons for a deep ceiling plenum per applicant's Exhibits M and N. This reasoning appears to be unfounded since these exhibits demonstrate that other options exist such as relocating all fan coil units over the rest room areas where ceilings can be lowered and building height can be taller. Additionally air duct depths shown on exhibit N can be made wider and shallower.
4. Applicant reasons for strict application of one style of Gill proportioned arch in Exhibits J1, J2, and J3 that is taller and narrower. In fact there are several Gill proportioned arches including those shown in applicants own rendering Exhibit B, of the proposed building.
5. Applicant reasons for raising building two feet per the City Engineers demand to do so. However, applicant's own civil drawing S – 1.3 dated December 1, 2009, with floor elevation at 70.75 feet versus now proposed elevation at 72.8 feet, shows a drainage design that appears to function properly. Applicant further deferred to elaborate on this issue or request City Engineer to attend DPR meeting to explain their reasoning. Applicant's drawings also do not accurately reflect the proposed topography and retaining walls required to raise the building. See Exhibit A and B. This discrepancy is evident by referring to Section B2 on A 4.1, which shows the proposed retaining wall between the sidewalk, and building then referring to exhibit B project where site development shows flat topography.

Conclusion:

Applicant can employ any or all following options to comply with LDC zoning height limit:

1. Leave ceilings high in classroom areas but lower in office, reading and stack areas.
2. Redesign flat roof at northwest area of the building with a lower parapet and a simpler slightly sloped roof.
3. Redesign plenum space for greater efficiency.
4. Design wider and shorter proportioned Gill arches for the façade as shown in attached exhibit.
5. Lower building toward original design employing drainage and site design on plan 5 – 1.3 dated December 1, 2009.

President LaCava will represent the La Jolla Community Planning Association at the Planning Commission hearing in the furtherance of the LJCPA appeal, with a letter expressing the sentiments put forth by Trustees Crisafi, Merten and Conboy.

Trustee Costello requested community support at the Planning Commission hearing scheduled for January 20, 2011.

12. Land Development Code Update #7

Discussion of the city's proposed update to the citywide Land Development Code. Possible action. No attachment, see city website.

Reference: <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/landdevcode.shtml>

President LaCava presented, invited Trustees to comment. Trustees Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Merten, Whittemore, commented. President La Cava responded to questions and there followed a general discussion among the Trustees.

LJCPA Member **Ms. Sally Miller** requested a copy of the Land Development Code be made available to the public in the La Jolla Library. **President LaCava** agreed to lend his copy of the L. D. Code to the Library.

Approved Motion: Motion to recommend the following proposals to the Land Development Code Update #7:

Issue #18: Planned Development Permits

§126.0602(a)(2) (NEW)

(a) The following types of *development* may be requested with a Planned Development Permit decided in accordance with Process Three.

(2) *Development* in accordance with Section 143.0403(a) that complies with the applicable *land use plan*, but contains uses that are not permitted in the underlying base zone.

Delete the proposed language in §126.0602(a)(2) and instead insert into §126.0602(b):

(b) The following types of *development* may be requested with a Planned Development Permit to be decided in accordance with Process Four.

(3) *Development* in accordance with Section 143.0403(a) that complies with the applicable *land use plan*, but contains uses that are not permitted in the underlying base zone.

Issue #33: Separately Regulated Uses in Planned Districts

§151.0401 Uses Permitted in the Planned Districts

(c) Where the permit process is unclear within a planned district, a separately regulated use identified in Chapter 14, Article 1 may be requested in accordance with the same permit process identified for the zone in the Use Regulations Tables in Chapter 13, Article 1 (Base Zones) that most closely meets the purpose and intent of the applicable planned district zone.

Delete the proposed language in §151.0401(c) and instead use:

(c) Where the permit process is unclear within a planned district, a separately regulated use identified in Chapter 14, Article 1 may be requested with a Planned Development Permit to be decided in accordance with Process Four.

Fitzgerald/Addington (12/1/2)

In favor: Addington, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Salmon, Whittemore, Weiss.

Opposed: Little

Abstain: LaCava, Weiss

13. CPA Bylaw Amendment – Recommendation to Members

Consideration and possible recommendation to Members to amend the bylaws at the March 2011 Annual Meeting. See attached draft proposal.

President LaCava presented suggestions for minor modifications to the LJCPA Bylaws.

Approved Motion: Motion to recommend approval of the following proposed Bylaws changes:

ARTICLE VI LJCPA Trustee Duties; Meetings and Committees

Section 2.

B. Committees

(3) COMMUNITY JOINT COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

a. COMMUNITY JOINT COMMITTEES

**(i) ~~COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CDP)~~
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW (DPR) COMMITTEE**

Replace "CDP" with "DPR" (three occurrences)

Section 2.

B. Committees

(3) COMMUNITY JOINT COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

a. COMMUNITY JOINT COMMITTEES

Replace "Promote La Jolla Inc." with "local manager/advisory board of the Business Improvement District" (two occurrences total)

b. COMMUNITY JOINT BOARDS

Replace "Promote La Jolla Inc." with "local manager/advisory board of the Business Improvement District" (four occurrences total)

Section 3. Community Participation

(2) Community Outreach

Replace "Promote La Jolla Inc." with "local manager/advisory board of the Business Improvement District" (one occurrence total)

(Weiss/Addington 14/0/1)

In favor: Addington, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Crisafi, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Salmon, Whittemore, Weiss.

Abstain: LaCava,

Trustee Costello initiated a discussion of additional Bylaws changes for consideration: **President LaCava, Trustee Whittemore, LJCPA Member John Berol, LJCPA Member Darcy Ashley, Trustee Burstein, Trustee Weiss**, explored suggestions. The Trustees consensus was to defer discussion of Bylaws amendments to the February meeting.

14. Adjourn @ 8:25 PM: to next Regular Meeting, February 3, 2010, 6:00 pm

Looking ahead to our February meeting:

- *Last opportunity to announce candidacy for March Elections*
- *Candidate Forum – Hear the candidates speak on their qualifications and reasons for running.*
- *Last opportunity to renew expiring Membership and be eligible to vote in the March Election.*

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE LA JOLLA
PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE
January 10, 2011**

Present: Clark, Little, Rasmussen, Fitzgerald, Hassun, Wagenseller, Steigler, Dewhurst and Parker

A quorum was established at 4 pm.

Public Comment and Chair Report/Board Discussion

Postponed until end of meeting.

Item A: Project Name: Everybody Luvs Chocolate, 5628 La Jolla Boulevard

Applicant: Rich Ehmke; Scope of work: change in use from vacant retail to retail/confectioner; signage.

Retail zoning is appropriate to this use. Issue is signage. Exterior wall is 18' 2" frontage, allowable signage at 2 square feet per linear foot. Calculation of allowable square footage is usually based on a "box" around the lettering. The proposed sign is individual plastic letters glued to the wall. If box were used, it would measure 44 square feet for all letters. The majority of the sign, if box, is 33 square feet with 3.75 square feet in additional small lettering indicating "ice cream" is available. Using that calculation, the sign is 35.8 square feet, where approximately 36 square feet is allowed. Ms. Stiegler expressed the opinion that this is a consistent signage calculation as has been used on other signage requests.

Motion: Fitzgerald/Hassun. Passed 8-0-1, that the two signs conform to the PDO. Wagenseller abstained, requesting guidelines whether this is one or two signs and how to measure.

The committee did not consider the colors in the signage, as the PDO does not apply to sign colors – only to exterior colors.

Item B: 939 Coast – trash enclosure

This is a request by the general contractor for the residents at 939 to move the trash enclosure into the side yard setback, enclosing it with a 6 foot concrete block wall, the highest allowable without a permit. No permit of any kind is being sought for this trash enclosure. It will include a trellis on top of it at 7' 10" height to keep gulls out of the trash cans. It will accommodate three bins, which need to be moved for access as they fill. Existing trash enclosures in the "D Bay" accommodates two dumpsters.

Under Municipal Code §159.0407(a)(b) this use can be in a side setback. This would be Process One -- that the City does not require notice or discretionary permit action. It is therefore brought as an advisory and the question is whether the green area, which currently occupies a portion of the setback, can be reduced. It was already reduced for the construction of the new porte cochere.

Discussion: Since 939 Coast is pre-1972 there is a deficiency in green space on the building as a whole per the PDO. The question is whether this can be further reduced, and it was apparently allowed when the porte cochere came before the PDO previously. Another question is whether there is a site line restriction; the applicant did not have the site plan with him. There was also a question whether neighbors should be notified, and this was recommended – the applicant said the management company will do so. No action was taken. Applicant was asked to return with additional information.

Non-Agenda Items

1. The La Jolla Foundation will return in February to discuss the application of the PDO to their projects. One additional project will be installed prior to our next meeting; a proposed “art” piece painted on cloth medium on the south elevation of the building adjacent to the parking lot at La Jolla Brewery on Fay Avenue. It is a stretched canvas painting of a 30’ foot high sand pebble. It is not painted on the building surface and will therefore be temporary, funded by LJF. This project is emblematic of the discussion to be had on what is a “sign” with which the PDO is concerned, and what rises to the level of a logo like a Wyland Whale for Pacific National Bank.
2. If a project requires a variance, should they come to PDO first?

Motion: Fitzgerald/Clark, 8-0; the PDO Committee requests the CPA advise the City that it should hear any project where the PDO is implicated.

The November minutes were approved Fitzgerald/Little, 5-0-3 (3 abstaining because they were not present at the November meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m. The next PDO meeting is scheduled for February 14, 2011 at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
Glen Rasmussen, Secretary

**La Jolla Traffic & Transportation Board
Meets 4th Thursday Monthly at
615 Prospect Street (Parks & Recreation Building)
Chair: Todd Lesser
Minutes of the January 28th , 2011 meeting**

Called to order: 4:12 PM

Attendees: Todd Lesser (Chair); Orrin Gabsch; Rob Hildt; George Sutton; Patrick Ryan; Keith Kelman; Dan Courtney

Absent: Daisy Fitzgerald, E. Van. Inwegen, Joe Dicks

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Melanie from Junior League of San Diego discussed the upcoming Island Divine event at Scripps Park. Mr. Lesser expressed his apologies for not including the item on the agenda and recommended that this item be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.
2. Esther Viti from the Nell Carpenter Beautification committee called for volunteers to help the committee clean Girard from Silverado to Kline.

AGENDA

1. CONSENT ITEM:

CHANGE IN VALET PARKING ON PROSPECT :

Michael Harth from Sunset Parking presented that he believed that there would be too much congestion coming into the Village on Torrey Pines if the three valet zone spaces were moved east to the Crabcatcher. He presented the Board with 50 signatures of businesses and residents who were against moving the valet zone. He indicated that although he believed this was not a good idea, he would not fight it in the interests of the community and the new restaurant owner.

Keith Jones from Ace Parking indicated that the only way to see if the new valet zone would work would be to implement a 5 month trial and objectively review the results. He also presented an email from City Traffic Engineer Gary Pence that indicated that Mr. Pence was also willing to conduct a 5 month trial and that he did not feel that there would be major adverse effects. He offered to pay the Town Council \$50,000 from the parking revenues.

George Hauer from George's at The Cove indicated that he was against the move of the zone and also that he would not fight it out of respect for the community and the new business owner. He stressed that if there was to be a trial period that it would have a definitive end date so that it would not become permanent by default.

Lincoln Foster asked the board to consider that everyone speaking had some bias, but that he preferred that valet remain where it was. He said that valet and parking in general had to be for the best of the community, not just a few companies and he implored the Board to walk the area carefully before voting.

Chair Lesser requested that Sunset ensure that cars were not being left out all day in that location and also said he liked the idea of multiple valet zones so that people could drop their car in one location and pick it up at another.

Mr. Ryan voiced concern that at the September meeting the Board had asked ACE to reach out to the community and Sunset, but that had not been done. He also raised concern that 50 people appeared to be against moving the zone.

Mr. Gabsch agreed with Mr. Foster and suggested that a compromise would be to move the existing valet zone east to keep it as one zone, but closer to the Crabcatcher.

Ester Viti spoke out that traffic congestion getting in to the village would be terrible and that she thought that one zone would be better.

Failed Motion: To accept the recommendation of Gary Pence and move forward with a 5 month trial of 3 valet spaces moved from in front of George's to in front of the Crabcatcher Mr. Hildt. No Second

Failed Motion: To move 4 spaces from the west end of the existing valet zone to the east end of the existing valet zone.

Mr. Gabsch. Seconded by Mr. Kelman.

2 For, 2 Against, 2 Abstentions (Chair Lesser, Mr. Courtney who arrived after discussions, Mr. Ryan recused.)

Approved Motion: For the interested parties to conduct a study or survey that will indicate the number of businesses and residents for or against the following three options:

- 1.) Keep the current valet location "as-is".
- 2.) Move four spaces from the west end to the east end of the existing valet zone.
- 3.) To take 3 spaces from the existing valet zone and move them in front of the Crabcatcher.

Mr. Kelman. Seconded by Mr. Sutton.

5 For, 1 Against (Mr Ryan recused)

Meeting adjourned 5:15pm

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE REPORT
FOR
JANUARY 2011

1/11/2011 Present: Costello, Crisafi (Chairman), DuCharme-Conboy, Gaenzle, Hayes, Liera, Merten, Thorsen

1/18/2011 Present: Collins, Costello, Crisafi (Chairman), Ducharme-Conboy, Kane, Liera, Merten, Thorsen

FINAL REVIEW

Project Name: **TREVINO RESIDENCE**

Project #:	5342 Chelsea St.	Permits:	CDP
	PO#221693	DPM:	Jeff Peterson (619) 446-5237 JAPeterson@sandiego.gov
Zone:	RS-1-7	Applicant:	Sarah Horton 619-231-9905 shorton@golba.com

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing residence and construct a new sustainable, 3,563 SF, two story over basement, single family residence on a .14 acre site in the RS-1-7 Zone of the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Residential Tandem Parking Zone, Transit Area Zone. Council District 1

Presenters: Tim Golba, AIA
Sarah Horton, AIA

Please provide for FINAL REVIEW: - Presenters response in italics

- a. Profile homes on both the North and South sides for elevations. – provided. On North, lowered one element, lowered roof, brought another back to match front, trellis added, reduce bulk & scale.**
- b. Consider articulation on North side which relates to adjacent Northern development. Especially consider elevation, relationship of mass of second story to single story next door (ref. LJ Com. Plan, 2nd story on sides should be set back). – (the above answers this)**
- c. Draw footprint of adjacent buildings. – provided, showing neighboring building four each directions, 1 and 2 story portions, and relationship of all.**

Neighbor: We have a high side of street vs low side of street. Views are lost with 2 story development on low side of street.

Costello: This part of Chelsea has one level near the street with the more intense second level at the back of the lot. Of course we can't hold the Applicant to a non-existent standard.

Liera: Bird Rock area has that stepped back characteristic noted in the Historical Society review.

Merten: The modifications to North elevation are really good.

Liera: Suggestion, place a trellis over the driveway to soften the look?

Collins: Solar panels on project. *Yes, 50 % power to be provided by panels located on back roof.*

Subcommittee Motion: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit.

(Merten/Costello 8-0-0)

In Favor: Collins, Ducharme-Conboy, Costello, Crisafi, Kane, Liera, Merten, Thorsen

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion: Passes

**La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee
Report – January 2011
Page 3**

Simimi Res. – Cont.

Thorsen: House will be unlike any other house in “Bulk and Scale” from street scape. Some of your photos of houses on your board are not in this area.

Unknown: Half of our questions (for Final Review) are not addressed

Chair: Too many questions are not answered to determine if this matches Community Character, etc.

Pete Wong: Photo presented. Will lose view.

Tiffany LeMarsh: photo trees with single level, 7,000 sq ft but is single level. Other side single level, second level is down below the slope preserving ocean views. Only one residence is 2 story (built sometime ago), most are built down slope. Against Community Plan; Community Character, Bulk & Scale, “transition to older and new development”. Most houses have been built down slope for the second level.

Thorsen: Community Character is single level.

Ducharme: from street, front elevation of second level should be stepped back.

Liera: Do a split level down slope, it will help stabilize slope too. May cost less. Can deal with light issue.

Chair: You have a difficult charge here. All these low profile houses are on your side of the street, one story on the slope side and 2 story below on the downhill side. It is hard to see how this will work or fit into a community without a composite drawing. But I haven’t seen this today and haven’t seen a willingness to come forward with the information to help us make a decision. Should you consider coming back or should the Committee just make a decision?

Mrs Simimi: *Would like single story house, lot won’t allow it. Can’t afford to go down the slope.*

Chair: Show Prop D height on Section A. Massing of the building from sides to side could be reduced.

DuCharme: Could we look at massing, the entry massing is the biggest thing there. Bring that down it would not have the massive look it has now. Lower the entry would make a series of boxes, but less massive. Stair tower doesn’t need that height. Reduce in scale, setback?, float top of roof.

Chair: Two directions, go down slope in the back, or begin to set the house back from the sides and reconfigure rooms.

Chair: Recommend a simple massing of adjacent homes, Photoshop or similar.

Merten: Show buildings on both sides of house.

Thorsen: Show buildings across the street too.

Pete Wong: Soils Report and undocumented fill. Caissons will need to reach stable soil. Questions stability of slope even with caissons. Just at the threshold to meet earth quake standards.

Leira: For return, get letter from City and Soils Engineer that Report is adequate.

Arfa; *OK*

For Return:

- a. Complete the un-responded above Items 1 thru 13 (10 issues).
- b. Provide letters from City and Soils Engineer that Soils/Geology Report is adequate.
- c. Use Photoshop or similar process to construct a simple massing of adjacent homes:
 1. Show buildings on both sides of house.
 2. Show buildings across the street too.
- d. Reconfigure design
 1. to have two levels with one below the slope as Neighbor to the East, or
 2. step back 2nd level (reduce massing side to side) and reconfigure rooms to soften street view, and for East & West Neighbors.
- e. Show Prop D height on Section A
- f. Please provide clear exhibits

**La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee
Report – January 2011
Page 4**

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Note: Preliminary Reviews can be rendered a Final Review by a unanimous DPR Committee vote.

Project Name: SHAHBAZ RESIDENCE	Permits: CDP
6412 Avenida Manana	DPM: Tim Daly 619-446-5356
Project #: 216575	tdaly@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-5	Applicant: Bejan Arfa 619-293-3118
	bejan@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.

Presenter: Bejan Arfa *- Presenters response in italics*

Liera: It is close to neighbors, which are one story. It would be nice to have a volumetric layout of how they relate to neighbors.

DuCharme: What is relationship of neighbors roofs from street scene, how does it relate in height?

Crisafi: As well as on site plan compose survey on that

DuCharme: Neighbor has had a recent remodel and records will be available from City.

Kane: Drawings are very hard to read, print too small for presentation. Not consistent elevation, order of photos backward?

Costello: Some photos seen before, are from the Simimi neighborhood?

DuCharme: Why photos from Muirlands Vista Way, what does the project look like from the bike path?

Liera: Notice amount of erosion shown on the photographs.

Crisafi: From LJ CP bike path is # 49, photograph site from the bike path below.

Costello: I did read the Soils Report.

DuCharme: Diveway dimensions? *Set by subdivision Cul-de-sac here.*

Merten: If driveway is not 20 ft then two spaces are needed on street.

Chair: 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.

Leon Poensky: Neighbor that overlooks property. Architectural Jury didn’t want to deal with. Likes conversation about softening impacts. Will be the biggest home in community, “unable to hear” % significantly larger than another home. This Applicant is the first to scrape the lot and rebuild home in the area, others have been remodels. Bulk & Scale is out of character with the Community, 300% larger than any other.

Collins: Slope is not stable and there have been failures at near by lots. *All around slopes are unstable. Site has varying 5 to 35 ft of fill.*

Costello: Soils Report and Cycles Letters also indicate these failures.

Thorsen: Can we ask for Return Item to have footprint and the houses all around it?

Crisafi: View from the bike path

Street elevations with homes on both sides of the street. sections

Side yard issues, how they relate to the two homes on either sides

Ocean views through side yards.

Merten: 1. Corner that projects forward of neighbors has the same issue as a recent project on Muirlands Dr. - *But Neighbor has no windows there.*

**La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee
Report – January 2011
Page 5**

Shahbaz Res. – cont.

2. Roof lines are not in the Com. Plan however, this entire area was built out in 1950s Ranch Style, all have low sloping hipped and gabled roofs. This area has a nice sea of singled and tile roofs, house next door has flat roof with parapet and gravel. Instead, use dark gravel or green, and lower parapets.

Mindy Poensky: our subdivision is all California Ranch, has 36 houses, average 2500 sq ft

Chair: pull tax rolls to provide neighboring F.A.R.s

Mrs. Van Os: expressed concerns about views Bulk & Scale. Hot tub lost by erosion. Chair, recommend that neighbors talk to City Geologist, Jim Quinn.

Thorsen: Ocean view could be part of this Neighborhood Character.

Please provide the following for Final Review:

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.

b. photograph the view from the bike path

c. project’s footprint and footprint of the houses all around it

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.

e. show how side yard issues relate to the two homes on either side

f. Are there ocean views through side yards from the street?

g. pull tax rolls to provide neighboring F.A.R.s

PUBLIC DISCUSSION (JAN. 11, 2011)

Project Name: **BISHOPS SCHOOL LIBRARY VARIANCE – INFORMATION ONLY**

Project Location: 7607 La Jolla Blvd.

Project Summary: Variance to allow a maximum building height at 32’-1” where 30’ is allowed by the PDO in Zones 5 & 6. Planning Commission continued appeal of Hearing Officer’s approval until Jan 20th.

Previous DPR action: (July 2010) Findings can be made for Variance 7-0-0

a. Jan 20 Planning Commission will hear continued Bishops Library Project. (Whitney Project will also be heard. Members asked to attend both, if not to speak, cede time.) Jan 26 Whale Watch Way Project will be before Hearing Officer.

b. John Frangos resigned from LJ DPR. LJ, Town Council will need to appoint a replacement representative.

c. Review of the Bishops School Library Exhibits

Architects Crisafi, Ducharme-Conboy, Merten reviewed the Bishops School Library Exhibits submitted Jan 3, 2011. Their conclusions were presented to the LJCPA Jan.6, and contend that several viable alternative designs can be made without compromising building function or the height limit, and that a variance is not justified.

Ducharme-Conboy elaborated on the report, clarified it for non-Architects, finalized it, and added some exhibits.

LJCPA Pres. LaCava wrote a letter, which incorporated the report, to be sent to the Planning Commissioners.

All were thanked for their fine Professional efforts.

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee– Minutes
Special Meeting
Thursday January 27, 2011

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment - None
2. Chair Comments –Order of the agenda has been changed to hear Item B first
Room 1 is assigned to another group and we must vacate room by 5:45
3. Project Review –A-B

Committee members present: Boyden (Chair), Lucas (Secretary), Furtek, Morton, Schenck. Absent: Merten, Morrison, Naegle.

A. Diarq-Westway Permit Amendment

- PROJECT NUMBER: 225627
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 8436 Westway Drive
- PROJECT MANAGER: Morris Dye; 619-446-5201; mdye@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Edward Sutton, 858-459-9291; ed.sutton@islandarch.com

Project Description: Demolition of existing 2-story 3,297 sf house. Construction of new 2-story 7,453 sq. ft. single-family residence, including hardscape, retaining walls, terraces, cantilevered pool and spa and relocation of driveway. Applicant is requesting an amendment to Site Development Permit (SDP) 416634 and Coastal Development Permit (CDP) 416633.

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

Presented by: Tony Crisafi

Compared the current design with the design that was previously approved and has a CDP and SDP. This house is 10% smaller compared to the approved design and has a lower overall average roofline. There are larger front and rear yards.

Lucas: The house below this is being remodeled and there are drainage concerns from the downslope neighbors. Are there drainage issues and how are you proposing to handle these?

Response: There is a cistern at the southwest to catch water runoff. In the event of the “100 year” rains, there are two overflow chutes with energy dissipaters that drain to swale below which feeds into the to city drainage system. There are no suspected ancient landslides at that area, or ancient creeks

Morton: Foundations system? *Response: standard with no caissons. Retaining walls in front are 5’ to 7’, with one spot at 9’.*

How do you make a 7’ retaining wall in the public setback? *Response: That will need to be corrected – will open it up and make it conform.*

Public comment:

Dr: Hamid Mani

Would like to see story poles all over proposed bldg site, not just 2 poles.

Bruce Rudd (representing Dr. Mani): Concern regarding the visual corridor and the massing of the structure and the height. Requesting story poles showing the heights of the building. Poles on south, northwest, and west end of entry would be helpful. Would like to see some of the trees onsite trimmed, [but it turns out the large ficus tree is on another property]. There is a eucalyptus tree that potentially could be trimmed to enhance views. Lives across Westway on corner of Calle del Oro

Mr. Robinson (representing homeowner Evans): Has sightline concerns and wants story poles as requested by other neighbors upslope. Quotes the LJ Community Plan: "Houses should be sited to preserve views as possible" [committee comment: this refers to public view]...She would like to still see the view of the Scripps pier. (Lives on Calle del Oro, next home upslope from Dr. Mani)

Response: Discusses placement of story poles so as to be the most indicative of the proposed structure. There is a complication in that the house is currently being leased and the owners are travelling, so that there are access issues. He will do what he can to get these up in a representative fashion.

Wetzler (neighbor bordering south property line on Westway): Single concern is with the driveway, which is really close to the property line and upslope from his house. How does it work? Is worried about the structural integrity of the hill and safety issues if a car does not make the tight turn. *Response: There is a low retaining wall that comes out of grade as you drive into the driveway. That could be increased in height making it safer. Does not see any landslide issues. The driveway does slope down into the garage, but the turning radius is adequate. Will meet with the Wetzlers to show 3 D representation.*

Mary Beth Adderle: Other neighbor living upslope on Calle del Oro has the same concerns expressed by the other neighbors.

Board Discussion:

Boyden: We can't require story poles, but it looks like the applicant is willing to put them up. Additionally, the City--and therefore we--does not protect private views.

Time was running short due to room scheduling. The board has questions and would like the applicant to come back.

Motion: Lucas; Second: Morton

Continue item to future meeting. The committee requests the following information:

- Driveway engineering in response to concerns expressed by neighbor Wetzler.
- Put up story poles to demonstrate to Dr. Mani and Ms. Evans the heights of the new building in several areas (Crisafi indicated that it may be difficult to get the cooperation of the tenant). Bring photos of story poles enhanced with proposed building outlines if possible.
- Outline, in another color, current house site plan and elevations superimposed over the permitted and proposed designs on existing drawings
- Provide information on proposed drainage system and how it will work.
- Elevations on houses across street and up Calle del Oro (site survey can show this)
- Meet with adjacent neighbors and report on the concerns.
- Provide an outline of the site coverage of the two homes on either side along with the proposed project.

Motion carries 5-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Morton, Schenck; Oppose, 0; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

B. Rosen Residence

- PROJECT NUMBER: 221438
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 8814 Robinhood Lane
- PROJECT MANAGER: Glenn Gargas; 619-446-5142; ggargas@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Erika Love; 619-857-7406; pacificpermits@aol.com

Project Description: Remodel of existing 1726 sq. ft. single family residence. Proposed scope is an 858 sq. second story addition (applicant) [Coastal Height Limit and Campus Parking Impact Overlay Zones. City]

Seeking: Site Development Permit

Presented by: Erika Love

858 sq. ft. being added to second floor addition. Elevations of the project were shown. There is an existing partly covered patio where part of the expansion will be made.

City issue: Step back the second floor about 2 feet. [Originally suggested by the La Jolla Shores Advisory Board which recommended the project for a Process Three].

An attempt was made to clarify side yard setbacks. It appears that there may be about 20' between this house and the one to the north, less between this and the houses to the south. Front yard setback is 18' on 300' survey, but applicant cited: 15 ft front yard setbacks. Range in neighborhood is 12 – 23 ft, with most in the 15 – 18 ft range.

Public comment: no neighbors present

Board Discussion:

Lucas:

While driving by to the meeting I inspected the site and could see no notice posted. *Response: It was on the left side of the garage.*

It is not there now. I don't think that we should be hearing this project or voting on this as that notice needs to remain up so that the neighbors are aware of the project.

Response: The city mailed out notices to the neighbors within 300 ft, and that should be sufficient.

Have they talked with the neighbors?

Response: She hasn't, she did not know about the owner, but didn't believe so.

(During the board discussion, Lucas had a person drive up to the house and confirmed that there is no notice currently posted).

Are there any other 2-story houses on Robinhood Lane?

Response: No – but there are two on Cliffridge Ave. that border the west of the property and more on other streets in the area.

Lucas: Even though this is a modest addition, proper notice should be given. I do not believe that is the case and can not support this project at this time.

Morton, Furtek and Schenck look at layout of second floor plan and ask questions regarding layout to the representative.

Morton: Can you step the second floor back on the North side of the house?

Response: in the bedroom areas yes, but the bathroom in between the two bedrooms is already a tight space and can't be recessed any more than it is.

Would you be willing to change the plan here with a 12" setback in the two bedroom areas? *Response: yes.*

Motion: Morton; Second: Schenck

Findings can be made based on changes noted on the plans 1/27/11, showing the change adding a 12" step back to north elevation on the second floor in both bedroom areas, leaving the middle bathroom section flush with first floor. Applicant is to provide dated photo showing notice posted on the property by Monday 1/31/11 and an affidavit from the immediate neighbors indicating that they had been noticed on this addition. These should be e-mailed to the PRC chair.

Motion carries 3-1-1

Approve: Furtek, Morton, Schenck; Oppose: Lucas; Abstain: Boyden

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee– Minutes Tuesday January 25, 2011

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment
2. Chair Comments –
 - A. To date we have no information from the Hooshmand, 2414 Calle del Oro, Cto Bello and City Rialto Drain and LJS electric Undergrounding district as to when they want to schedule.
 - B. We are expecting plans for a new project at 8435 Ave. de las Ondas noticed recently. We have plans for the Nooren residence at 8001 Calle de la Plata to be noticed on January 27.
 - C. PRC Terms of service are up for renewal during the month of May and for the Chair. PRC members appointed by the LJCPA should contact the new Chair of the CPA after one is elected in April and LJS Chair for ratification by those boards at their May meetings.
3. Project Review –A-B

Committee members in attendance: Helen Boyden, Tim Lucas, Phil Merten, Betty Morrison, Michael Morton, Dale Naegle, John Schenck. Absent: Ed Furtek

E. Aron Residence

- PROJECT NUMBER: 215861
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
- LOCATION: 8435 La Jolla Scenic Drive North
- Project Manager: Patrick Hooper; 619-557-7992; phooper@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Colin Hernstad; 619-921-0114; colinhernstad@gmail.com

Project description: Demolish existing residence and construct a 2-story 8364 SF residence on a 0.49 acre site in the SF zone of LJSPDO within the LJ Community Plan, Coastal Height Limit, Airport Influence Area, [Campus] Parking Impact [City] To build a new SF residence to accommodate a young, very active family of 6 (expecting to increase) in an environmentally friendly home that will enhance the neighborhood and community. [Applicant]

SEEKING: Site Development Permit (SDP)

Previous Action: November 2010 LJS Permit Review Committee

Motion: Morton Second: Merten

Continue item and return with:

- Parking spaces noted on site plan.
- Setbacks shown on site plan to second story.
- Finished landscape plan and drainage plan.
- Patio structure modifications and how they comply with city codes.
- Show how drainage from roof and hardscape will be handled.
- Distances of hardscape from property lines.
- Completed geology study.
- Updated landscape plan.
- Calculate setback averages.
- Extend site sections to neighboring structures on both side to show mass and bulk of these structures.

Carried: 6-0-1; Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Morrison, Merten, Morton, Schenck; Oppose: 0; Abstain: Boyden (Chair)

Please see November 2010 LJSPRC Minutes for Committee Discussion and Community input.

1/25/2011:

The Chair announced that she had prepared a supplemental neighborhood survey that adds the intervening homes in the 8300, 8200 and 8100 blocks of La Jolla Scenic Drive as well as additional homes in the 8400 and 8500 blocks of La Jolla Scenic Drive and homes omitted in the 300' radius on Cliffridge Lane, plus additional information about

other homes on the west side of La Jolla Scenic Drive. For the homes added only the lot size and home square footage was supplied. She stated that she had distributed the information to committee members without comment prior to the meeting. She then distributed copies of the Supplementary Neighborhood Survey to the Committee, the applicant and others in attendance.

Presented by: Colin Hernstad & Brian Beggs (Tri dimensional engineering) presented on drainage aspects.

Changes and response to previous committee request:

- The proposed project being presented has a reduced footprint on the eastern (rear) side of the house (towards the slope).
- House is now at 7498 sq. ft. with an FAR of about .40
- Plan reflects 6 parking places on the site plan. 6 bedrooms on site plan (5 + Guest).
- Second floor superimposed on the plan.
- Closest first floor setback on the north is 5 foot at the garage. South 9 foot minimum.
- Second story setback minimum: 7.75 on north, 12.5 on the south side. Current: 7' on north, 6' on south.
- Landscape coverage now at: 37%

Civil engineer Beggs: Some of the drainage from the rear yard stays in the back yard in a sump. There is a small north-south swale on east side of property slope which discharges through the yard to the south. A retaining wall is proposed for the east of the lot and the grade below it will be leveled, forming a sump condition that backs into the swale.

Public comment:

Tom Moffette (lives on adjacent property at east below on Sugarman Drive): The property to the north was part of an older city dump. The berm carries water to the south. There is a lot of erosion on the hill several houses to the south. He does not want the quantity of water increased into the swale, which will further the erosion.

Response: the amount of water that will be increased is very small. Runoff from the midpoint of the house goes to the front, the rest to the rear. Water is at a lower slope 1% to the leveled sump area, which should retain most of the water and send very little to the swale.

Moffette: Where does the drainage from the pool go? Where do they empty the water from the pool? *Response: There is no storm drain system on LJ Scenic [location of nearest storm drain needs to be clarified at subsequent meeting]. Pool discharge water must go to the sanitary system per code.*

Moffette: The pool is 45' from the east property line. Several years ago, a pool ruptured 6 houses away and created problems for downslope residents. He hopes that this design will be sound.

Susan O'Neill: What is the volume of water coming off the roof and hardscape in a 100 year storm?

Response: They don't measure in total volume but in rates: currently the runoff is 1.10 cubic feet per second (cfs). The proposed project has a slight increase to 1.17 cfs.

O'Neill: What is the mass of the structure? What is the weight – concerns with stability of the soil?

Response: They don't calculate the mass of a house. The geology reports indicate no issues with soil stability.

Board discussion:

Morton: The existing roof plan shows one section is flat. He makes the suggestion that water from this be piped and sent to the front of the house to lower the amount draining to the rear.

Boyden: This house is now smaller at 7498 ft. Average FARs for nearby lots with areas greater than 20,000 sq ft are in the .200 range (current average is .174-calculated after the meeting). This project has a FAR of .4 (reduced from .44) more than twice as much as the houses on similar lots within this section. The largest in neighborhood excluding garage is 5052 sq ft, and this far exceeds that. From a square footage perspective this home is 50% larger than any within two blocks. The larger homes presented for comparison were located south of Pottery Canyon, one half mile distant.

Merten: Has concerns with the way the house is placed on the site. The Design Manual: "Building structure and setbacks shall be in general conformity with those in the area..."

Most houses are single story; those with second stories have them placed in center of house away from property line. The second floor level of this design is stepped back slightly, but the profile of the existing vs. proposed really stands out. The proposed setback doesn't conform to the LJSPDO Design Manual. The proposed mass and bulk is too forward and disrupts the architectural unity of the neighborhood.

Response: Shows poster board of other houses on same side of street. Some Other houses are large in street appearance. Applicant will mitigate the effect of this project through plantings and trees.

Boyden: Points out that the one large house they used as an example for the neighborhood is really large, stands out at the front, and doesn't fit with the neighborhood architectural unity. House on north side of 8435 is ranch style and very low profile. This design will dominate that house. The south house has lots of trees along the side that mitigate the effect of this size and the two story element is in the center of the façade with one story elements to either side. The proposed house is larger than any other in the neighborhood, and the next house would use this as a precedent to propose an even larger home.

Response: Planting will mitigate and the setback from the street mitigates.

Merten: On the south, the setback is adequate and has landscaping to shield the house. On the north side there are concerns with privacy and it crowds the neighboring house. Thinks that the design can be adjusted to better conform with the neighborhood.

Schenck: Concern with the 2-story element on north side and the overall size of the project.

Morrison: The size of house being largest in the neighborhood is a concern.

Naegle: This is a big lot. Since there is no great view, second floor could be reduced and first floor expanded. The design should have an elevator also. He likes the elevations, but thinks the garages with the house behind stand out too much and are not part of the neighborhood.

Response: There is a nice view of the mountains to the east from the second floor. (committee pointed out that there was similar from first floor as there is nothing to block view to the east)

Response from owner: The house to the south is in process of being sold and will be redeveloped/expanded within the next two years.

Boyden: Thinks the applicant's project should match the scale of the neighborhood.

Morton: The original development of this area was in the 1960s, as small modest houses. While there is no established FAR in the La Jolla Shores, he is sensitive to second floor and the neighborhood properties. Recommends looking at the side elevations to see what can be done to shift things a bit, such as, changing windows to high ribbon to protect privacy.

Response: Closet in master bedroom could be reduced. Master bathroom is there and has a planter, so no privacy issue there.

Merten: Our committee is prevented from making conditional approvals. At this time, he can not find that the project conforms, due to the second floor and closeness to the property line issues.

Lucas: Has the same concerns with the scale of the house.

Motion: Merten; Second: Schenck
To continue project to future meeting.

Motion carries: 6-0-0

Approve: Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; Oppose: 0; Abstain: Boyden

D. 1912 Spindrift

- PROJECT NUMBER: 214654
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
- LOCATION: 1912 Spindrift
- Project Manager Glenn Gargas: Ph: 619-446-5142; ggargas@san Diego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Lisa Kriedeman; 858-459-9291; lkriedeman@islandarch.com

Project Description: Demolish existing residence and construct a 4699 sq. ft., two-story single family residence. City Coastal (appealable); Coastal Height Limit, Sensitive Coastal, Flood Plain, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area Overlay Zones [City]Construction of new two level single family residence with loggia, balconies, hardscape, landscape, retaining walls, masonry, fences and pool. [Applicant]

Note: Applicant made another submittal to the City in late November answering questions raised in the first cycle and revising plan. Subsequent City cycle is scheduled to be received prior to this meeting. No revised cycles were provided by the City

Note: Project reduced in size from original submittal to City. [Applicant] See below.

Seeking: Site Development Permit: Environmentally Sensitive Lands and LJSPDO (SDP) and Coastal Development Permit (CDP)

Previous Action: November 2010

Motion: Merten; Second: Morton

Continue item. Request that project come back with neighborhood site plan that shows this building in relationship to neighbors, show the elevation of this house in relationship to neighbors. Provide details on parking spaces and access.

Carried: 6-0-1 Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Morton, Merten, Morrison, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden (Chair)

Please see November 2010 LJSPRC Minutes for Committee Discussion and Community input.

1/25/2011:

Presented by: Matt Peterson & Lisa Kriedeman:

Latest cycle issues: 82 issues identified – all have been resolved except for one.

Concerns with 10 ft setback from the property line. Adjustments have been made to the design to address this.

A poster board was presented with photographs of 16 properties in neighborhood and comparisons to the proposed designs and the existing structure were presented.

Changes include:

- The main level has been reduced 681 sq ft and the upper level has been reduced 463 ft. The total proposed square footage is 3,475, down from 3,753 of the previously presented design and 4,699 from the original concept.
- FAR is now 0.25, down from 0.27.
- Ridge height reduced 2' 7" to 25.25 ft. Chimney lowered 2' 4.5" to 27.25'.
- Pushed building back at north corner, so now 12' setback at closest point to street.

- Front yard setback changed from 10 to 12 ft.
- Side yard setback proposed: South: minimum 2 ft (previously 1.6'). North side remains at 6 ft

Boyden: Due to the hedges in neighborhoods, you can not see houses or any view corridors presently.

Response: The view corridor proposed on the north side of the house will be the first view corridor south of the Marine Room.

Morton: What is the material of the gate and the new fence?

Response: The gate will be open, but there is no view corridor there. The fence will remain as is - they can't disturb the soil due to native American site issues. There will be a view corridor at the wider setback side.

Morton thought the brush and tress along the south property line could be trimmed and thinned which might open up a diagonal view of the ocean.

Public comment:

Sue Weissman: She lives further away and has no view issues. She is concerned about the hedges and brush bordering the sidewalk. The sidewalk is being encroached on by these hedges and they need to be trimmed back.

Response: They will be trimming the hedges back and maintaining things better. They can not do any major changes or plantings due to Native American site restrictions as interpreted by the City.

Board discussion:

Morton: This looks like a modest house. What is the curve of the house for?

Response: A stairway goes up. This also adds articulation to the design and increases the setback to the sidewalk.

Merten: Has concerns about the placement of the building. It doesn't fit with the rest of the houses of the neighborhood, which are all set back more. This house is too near the street and is two stories as well. He does not feel that he can make the findings for this project.

Response: Other houses have 2-story elements and are close to the street (shows neighborhood photos). This is a narrower lot than others in the neighborhood. They can not build on the bluff and there is also a fault line running diagonally, which limits the placement of the house.

Lucas: Is concerned with the massing towards the street, but the circumstances of not being able to develop over the cliff and the Native American site restrictions force a design like this. If they decided against having a pool, they could move the house down slope, and have more parking, but having this shallow pool forces this design.

Morton: This design offers better views and a view corridor than currently exist.

Motion: Lucas; second: Morrison

Findings can be made for the project as shown with the 2' South and 6' North side setbacks. The committee suggests that thinning of the trees be trimmed and that hedges and bluff shrubbery be landscaped and trimmed to improve neighborhood and public views along the property lines.

Motion carries: 4-3-0

Approve: Lucas, Morrison, Morton; Oppose: Merten, Naegle, Schenck; Tiebreak: Boyden (chair) approve