



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

President: Tony Crisafi  
Vice President: Joe LaCava  
Treasurer: Orrin Gabsch  
Secretary: Dan Allen

## La Jolla Community Planning Association

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

### Thursday, 1 November 2012

## DRAFT AGENDA – REGULAR MEETING

6:00p

1. Welcome and Call To Order: **Tony Crisafi**, President
2. Adopt the Agenda
3. **Meeting Minutes Review and Approval: 4 October 2012**
4. **Elected Officials Report** – Information Only
  - A. Council District 2 – Councilmember Kevin Faulconer  
Rep: **Katherine Miles**, 619.236.6622, [kmiles@sanidiego.gov](mailto:kmiles@sanidiego.gov)
  - B. Council District 1 – Councilmember Sherri Lightner  
Rep: **Erin Demorest**, 619.236.7762, [edemorest@sanidiego.gov](mailto:edemorest@sanidiego.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](mailto: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**
  - A. 7755 Sierra Mar – Appeal filed October 9<sup>th</sup>.
  - B. Tong EOT – Appeal filed Oct. 23<sup>rd</sup> – Action item - to approve appeal
  - C. UCSD SIO MESOM Laboratory letter sent Oct. 24<sup>th</sup>
  - D. Subcommittee review of projects – purpose is to advise the City on land use policies of the La Jolla /La Jolla Shores Community Plan, Planned District Ordinances & City General Plan.
  - E. Lack of response to Trustee concerns re: land use issues

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, 2<sup>nd</sup> Mon, 4pm

DPR – Development Permit Review Committee, Chair Paul Benton, 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> Tues, 4pm

PRC – LJ Shores Permit Review Committee, Chair Helen Boyden, 4<sup>th</sup> Tues, 4pm

T&T – Traffic & Transportation Board, Chair Todd Lesser, 4<sup>th</sup> Thurs, 4p

**A. Heritage On Ivanhoe Map Waiver**

**DPR Action: The findings can be made for a Map Waiver and Amendment to CDP #793182 to create 14 residential condominium units at 7716 Ivanhoe Avenue. 5-0-1**

7716 Ivanhoe Ave (mult addresses) - Map Waiver and Amendment to CDP #793182 to create 14 residential condominium units

**B. Benson Residence**

**DPR Action: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing two level 7,554 sq ft single family residence, and construct a two level 9,995 sq ft single family residence located at 5970 Camino De La Costa. The Motion is based on the revised drawings dated 9 Oct. 2012, signed by the applicant, Sheet A1.1. 5-0-1**  
5970 Camino De La Costa - CDP and SDP to construct additions to an existing single family residence.

**C. Butterfield Residence**

**DPR Action: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to Demolish 2 existing structures at 5328 and 5334 Calumet Avenue, execute a lot tie agreement, and construct a new 7,308 SF single story home and a basement on a 15,201 SF site based on revised drawings dated 16 Oct 2012 signed by Kristi Hanson. 4-3-0**

5328 & 5334 Calumet Ave. – CDP & SDP to demolish 2 existing structures totaling 8,042 SF & execute a lot tie agreement, and construct a new 7,308 SF single story home, a spa, and a 2820 SF basement on a 15,201 SF site (Lot 15 is 7,272 SF and Lot 16 is 7,929 SF)

**D. McIlvaine (Landa) Residence**

**PRC Action: The findings can be made for a SDP & CDP based on plans dated 5-10-2012 but presented today with bedrooms reduced from five to four with no change in footprint. 5-0-1**

8415 Avenida de las Ondas –CDP and SDP to demolish an existing 2,484 sf SFR, garage and pool. Construct new 2 story 7830 sf 4 bedroom SFR (incl. 113 sf from 3242 sf partial basement ) on a 25,757 sf lot. Includes garage, new pool with wine grotto & exercise pavilion, new site retaining walls and associated landscape features. Campus Impact Zone.

**E. Gaxiola Residence**

**PRC Action: The findings can be made for a SDP & CDP based on plans dated July 22, 2012 and presented today with square footage corrected to 11,696 including 4,744 sf phantom floor. 3-2-1.**

2414 Calle del Oro –SDP and CDP to demolish existing 1-story 3,178 sf residence and construct a new 2-story 11,696 sf residence (of which 4,744 is phantom floor) with 4 bedrooms, 7 bathrooms and 2 car garage, attached guest quarters, swimming pool and retaining walls on a 29,120 sf lot. Square footage includes extensive non-habitable space.

**F. Lambert Felice Residence**

**PRC Action: The findings can be made for a SDP & CDP for the project as presented with plans dated October 23, 2012 and a letter from Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. dated 10-23-2012. 5-0-1**

2382 Via Capri Court –SDP and CDP for a 702 sf first-floor addition and a 580 sf garage addition to an existing 4,204 sf SFR on a 13,250 sf site.

**G. La Jolla Christmas Parade and Holiday Festival**

**T & T Action: Motion to approve street closures 7-0-0**

Street Closures – Dec. 2<sup>nd</sup> for annual holiday parade

10. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADVISORY COMMITTEES - Information only
  - A. COASTAL ACCESS AND PARKING BOARD – Meets 1st Tues, 4pm, Rec Center
  - B. COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE – Meets 4<sup>th</sup> Tues, 7p, 9192 Topaz Way
  
11. **Fairway Views SCR** – Full Review by Trustees per request of Applicant – Action item  
1456 Nautilus St - SCR for a proposed dwelling on an undeveloped site.  
The three lot project was previously approved. One house was built, two others not. Now applicant wants to construct a second house. Will use the previous CDP, need SCR. Approved for three levels (FAR .27), modern flat roof style, now wants two levels Mediterranean (FAR .22). House will go in a trough and not affect views. Driveway to be off Nautilus. No change in access, shared access. Will need retaining wall to make driveway.  
*DPR Action (Oct. 2012):* Findings cannot be made for a Substantial Conformance Review for the existing Coastal Development Permit because the Architectural concept is significantly different from the original design. 6-0-1  
Applicant: Bob Belanger
  
12. **FY 2014 Capital Improvements Program Budget** – Action Item  
Review projects that have not yet been funded, only partially funded and thus delayed, or have yet to be taken up by the City. Submit proposals to CPC by no later than November 7;  
References: <http://www.lajollacpa.org/cip.html>;  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/iba/pdf/cipguidefullversion.pdf>  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/iba/pdf/cipguidequickversion.pdf>  
See attachment for projects suggested at LJCPA Oct 4 meeting.
  
13. **Valet 7979 Ivanhoe** – Full Review by Trustees per request of Applicant – Action item  
7979 Ivanhoe – Amaya restaurant is requesting a valet parking permit  
*T & T Action (Oct. 2012):* Motion to approve with conditions: 1 Year approval & Applicant come back to LJTT for renewal, signage to say Open to Public. 3-3-1  
Applicant: Nate Sposato
  
14. **Adjourn** to next Regular Monthly Meeting, December 6th, 2012, 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: Joe LaCava  
Treasurer: Orrin Gabsch  
Assistant Treasurer: Jim Fitzgerald  
Secretary: Dan Allen

## La Jolla Community Planning Association

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

**Thursday, 4 October 2012**

### **DRAFT MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING**

Trustees Present: Dan Allen, Cynthia Bond, Tom Brady, Devin Burstein, Bob Collins, Laura Ducharme-Conboy, Michael Costello, Dan Courtney, Jim Fitzgerald, Orrin Gabsch, Joe LaCava, David Little, Tim Lucas, Nancy Manno, Phil Merten, Frances O'Neill Zimmerman.

Absent: Tony Crisafi, Cindy Thorsen.

**1. Welcome and Call To Order: Joe LaCava**, Vice President, at 6:05 PM

**2. Adopt the Agenda**

**Approved Motion: Motion to adopt the Agenda, (Fitzgerald/Collins, 12-0-1).**

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten.  
Abstain: LaCava.

**3. Meeting Minutes Review and Approval – 6 September Regular Meeting**

**Approved Motion: Motion to approve Minutes of September Meeting, (Fitzgerald/Manno, 8-0-5).**

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Costello, Fitzgerald, Lucas, Manno.  
Abstain: Burstein, Conboy, Merten, Little, LaCava.

**4. Elected Officials Report - Information Only**

**A. San Diego City Council District 2** - Councilmember Kevin Faulconer

Rep: Katherine Miles, 619.236.6622, [kmiles@sandiego.gov](mailto:kmiles@sandiego.gov)

Ms. Miles was not present.

**B. San Diego City Council District 1** - Councilmember Sherri Lightner

Rep: Erin Demorest, 619.236.7762, [edemorest@sandiego.gov](mailto:edemorest@sandiego.gov)

**Ms. Demorest** reported that tree (palm) trimming funds have been made available from Mayor's office, and to suggest trees in need of attention call the Council District office; demolition of the Childrens' Pool Lifeguard Station is awaiting a "seal disturbance permit" which is expected before pupping season begins in mid-December, otherwise demolition will be in May, and in any case construction will begin next summer; for the La Jolla Cove Lifeguard Station replacement, it is planned to have a contractor in February, and so construction will begin next summer as well;

**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](mailto:adelouri@ucsd.edu), <http://physicalplanning.ucsd.edu>

Ms. Delouri spoke under Item 11 on the subject of the UCSD MESOM Laboratory.

### **General Public Comment**

**John Lee Evans**, President of the Board of Education of the San Diego Unified School District and candidate for re-election to the Board in District A, spoke; **Melinda Merryweather** announced the event scheduled 17 October for Independent La Jolla; **Michelle Holt** representing the Bird Rock Community Council talked about the

Olney Street (Pacific Beach) San Diego Police Department building upgrade; **Tim Lucas**, speaking for the La Jolla Shores Association, announced there are two vacancies on their board; **Ed Ward** described the Liberty Institute; Architect **Omar Al Basseet** spoke about his favorable impression of La Jolla.

## 6. Non-Agenda Items for Trustee Discussion

**Joe LaCava** announced a debate by the San Diego City Council District 1 candidates 10 October at the Recreation Center at 7PM.

## 7. Officer's Reports

### A. Secretary

**Trustee Allen** stated LJCPA is a membership organization open to La Jolla residents, property owners and local businesspersons at least 18 years of age. By providing proof of attendance one maintains membership and becomes eligible for election as a Trustee. Eligible non-members wishing to join the LJCPA must have recorded attendance for one meeting and must submit an application. Forms are on-line at [www.lajollacpa.org](http://www.lajollacpa.org).

### B. Treasurer

**Trustee Gabsch** asked assistant treasurer, **Jim Fitzgerald**, to give the Treasurer's report. **Trustee Fitzgerald** presented the results for the past month. September Beginning Balance: \$420.49 + Income \$120.00 – Expenses \$223.24 = October Beginning Balance: \$317.25. Expenses for the month included agenda printing, telephone expenses and annual Post Office box rental.

**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 are in cash to preserve anonymity.

## 8. President's Report

**Vice President LaCava** gave the report.

### A. Children's Pool Rope Barrier – Planning Commission Hearing 9/27

The Planning Commission upheld the LJCPA appeal to not extend the time period of the rope barrier to year-round based on the La Jolla Community Plan requirement for public access to the beach and ocean,

### B. Tong EOT - Action item: whether to appeal potential future adverse decision of Hearing Officer on Oct. 10, 2012

Last month's LJCPA motion to oppose has been submitted and we are in need of a presenter for the 10 October hearing.

### C. Puesto Sidewalk Cafe – Notice of Decision noticed Aug 17th, no appeal made, received notice Sept. 14<sup>th</sup>

The president will follow up on this situation of receiving notice one month late.

### D. 7755 Sierra Mar – Action item: whether to appeal the Hearing Officer decision of Sept. 26

LJCPA voted in December 2008 denial of the project 10-0-0 supporting PRC, based on bulk, scale and impact on neighbors (remodel of 5,006 sf home and addition of 8,714 sf on 37,790 sf lot, FAR =0.40, site coverage 21%). Now it is returning in modified form. Both LJCPA and La Jolla Shores were bypassed this second time around.

## Approved Motion: To close debate and proceed to vote on the pending motion, ("Call The Question"), (Zimmerman, 15-0-1).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Collins, Conboy, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Zimmerman.

Abstain: LaCava.

## Failed Motion: To not appeal 7755 Sierra Mar project, (Fitzgerald/Gabsch, 3-11-2).

In favor: Brady, Burstein, Fitzgerald.

Opposed: Allen, Bond, Collins, Costello, Courtney, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Zimmerman.

Abstain: Conboy, LaCava.

## Approved Motion: To appeal 7755 Sierra Mar project, (Courtney/Costello, 11-3-2).

In favor: Allen, Bond, Collins, Costello, Courtney, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Zimmerman.  
Opposed: Brady, Burstein, Fitzgerald.  
Abstain: Conboy, LaCava.

- E. 1223 Muirlands Vista Way** – Over height swimming pool, response from City  
**President Crisafi** and **Trustee Merten** met with the Development Services Department and letters have been exchanged. We still await the City response on what is clearly a mistaken reading of regulations by the City that permits the apparently non-conforming swimming pool. **Trustee Gabsch** recommended going over the head of DSF and bringing the matter to the attention of the Mayor. **Trustee Little** and **Rob Whittemore** commented.

*At this point the sequence of the agenda was modified to hear Item 11 at "Time Certain".*

**11. UCSD Scripps Institute of Oceanography: MESOM Laboratory** - Action Item

La Jolla Shores Drive – building under construction is blocking ocean views contrary to what is presented in photo simulations; LJCPA sent letter to Chancellor, University of California, San Diego, and to the regional office of the California Coastal Commission on 9/10/12; response from Chancellor was attached to the agenda. There has been no response from the California Coastal Commission.

UCSD Photo simulations: <http://commplan.ucsd.edu/MESOM/MESOM%20Photosimulation%20RFS.pdf>

**Trustee Conboy** presented a comparison of the earlier photo simulations with current photographs.

**Brad Werdick**, Director of Physical and Community Planning at UCSD made a presentation with similar illustrations.

**Mr. Werdick** further related that they have checked that the building went up according to plans and sure it is right. Some of the current obstruction (about 6 to 18 vertical inches) is due to construction forms. The view to the ocean there was not totally clear beforehand due to bushes and trees at the building site, and so the net loss is less than appears. He further emphasized removal of 28 mature dense shrubs and trees from the west side of La Jolla Shores Drive to compensate for lost ocean views from the road due to the building. These trees are replaced with 28 trees on the east side of the road. There is a path and lookout on the ocean side of the new building and so pedestrians can see even more than before. The building is in conformance with the UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan Final EIR, which addressed the loss of ocean views due to campus development. The La Jolla Shores Association was given detailed presentations as the project design proceeded. The view issue in particular was argued in interaction with the Coastal Commission who approved the MESOM project after many concessions by UCSD. On the topic of the photo simulations, it was stated that there was no effort to mislead the LJCPA or the public and that the result was the architects' best effort.

Members of the public attending and Trustees offered inquiry and comment almost universally critical of UCSD. It was agreed, however, that there might be some imperfection in the architects' original photo simulations. **Melinda Merryweather, Roger Wiggans, Bernie Segal, Althea Brimm** and **Rob Whittemore** spoke. **Trustees Brady, Collins, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten** and **Zimmerman** participated in the discussion.

**Approved Motion: To direct the LJCPA President to send a letter to the Governor of the State of California, to the Regents of the University of California, to the President of the University of California, to the California State Architect, to the Chairman of the California Coastal Commission, to the San Diego Coast Representative member of the California Coastal Commission, to the Executive Director of the California Coastal Commission, to the Mayor of San Diego, to the City of San Diego Development Services Department, and to San Diego City Councilmember, District 1. The letter shall request a reduction in the height of the UCSD SIO MESOM Laboratory to conform with the elevations demonstrated in the renderings presented to the La Jolla community, (Courtney/Fitzgerald, 14-1-1).**

In favor: Bond, Brady, Burstein, Collins, Conboy, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Zimmerman.  
Opposed: Allen.  
Abstain: LaCava.

**Approved Motion: To direct the LJCPA President to send a letter to the Chancellor of the University of California, San Diego, and to the Deputy Director, San Diego Coast District Office, California Coastal Commission. The letter requesting a renegotiation of the proposed deed restriction relative to roof heights on the Scripps Institute of Oceanography campus west of La Jolla Shores Drive and for the deed restriction be brought back to the La Jolla community for review. The purpose of the renegotiation is to comply with the Visual Resources element of the La Jolla Community Plan, (Costello/Merten, 12-3-1).**

In favor: Bond, Brady, Collins, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Zimmerman.  
Opposed: Allen, Burstein, Conboy.  
Abstain: LaCava.

## **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 Paul Benton, 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. Herringbone Sidewalk Café Permit (signage)**

**PDO Action: Signage meets intent of the code, to not create a potential obstruction in the right-of-way, because blade sign extends over approved sidewalk café. Based on placement, recommending an exemption from the 14 foot above finished floor clearance requirement. 8-0-0**  
7837 Herschel Ave.- signage permit

**Approved Motion: Motion to accept the action of the Planned District Ordinance Committee: (A) Herringbone Sidewalk Café Permit (signage): Signage meets intent of the code, to not create a potential obstruction in the right-of-way, because blade sign extends over approved sidewalk café. Based on placement, recommending an exemption from the 14 foot above finished floor clearance requirement, (Burstein/Fitzgerald, 15-0-1).**

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Collins, Conboy, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Zimmerman.  
Abstain: LaCava.

## **10. Reports from Other Advisory Committees - Information only**

- A. Coastal Access and Parking Board** - Meets 1st Tues, 5pm, La Jolla Recreation Center.  
**Trustee Allen** noted that the Board met in October and will meet next again in December.
- B. Community Planners Committee** – Meets 4th Tues, 7pm, 9192 Topaz Way, San Diego.  
**Trustee LaCava** reported that the CPC was addressed at their last meeting by the mayoral candidates.

## **12. FY 2014 Capital Improvements Program Budget**

Review & recommend projects that have not yet been funded, only partially funded and thus delayed, or have yet to be taken up by the City. Submit proposals to CPC by no later than November 7;

References: <http://www.lajollacpa.org/cip.html>;  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/iba/pdf/cipguidefullversion.pdf>  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/iba/pdf/cipguidequickversion.pdf>  
<https://www.sandiego.gov/cip/projectinfo/index.shtml>

**Vice President LaCava** reviewed the process. A listing from La Jolla Parks and Beaches, Inc., was distributed. **Egon Kafka** addressed the City's fees for the Concerts by the Sea program and compensatory funding from the City operating funds if local funds relieved capital expenditure for improvements at Scripps Park.

**Trustees Manno** and **Courtney** spoke in favor of giving highest priority to the Torrey Pines Road corridor modifications; **Trustee Gabsch** agreed with giving highest priority to Torrey Pines Road, and he proposed addition of sidewalk completions where there are none or only one side has a sidewalk, particularly La Jolla Mesa Drive. **Trustee Costello** asked for priority for complete sidewalks for La Jolla Hermosa Park (at Camino de la Costa and Chelsea) and for a traffic circle at Chelsea and Midway; **Trustee Zimmerman** spoke to lesser priority for Coast Walk parking; **Trustee Lucas** mentioned a proposal for a pedestrian bridge over Torrey Pines Road (instead of the Princess Street traffic signal); **Trustee Brady** spoke of a need for street lighting on Fay Avenue between Silverado and Prospect. **Trustee Collins** said more detail was needed on Project #S00928. **Trustees, Merten, Fitzgerald, Costello** and **Courtney** commented. **Trustee Burstein** asked about street repaving. Council Representative **Erin Demorest** provided clarifications on several points. **Trustee Little** asked to have the Trustees take a ballot on the priorities. **Vice President LaCava** said he had made notes and will propose a revised list for Trustee consideration at the November meeting taking into account the comments of all.

**Trustee Manno** praised Vice President LaCava for his work on the citizen participation effort in the 2014 CIP.

**13. 2351 Vallecitos Residence - Full Review by Trustees per request of Applicant** - Action Item  
2351 Vallecitos - CDP and SDP to demolish an existing 2664 sf residence and construct a 4920 sf single story SFR on a 19,236 sf lot according to revised plans dated September 17, 2012. Includes 3-car attached garage, pool and retaining walls.

*PRC Action (Sept. 2012): Project should not be approved on the basis that it disrupts the architectural unity of the area. [and] The east side-yard setback is not in general conformance with the area. 3-1-4*

Applicant: Haley Bareisa, Island Architects

**Ms. Bareisa** presented the project and provided handout material. The neighbors' objections were related to concerns re the "pop-up" ("monitor") providing a high ceiling and clerestory windows in the center of the proposed new home and the re-orientation of building to result in a long, narrow setback on one side of the lot. **Ms. Bareisa** said that they had worked with neighbors on these issues.

**Steven Victor**, attorney for Althea Brimm, **Ms. Brimm, Bernie Segal, Littleton Waller, Uri Feldman**, owner of the project, and **Helen Boyden** spoke. Primary issue was the setback patterns on the building pads proceeding up the slope; while private views are not a consideration for the LJCPA, the building pattern is a consideration in the La Jolla Shores Planned District. **Trustees Burstein, Collins, Conboy, Costello, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Little, Manno** and **Merten** participated in the discussion.

**Approved Motion: To close debate and proceed to vote on the pending motion, ("Call The Question"), (Zimmerman, 14-0-2).**

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Collins, Conboy, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Little, Manno, Merten, Zimmerman.

Abstain: Lucas, LaCava.

**Failed Motion: 2351 Vallecitos Residence: Project should not be approved on the basis that it disrupts the architectural unity of the area, (Little/Manno, 5-8-2).**

In favor: Collins, Gabsch, Little, Manno, Merten.

Opposed: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Fitzgerald, Zimmerman.

Abstain: Lucas, LaCava.

**Approved Motion: 2351 Vallecitos Residence: Findings can be made to approve the project as conforming to the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, (Conboy/Burstein, 8-5-2).**

In favor: Allen, Bond, Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Fitzgerald, Zimmerman.

Opposed: Collins, Gabsch, Little, Manno, Merten.

Abstain: Lucas, LaCava.

**14. Adjourn, at 9:45 PM.**

Next Regular Monthly Meeting, 1 November, 6:00 pm.



**LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**

**COMMITTEE REPORT**  
**FOR**  
**October 2012**

**October 9 Present:** Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Liera, Merten, Welsh

**October 16 Present:** Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Welsh

**1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT BY THE COMMITTEE 10/09/12**

**Costello** Announced that there will be an Independent La Jolla Form at the Riford Library Oct 17, 2012 at 5:30 PM. Casey Tanaka, the Mayor of Coronado, and Michael Ott, the Director of LAFCO, will speak.

**2. FINAL REVIEW 10/09/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 9/18/12)**

Project Name: **HERITAGE ON IVANHOE MW**

7716 Ivanhoe Ave (multiple addresses) Permits: CDP  
Project #: PO# 289238 DPM: Jeff Peterson 619-446-5237  
japeterson@sandiego.gov  
Zone: RM-3-7 Applicant: Robert Bateman 858-565-8362

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Map Waiver and Amendment to CDP #793182 to create 14 residential condominium units (under construction) on a 0.72 acre site at 7716 Ivanhoe Avenue (multiple addresses) in the RM-3-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, and Transit Area.

**Presenters:** Robert Bateman  
Sasha Varone

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION:**

The Applicant would like to sell the 14 residential units as independent condo units. Initially there were three lots that were consolidated for the Heritage on Ivanhoe Project. A map waiver will allow them to be sold as 14 individual units.

**Provided for FINAL REVIEW:** *Applicant response in Italics*

1. Please provide the previously drawn Landscaping plan. *Provided landscaping plan, will keep the big Brazilian Pepper Tree, additional 24" box trees will be planted.*
2. Indicate the location of the historic Tudor style house. *House is located at the North East corner, will be for sale.*
3. Define the common areas and public areas in the Project. *Outlined private areas for each individual unit. Common areas such as the driveways, central courtyard with mailboxes and parkway on Ivanhoe were outlined.*

**SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:**

(Collins/Costello 5-0-1)The findings can be made for a Map Waiver and Amendment to CDP #793182 to create 14 residential condominium units at 7716 Ivanhoe Avenue.

**In Favor:** Benton, Collins, Costello, Liera, Welsh

**Oppose:** 0

**Abstain:** Merten

**MOTION PASSES**

**3. FINAL REVIEW 10/09/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 4/17/12)**

Project Name:	<b>BENSON RESIDENCE</b>	Permits:	CDP + SDP
	5970 Camino De La Costa		
Project #:	PO# 232790	DPM:	Sandra Teasley 619-446-5271 steasley@sandiego.gov
Zone:	RS-1-5	Applicant:	Mark T. House 619-557-0575 Scott Huntsman, Matt Peterson

**Scope of Work:**

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing two level 7,554 sq ft single family residence, and construct a two level 9,995 sq ft single family residence located at 5970 Camino De La Costa in the RS-1-5 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, and Transit Area.

**Presenters:** Mark House  
Scott Huntsman  
Myles Cooper C.E.  
Trace Wilson

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION:**

The Applicant is no longer planning additions to the existing house, instead there will be a completely new house. They are complying with all new setbacks, and other requirements. Applicant is not relying on existing conditions.

Sideyard setbacks, both sides, 7 ft 7 in. Sideyards are open, can see ocean. Utilities will be underground, poles removed. Gates are 75% open. FAR, allowed = .45, proposed = .352. Lot coverage 21.3%. 3 bedrooms plus office, 4 car garage plus motor court. Front yard setback = 20 ft. Rear yard over 100 ft (so, 40 ft bluff edge OK). One corner of the long axis of the swimming pool is in 40 ft bluff edge setback. The pool corner problem was solved by rotating the long axis of the pool 90 degrees on the plans, the design change was signed by Mark House and dated.

Roof plan, flat roof with low parapet walls, ¼ in/ft for drainage. Usually the inside of the parapet walls has flashing and black membrane and looks unfortunate, can you help that? ***Yes, we will work with the contractor also keep them low, 4 – 8 inches. Not much should be visible from the street.***

What documentation is there to codify the VC and its maintenance? ***There will be a VC easement document recorded, as well as a covenant of easement for the bluff. As well the side yard views. These are recorded against the land.***

Can you open up the bushes along the side yard setback in front, to make a wider VC? ***We want to keep the bushes to screen the neighbor's retaining wall.***

**SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:**

(Merten/Liera 5-0-1) Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing two level 7,554 sq ft single family residence, and construct a two level 9,995 sq ft single family residence located at 5970 Camino De La Costa. The Motion is based on the revised drawings dated 9 Oct. 2012, signed by the applicant, Sheet A1.1.

**In Favor:** Collins, Costello, Liera, Merten, Welsh

**Oppose:** 0

**Abstain:** Benton

**MOTION PASSES**

**5. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 10/09/12 + FINAL REVIEW 10/16/12**

Project Name: **BUTTERFIELD RESIDENCE**

5328 & 5334 Calumet Avenue	Permits:	CDP & SDP
Project #: PO# 243464	DPM:	John Fisher 619-446-5231 jsficher@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-7	Applicant:	Dave Longmore 858-603-9478 619-234-0361

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to Demolish 2 existing structures totaling 8,042 SF at 5328 Calumet Avenue and 5334 Calumet Avenue, execute a lot tie agreement, and construct a new 7,308 SF single story home ( 5,332 SF living area + 703 SF attached garage + 1,273 SF “phantom floor”) for a total FAR of .48, a spa, and a 2820 SF basement on a 15,201 SF site (Lot 15 is 7,272 SF and Lot 16 is 7,929 SF) The project is located in the RS-1-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, and Transit overlay zones.

**Presenters:** Matt Peterson  
Kristi Hanson  
Ingrid Espe

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION 10/09/12:**

Statistics sheet provided with 4 pages of drawings. Two lots are merged, and both houses will be removed (total = 8,042 sq ft), a one story single family home (7,308 sq ft) will be constructed. The FAR allowed = .49, proposed = .48. There is an 11 ft setback on one side, 12 ft the other. On S-W side there will be a big view corridor when combined with Bandera paper alley. The project includes three bedrooms and a full basement. There will be a safety rail partitioning the private property from the bluff edge and a 5 ft set back. They will provide a new fence at the Bandera paper alley. Project includes 4 parking spaces. The house will be 25 ft from bluff edge. The Coastal bluff is in City property.

**Costello:** asked Applicant to re-post notices on green paper in obvious locations, **answered “no”**.

**Benton:** Let’s review the rear yard setback issue. ***Muni Code requires 15 ft (observing 22 ft), bluff edge setback is 25 ft.***

**PUBLIC COMMENT 10/09/12:** *Applicant response in Italics*

**Rita:** will there be a basement? ***Yes, a full basement***

**Howard Reedy:** what is the fate of the basement excavate? ***It is trucked off site for licensed disposal.***

**Collins:** What is the paper alley width? ***I believe it is 20 ft***

**Jackie Lustiak:** how many feet are you providing for a VC? ***12 ft plus the Bandera VC, a total of 32 ft.***

**Peter Wintje:** How much VC is there now between each of the houses and how much will there be with just one house? ***Maybe 4 ft each, but none in between the two houses. The only way to get more is with a new Coastal Permit.***

**Steve Rossi:** Objects to the change in density brought about by one house placed on two lots. Concerned about bluff erosion, acceleration of bluff erosion.

**Costello:** This change in density issue was noted in the City Cycle Issues Letters. This is clearly inconsistent with the density range of the LJ Community Plan.

**Marie Mazzone:** Mass is not consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. Concerned about loss of views, light and sky.

**Provided for FINAL REVIEW 10/16/12:**

1. Please prepare a summary of the existing setbacks and view issues and how they will change with the proposed project, two houses versus one.

*Two houses - setback 4 ft on all sides = 24 ft, FAR= .57, 30 ft high;*

*One house - setback sum =23 ft, FAR= .49, 24 ft high (27 ft chimney)*

2. Identify statements in your Geological Report about bluff erosion and rate of bluff retreat. How is 75 year life determined? Bring in your Geologist? **Les Reed, Geologist: Cabrillo Formation is more resistant. Up the coast a storm drain, 50 or 60 years old, serves as a bench mark for bluff recession, 24 inches per 50 years. 75 years seems a reasonable number to say the house site will last. There is an old WWII drain trench going thru where the basement will be, this will have a solution.**

3. Please provide some details / drawings of the basement. *There is a full basement, but not under the garage. There is a lot of mechanical space and storage space.*

4. Provide some details of treatment to the walls along the ocean. Make more natural looking? *Garden walls have been stepped back to conform to the house.*

5. Can you alter the single structure design to appear more like two houses on two lots? Landscaping at the entrance is a broad open area. *The street front of the house leading to the great hall is glass giving a blue sky view.*

6. Please respond to the SD City Cycle Issues Letters (page 4, II. Significant Project Issues) comment that a lot merger will create a density inconsistent with the La Jolla Community Plan. *Provided a report stating a lot of minimums are required, not maximum.*

7. Detail the effect on the neighbors across the street of switching setbacks. They purchased property with setbacks a certain way, how will this change their views? *There are not views to the ocean for the neighbors anyway. There will be much more view than now.*

8. Break up the view of the safety wall from the ocean. Something other than a straight line, relate better to the bluff and structure architecture. (Calif. Coastal Com is concerned about the appearance from the ocean.) *no response.*

9. Please provide some building sections, showing the roof type and details. *Layered roof to create areas of interest , parapet with flat roof, 24 ft high. The highest point of chimney is 27ft.*

j. Please provide the DPR Members with copies of the Geological Report. Send by PDF to Chairman Benton or provide paper copies. *Done by email.*

k. Have a simulation showing roof lines of the neighborhood. *Provided, but not of the neighborhood, or neighbors, just the first few feet of each house on both sides.*

**PUBLIC COMMENT 10/16/12: Applicant in Italics**

**Jackie Lustiak:** You are not giving us anything in return. There is no gain in the View Corridor. Can you move the house to the North? That will give a great view widening the view thru the paper alley.

**Steve Rossi:** Has observed the primordia of a sea cave being formed, the bluff face has become concave in the past 6 months.

**Les Reed:** *We get periodic bluff failures, these stabilize. This has been over steepened at the location of the old fault. There is a notch on the cliff face. They know the mechanism that formed this. They will look at this, does not affect the estimate of 75 years. The basement is going in bed rock material digging it shouldn't produce a problem, drains and a sump pump will handle water accumulation, if there is a cave formation this will help stabilize it.*

**Marie Mazzone: Stated references from the La Jolla Community Plan in Bold:**

*Mrs. Mazzone comments in Italics*

**P. 39** Goals. Protect the environmentally sensitive resources of La Jolla's open areas including its coastal bluffs,.....

**P. 50** Visual Resources. b. Public views to the ocean from the first public roadway adjacent to the ocean shall be preserved and **enhanced**, including visual access across private coastal properties at yards and setbacks. *How will Butterfield project enhance?*

**P 50-51** Shoreline Areas and Coastal Bluffs

a. The City should preserve and protect the coastal bluffs, beaches and shoreline areas of La Jolla assuring that development occurs in a manner that protects these resources, encourages sensitive development,... **and maximizes physical and visual public access to and along the shoreline.**

**P. 51** These regulations assure that development occurs in a manner that protects these resources, encourages sensitive development, and **maximizes** physical and **visual public access** to and along the shoreline.

**P. 51 c.** Development on coastal bluffs should be set back sufficiently from the bluff edge to avoid the need for shoreline or bluff erosion control (*as evidenced by 5322 Calumet's Coastal Commission emergency repair permit for bluff failure*).

**P. 52 d.** The City should ensure that new **development does not restrict or prevent lateral vertical or visual access (Fig 9 and App H) to the beach on property that lies between the shoreline and first public roadway, or ...designated public open space easements.**

**P. 56** Visual Resources. c. Protect public views to and along the shoreline as well as to all designated open space areas and scenic resources from public vantage points as identified in Fig 9 and App H. Public views to the ocean along public streets are identified in Appendix G. Design and site proposed development that may affect an existing or potential public view to be protected, as identified in Figure 9 or in Appendix G, in such a manner as to preserve, **enhance** or restore the designated public view. *How will Butterfield project enhance?*

d. Implement the regulation of the building envelope to preserve public views through the height, setback, landscaping and fence transparency regulation of the LDC that limit the building profile and maximize view opportunities. *Board members comment at last meeting. Can you alter the single structure design to appear more like two houses on two lots?*

**P. 57** **Where new development is proposed on property that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway, preserve, enhance or restore existing or potential view corridors... I suggest a generous compensatory setback.** *If you are asking for a lot tie and making a change in the character of a neighborhood, there should be a concession in the way of very generous setbacks in exchange for eliminating public view with a lot tie. I recommend the largest setback be placed on the south side where the paper alley already exists since it will really open up the space for public viewing.*

**P. 59-60** Require removal of obsolete or unnecessary protective devices, when feasible, and in a safe manner, or otherwise allow such devices to deteriorate naturally over time without any improvements allowed, to restore the natural integrity and visual quality of the coastal bluff over the long-term. Do not allow erosion control measures on a site where development was approved with less than a 40 foot bluff edge setback, unless otherwise permitted in the Sensitive Coastal Bluff Regulations in the Land Development Code.

**P. 84** 3. Development Near Coastal Bluffs

a. The City should ensure that residential projects along the coastal bluff maintain yards and setbacks as established by the underlying zone and other applicable regulations in the Land Development Code in order to form view corridors and to prevent a walled-off appearance from the street to the ocean. (*Lot tie will give walled off appearance. A concession would be larger easement, and or an alteration of building mass.*)

**P. 81** Residential areas Goals. Maintain the character of La Jolla's residential areas by ensuring that

redevelopment occurs in a manner that protects natural features, **preserves existing streetscape themes and allows a harmonious visual relationship to exist between the bulk and scale of new and older structures.**

**Peter Wintje:** Can you shift the house North?

**Rita:** Re shift house. There is hardly any space there now

**Peterson:** *from the Muni Code setbacks should be .08 of the lot width. For two houses 8 ft +4 ft + 4 ft +8 ft total 22 ft. setback. Butterfield will give 23 ft, so it is slightly more.*

**Liera:** what are the fences like? *Over 3 ft they will be glass.*

**Costello:** re Cycles Letters, City Planner pointed out the change in density conflicting with the LJ Com Plan. The Residential Densities Map, LJCP, pg 81, depicts the site as Low Density Residential (5-9 dwelling unit/ acre. That is 5 du/a = 8,712 sq ft/ du, 9 du/a = 4,840 sq ft/du. Pg 89 uses text to describe Low Density as 5-9 du/a, 5,000 -7,000 sq ft lots, and RS-1-7 zoning. SD Muni Code ch 13, art 1, div 4 lists RS-1-7 with min lot size of 5,000 sq ft, RS-1-3 with min lot size of 15,000 sq ft. The average lot size of the 29 homes in the immediate neighborhood is 7,552 sq ft. A lot tie would give Butterfield 15,200 sq ft, which is twice the size of the neighbors, inconsistent with RS-1-7, but consistent with RS-1-3. (BTW, the house size (7,308 sq ft) is almost 3x the average size of neighboring homes (2,504 sq ft). Graphic analysis was presented showing inconsistency in changing the lot size and the Community Character. Asked that DPR deny the project but if not, at least require increased side yard setback for view easement as compensation.

**Liera:** The size of the lot is the most important determinate in the Community Character. Discussed implications of density changes and agreed rules shouldn't be broken.

**Collins:** What is the width of the house? *114 ft*

**Merten:** My Motion to approve will be contingent upon the Applicant removing all the palm trees in the side yard view easements. Can you remove the trees in front of the view easements?

**Hanson:** *Yes. Plans revised dated, signed by Hanson.*

**SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 10/16/12:**

**(Merten/Hayes 4-3-0)** Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to Demolish 2 existing structures at 5328 and 5334 Calumet Avenue, execute a lot tie agreement, and construct a new 7,308 SF single story home and a basement on a 15,201 SF site based on revised drawings dated 16 Oct 2012 signed by Kristi Hanson.

**In Favor:** Benton (to break tie), Collins, Hayes, Merten

**Oppose:** Costello, Liera, Welsh

**Abstain:** 0

**MOTION PASSES**

**6. FINAL REVIEW 10/16/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 09/18/12)**

Project Name: **FAIRWAY VIEWS SCR**

1456 Nautilus Street

Permits: SCR for CDP

Project #: PO# 291493

DPM: Jeanette Temple 619-446-5245  
jtemple@sandiego.gov

Zone: RS-1-4

Applicant: Terry Montello 619-994-5557  
Bob Belanger 619-261-1288

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Substantial Conformance Review for a proposed dwelling on an undeveloped site at 1456 Nautilus Street in the RS-1-4 zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Limit.

**Presenters:** Bob Belanger  
Larry Cole, CE

**Provided for FINAL REVIEW: *Applicant reply in italics***

1. Superimpose old and new drawings differentiate with color or shading. *Done, close to same footprint*
2. Have a cross-section showing driveway and access. *Done*
3. Provide a drainage study, and how it relates to East property including a concept drawing. *2003 Drainage Study, drainage from the East does not go into this lot, water from the North flows down the driveway before it can get to the house.*
4. Show the West elevation to Nautilus and a cross section from top of property to Nautilus. *Done*
5. Provide an analysis of traffic movement in and out of Nautilus. **Cole:** *demonstrated turns into and out of property, use of center lane.* **Grunow's** photo shown. **Liera:** traffic light will also stop traffic.
6. Provide view of roofline from Nautilus. *Done, structure is depressed into the terrain; only the roof is seen from Nautilus, ie, Spanish Colonial type tile with tower.*
7. Have an over-head view of roof, please color, and indicate texture, gravel, and tile. *Provided*
8. Provide project statistics in addition to FAR. *Previous Plan: 3 floors, 12,000 sq ft. Current Plan: 2 floors, 9,615 sq ft, 23% lot coverage, FAR = .223*
9. Provide information on Fairway closure or vacation. Is there a proscriptive easement for a walking path? *Paper street is not vacated, it still exists as an easement.*

**DISCUSSION:**

**Hayes:** retaining wall – sidewalk to house? *7 to 10 ft high, guardrail topped by wrought iron*

**Liera:** explain the retention basin

**Benton:** for a SCR, you need to show these projects are substantially the same, and also that we make a finding with regard to the LJ Com Plan. Let's focus on those issues. The style is substantially different. The old drawing was for a sleek modern simple design with horizontal elements going slope to slope. Now you have a Spanish Colonial architectural style with tile roof and tower. The question for Committee Members is: is this substantially the same, as well as the issue of the footprint.

**Merten:** What is the difference of the two building heights? *About 7.5 ft*

We are to determine that the project is in substantial conformance with the original project. We are to make a determination based on the rules and regs in effect at the time of the review. When we see projects that are so different in many ways, I wonder if this shouldn't be an amendment to the Coastal Permit. A SCR is problematic, it must comply with the LJ Com Plan, in Residential Development, it addresses architectural character. City Bulletin about SCR, Architecture Review of proposed changes to an architectural style of an approved project should weigh the significance that the discussion maker had placed on architectural style when the project was approved. When findings of neighborhood compatibility are required, even minor changes to architectural elements or materials could be significant. Increased height of a flat roof to a gabled roof could affect neighbors and could lead to controversy as to why the design change occurred after the public hearing. The overriding goal should be that the modified plan be better than the original one....

**Benton:** OK, clearly there are Spanish styles in the neighborhood, but the point is this is a very significant change in plans.

**Merten:** re 7 – 10 ft retaining walls. Retaining walls leading to driveways / garages can be > 6 ft. Would rather see the walls step up, be broken into two lower levels of terraced walls, landscape between.

The consensus of the DPR Members is that there are so many significant changes to the project that a SCR is not appropriate, however, a new CDP would likely be approved.

**Belanger:** *If a vote for the SCR fails the owner will build the previously approved plan.*

**SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:**

**(Liera/Merten 6-0-1)** Findings cannot be made for a Substantial Conformance Review for the existing Coastal Development Permit because the Architectural concept is significantly different from the original design.

**In Favor:** Collins, Costello, Hayes, Liera, Merten, Welsh

**Oppose:** 0

**Abstain:** Benton

**MOTION PASSES**

**7. FINAL REVIEW (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 08/21/12)**

Project Name: **CAMAISA RESIDENCE**

9450 La Jolla Farms Road

Permits: CDP

Project #: PO# 260171

DPM: Patrick Hooper 619-446-5001

Zone: RS-1-2

phooper@sandiego.gov

Applicant:

Sandra Escobedo 858-456-8555 x109

Scope of Work:

Joseph Reid 858-456-8555

(Process 3) An 1,835 SF addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.74 acre site located at 6450 La Jolla Farms Rd in the RS-1-2 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway and Parking Impact Overlay Zone.

**Presenters:** Joseph Reid  
Sandra Escobedo  
Ione Steiger

**Provided for FINAL REVIEW:**

1. Please meet with neighbor's representatives Architects. *Done*
2. What will you use for a tennis court fence? *No fence around the court. 3 ft wall existing wall remains.*  
If no or limited fence, will you place that in a deed restriction? ???
3. What will the tennis court surface be? *Concrete, with a perimeter of permeable material to reduce hard cape*
4. Provide documentation that the City Staff will allow parking in the front yard, and tennis court for the required parking. *Provided a letter tentative from city planner Patrick Hooper that they will allow the tennis court to be used for parking requirement.* What is the Muni Code reference? ??? What about access to the tennis court? *We will cut a grasscrete driveway from the street. There will be a second driveway curb cut. Stiegler: the City is OK with using the tennis court. The parking requirement is because of mini dorms like around SDSU.* How many bedrooms? *Nine* How many people living there? *Seven*  
**Liera:** Doesn't a tennis court need a high fence to keep the balls from going into the street? **Collins:** shouldn't we ask for a deed restriction on fence height / construction?
5. Provide updated CILs. *Not done.*
6. Provide parking layout plan. *On plans distributed*
7. Provide clearer drawings, use color to identify existing and new/proposed. As well as 1st and 2nd level color drawings. Shade or color. *Done, shaded areas would be new construction.*
8. Provide more treatment, motif, of the South facing structure. *Instead, will block several second level windows, will add plants.*
9. Please show a cross-section of proposed 2nd level structure and neighbors to the South.
10. Please provide a street scene showing proposed structures including the current property's structures to the North and South.
11. Please have a compliant landscape plan and with compliant hardscape.  
*front yard: 41% landscape / 59% hardscape*



**DISCUSSION:**

**Merten:** *(45 degree angled plane does not apply here because of lot width.)* You see the nice setbacks all along the Farms Area. Would like to see the second story wall setback, provide some articulation here. The existing 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is too close to the neighbor (4 ft). The wall is the most unfortunate thing about this Project and now you are extending it making it less pleasant. LJCP asks height over one story be stepped back you aren't doing that (lot width). Can you push the proposed second floor in some?

**SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:**

**(Hayes/Collins 2-3-0)** Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish part of an existing structure at 6450 La Jolla Farms Rd and construct a 1,835 SF addition to the existing single-family residence.

**In Favor:** Collins, Hayes,

**Oppose:** Costello, Liera, Merten

**Abstain:** 0

**MOTION FAILS**

**8. COURTESY PRESENTATION 10/16/12:**

Project Name: **ROBERTS RESIDENCE**

9438 La Jolla Farms Road

Permits: CDP

Project #: PO# 294531

DPM: Jeff Peterson 619-446-5001

Zone: RS-1-2

japeterson@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Charity Lonberger 858-459-0805

Scope of Work:

A Coastal Development Permit for the remodel of an existing 3,377 SF one-story single-family residence on a 49,145 SF lot. The proposed project expands the house to a 8,058 SF single-family residence. The majority of the proposed home is one story with the exception of a 861 SF lower level, which creates a 2-story portion on the south western portion of the footprint. In addition to expanding the existing house there will be an addition of a 2-story detached studio/exercise room (accessory building) and a detached 1-story garage/recreation/pool house (may serve as guest quarters). Site improvements include a new driveway, pool, garden walls and landscaping.

**Presenter:** Charity Lonberger

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION:**

Applicant gave a courtesy presentation as it relates to the Camaisa Project, her project is directly adjacent to the Camaisa property. Lonberger is assisting the Roberts's with their remodeling and coordinating with the Camaisa's. The project adds about 4,000 sq ft to the residence. An orchard will add some screening. RS-1-2 zone. Has a historic designation for the builder/owner. Lot coverage is 16%.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Hayes:** Can you describe some details of the walls around the two properties? *There will be perimeter walls. All the wall heights are not yet final; they could be 10 ft to 6-10 ft. Part in setback, talks in progress with City for solution.*

**Collins:** What are the setbacks? **15.4 ft, 11 ft**

**Please provide For FINAL REVIEW:**

1. Will the 10 ft high South wall have view corridor issues? Please articulate the wall.
2. Detail elevations
3. Detail materials used
4. Provide a Landscape plan (depending on features, you may not want orchard)
5. Consider articulating the long straight walls
6. Please provide an outline, street scene, of the houses on each side with the proposed house (photosimulation OK, but not requested).
7. Detail of flat roof, treatments of roof
8. Is there a View Corridor required or established?

**9. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 10/16/12**

Project Name: **GIRARD AVENUE MIXED USE**

7610 Girard Avenue

Permits: CDP

Project #: PO# 274439

DPM: John Fisher 619-446-5231

Zone: RS-1-2

jfisher@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Ashley Prikosovits 858-527-0818

Beth Reiter 858-232-4580

Scope of Work:

A Coastal Development Permit and Map Waiver application to waive the requirements of a Tentative Map to construct eight residential condominium units and one 5,125 square foot commercial condominium unit on a vacant 0.27 acre site at 7610 Girard Avenue in Zone 1 of La Jolla Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan in Council District 1

**Presenters:** Phil Quatrino  
Ashley Prikosovits

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION:**

They will be presenting their Project to LJ PDO.

Project includes 25 Spaces of subterranean parking from alley. They have established a parking agreement with Vons, to provide surplus parking. The 1<sup>st</sup> floor is commercial and the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is residential. Project consists of eight 2-story residential units of 1400 to 2600 sq ft each and contains two elevators.

**Collins:** Is that Vons employee parking? *We will have to show compliance to the City.*

**Liera:** colors may not be compatible with the PDO (dark brown)

**Collins:** PDO requires earth tones.

There will not be fenestrations on the alley wall next to Vons. As there will be noise from deliveries at all hours.

**Please provide For FINAL REVIEW:**

1. Please bring samples of stucco, wood-like material
2. Please bring documents showing parking agreements.
3. Please bring a parking study, including how Vons parking is affected.

# La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee Minutes

Tuesday October 23, 2012

**Committee members in attendance:** Helen Boyden (chair), Janie Emerson, Tim Lucas, Phil Merten, Myrna Naegle, John Schenck. **Members absent:** Dede Donovan, Laura DuCharme Conboy.

## 1. Non-Agenda Public Comment -- None

## 2. Chair Comments

- The Vallecitos project was approved by the LJS AB 4-0 and by the LJCPA at its October meeting 8-5. See minutes when available.
- The Planning Commission voted unanimously that several of the findings for an SDP for the year - round seal rope could not be met.
- The LJS AB voted to recommend approval of the Abelkop residence on Rue Denise.
- LJS AB agendas have an official posting URL of:  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/lajolla/pddoab.shtml>
- The Viterbi project will not be heard until a future meeting: soil reports and cycle not done
- Sierra Mar project may be coming to committee for review
- December meeting would fall on December 25, so committee will have to select another date for the meeting. Two possibilities are Dec 17 or Dec 19. Dec 17 the meeting would have to end by 5:45pm due to room scheduling. After some committee discussion, December 19 looks like the better date. Boyden will check with the absent committee members and see if the date works for them.
- The November meeting falls on Nov 27, the Tuesday after Thanksgiving.

## 3. Project review

**A. McIlvaine (Landa) Residence – 8415 Ave. de las Ondas**

**B. Gaxiola Residence –2414 Calle del Oro**

**C. Lambert Felice Residence --2382 Via Capri Court**

### A. McIlvaine (Landa) Residence

- PROJECT NUMBER: 282104
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 8415 Avenida de las Ondas
- PROJECT MANAGER: Paul Godwin; 619-446-5190; [pgodwin@sandiego.gov](mailto:pgodwin@sandiego.gov)
- OWNER'S REP: William S. Hayer; 858-792-2800; [bhayer@hayerarchitecture.com](mailto:bhayer@hayerarchitecture.com)

**Project Description:** CDP and SDP to demolish an existing 2,484 sf SFR, garage and pool. Construct new 2-story 7830 sf 4 bedroom SFR (incl. 113 sf from 3242 sf partial basement ) on a 25,757 sf lot. Includes garage, new pool with wine grotto & exercise pavilion, new site retaining walls and associated landscape features [applicant] Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit and Campus Parking Impact Zones.

**Previous LJSPRC Action;** see August 28<sup>th</sup> PRC minutes for full comments and details

**Motion: Schenck; second: Naegle**

Continue this item to a future meeting. The committee would like to see the proposed parking plan after review by the city.

**Motion carries: 3-1-2;** approve: Lucas, Naegle, Schenck; oppose: Emerson; abstain: Boyden (chair), Conboy (did initial consulting on project)

**Presented by: William Hayer**

The City did not accept the back & fill parking scheme in the garage, so they would be 1 short of the 5 required in the Campus Parking Impact Zone. In response they have eliminated 1 bedroom and now have 4 total, so the parking requirement drops to 2, which they meet. They converted the guest suite bedroom to a media room and expanded the game room and opened up access to what was an en-suite bathroom. Neither of these qualify as a bedroom as they have a “non-conventional opening” to the rooms, and the city has reviewed the change and agreed. The street right of way easement at the east of the property has been vacated, so there are no issues with locating the proposed house to the back of the lot as shown in the plans.

**Emerson disclosure:** At the last meeting there were some drainage concerns for this street that impact houses (including hers) on La Jolla Shores Drive. She discussed the impacts with the architects and the current plan lessens the runoff being discharged. She no longer has concerns with this aspect of the project.

**Hayer:** There are two drainage issues: the drainage from houses above that collects into a swale and drainage from the site itself. Analysis by their hydrologist shows that the drainage plan for the site itself will discharge less water onto Ave de las Ondas than is presently being discharged. They will collect the water at the west portion of the lot and it will be drained onto the cul-de-sac via a through curb drainage system. Due to water percolating down into the large grassy areas on the lot they will reduce the amount of drainage being discharged.

For the drainage from uphill, there is a concrete swale that goes across several properties upslope, including this property, and feeds into a storm drain on Calle del Oro. There is a pipe from the upslope properties that drains into the swale at the north east side of the property. There is no easement or agreement for this, but they will continue to accept the drainage. The swale will be eliminated on their property and a drainage pipe that connects with the upslope drain pipe will be utilized to move the water across the property underground, to the swale at the west side of the property. There is a french drain at the retaining wall at the back of the lot that will collect water overflow water from above and feed into the site drainage scheme.

**Merten:** It is legal and normal for water to drain downslope onto other properties. However it is not usual for this water to be collected and discharged onto another property without an agreement. **Jennifer McIlvaine (owner):** We decided to not go through legal proceedings on this issue and just to handle it with the proposed design. The system was put in illegally years ago by previous owners.

**Lucas:** So for clarification, you are going to handle this discharge in an underground pipe and then bring it back to the surface and feed it to the swale at the south end of the property. **Hayer:** Yes the adjoining property will daylight the water into the swale at the property line.

**Public Comment**

**Gail Forbes:** There is a storm drain, down the street that they might be able to tie into. On the west side of property there is an SDGE easement. Do they know about the plans for undergrounding of the cables?

**Response:** Don't know; that is up to SDGE.

**Motion:** Merten **Second:** Schenck

The findings can be made for a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit based on plans dated 5-10-2012 but presented today October 23, 2012 with bedrooms reduced from five to four with no change in footprint.

**Motion carries 5-0-1**

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

## B. Gaxiola Residence –

- PROJECT NUMBER: 207195
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 2414 Calle Del Oro
- Project Manager: Morris Dye: mdye@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Grisel Cedillo ; griselcedillo@yahoo.com; Victor Gutierrez; victor.guti2@gmail.com

**Project Description**–SDP and CDP to demolish existing 1-story 3,178 sf residence and construct a new 2-story 11,696 sf residence (of which 4,744 is phantom floor) with 4 bedrooms, 7 bathrooms and 2 car garage plus 3 in driveway, attached guest quarters, swimming pool and retaining walls on a 29,120 sf lot.

**Previous PRC action:** August 2010-please see minutes on line at [http://www.lajollacpa.org/minutes/prc10\\_0824min.pdf](http://www.lajollacpa.org/minutes/prc10_0824min.pdf)

### **Motion: Morton; second: Lucas**

To continue item to a future meeting

The committee would like to see **the following items presented:**

- **A drainage plan showing the swale and the drainage pattern proposed**
- **Bring a site plan** drawing that shows the outlines of building on adjacent properties
- Show additional on site **parking spaces and guest parking spaces on the site plan**
- Bring the 300' **neighborhood** setback survey that is required by the City
- Re-label the cross sections **of the building** to match with plan
- Show a grading plan with the existing and proposed **site** contours and drainage **pattern**
- Provide a **site grading** plan that would adequately address offsite drainage from upslope properties and to the downslope neighbors below
- **Show drainage devices to channel and control the flow and route it to the curb or storm drain system**
- Show the existing house outline overlaid with the current proposed project. **on the site plan**
- **Request that the applicant provide a title report with a schedule B attachment - which will show all easements on the property**

**Motion carries: 5-0-1;** approve: Furtek, Lucas, Merten, Morton, D. Naegle; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

**Previous PRC Action, September 25, 2012. See PRC minutes for full details.**

### **Motion: Emerson; second: Conboy**

To continue item to a future meeting. Provide full presentation of the project and a materials board. Provide 300' setback survey.

**Motion carries: 6-0-1; approve:** Conboy, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Naegle, Schenck; **Abstain:** Boyden (chair). (Donovan left during discussion)

### **Chair report:**

A letter was presented to the committee from the Boyntons, neighbors that could not be present at this review. They and other neighbors met with the Gaxiola representatives. They were happy with the house being placed more towards the rear of the lot and the pool is moved back enough so there should not be any privacy issues with their bedrooms and guest rooms. The drainage concerns appear to have been addressed. Letter is included as part of public record.

**Presented by: Grisel Cedillo & Luis Gutierrez**

The two-story house will be built on the same level pad as the existing home, (The present house sits 1-story on the pad.) There are 4 bedrooms on the main level (second floor) plus guest quarters with only outside entrance on the first floor. The garage and equipment room is also on the first floor. Because there is no direct access from the main house to the lower guest room, it is considered as a separate space for the parking requirements. They are required to have 2 spaces from the main house, plus 1 for the guest room (instead of 5 that would be required in Campus Parking Impact Zone if guest room was part of main house). Parking spaces provided are 2 in garage (plus 1 tandem not part of the count) and 3 spaces in the driveway. There is a significant amount of phantom space under the main house (second story), that is being counted in the FAR calculations, which if included would be around 0.4, without it counting the living space is 0.28. They will be retaining the drainage swale at the back of the property (east) that drains to a storm drain on Calle del Oro. In addition, there will be a second drainage system installed at the downslope (west) edge of the property that will drain into a different storm drain on Calle del Oro. This should address the drainage and flooding problems that the downslope neighbors have reported over the years.

**Lucas:** Unsure of the comment about the pad being the same? **Gutierrez:** The lot will be excavated to the east towards the slope at the same level as the current house pad, and the house will be built on that. **Merten:** Essentially what they are doing is putting up retaining walls at the first-floor level and filling most of that in except for the pool and guest room, and then building the house on the second level.

**Boyden:** How do you get to the guest quarters? **Gutierrez:** Access is around the east of the house. The easiest way is from the patio at the back of the main house and you walk around and down to the lower level.

**Naegle:** Do you have pictures or a street scene of the adjacent houses? It would be really helpful to see the compatibility of the proposed structure with the neighborhood. **Gutierrez:** No, I don't have that.

**Merten:** It would be helpful to have an elevation with the swimming pool wall shown, so we could see what this will look like from below. The wall is 8' high. On the plans you show 4,744 sq ft of phantom space, but on the main level you are showing habitable space of 4,900'. **Gutierrez:** They have included the terrace and the patios in the phantom space calculation, which brings the calculation up. **Merten:** The retaining walls at the front are 8' high, plus another 4 feet to the lowest part of the lot, so it makes the wall effectively look 12' high. On other projects in the neighborhood the retaining walls were broken into 2 parts to minimize the effect of the mass of the wall. Initially he was concerned, but since they are finishing this retaining wall with the same materials as the other walls of the project, it becomes more of an architectural element of the house. The setback to the property line with the downslope neighbor is much greater than the setback from the neighbor to the property line. **Gutierrez:** They had a discussion with that neighbor who was more concerned with the noise of the pool than the height of the retaining wall. Since they have increased the setback to the pool, the neighbors were OK with the project. **Merten:** Even counting the phantom area behind the retaining walls, the FAR is only around 0.4, which is compatible with the neighborhood.

A committee discussion ensued regarding the many styles of houses in the neighborhood, to the conclusion that it was a very eclectic neighborhood.

**Materials samples were presented to the committee:** Earth toned slate, white/gray gravel asphalt tile roof, off-white stucco, earthy tile for pavement, travertine tile for interior. The physical materials presented were less stark than the white and gray in the rendering—being gray-brown variegated slate and a creamy color stucco.

**Prop D/ 30' height measurements:** The maximum is 29' 6" for chimney (sticks up 4' from house). Wood-burning fireplace. Most of house is 22'.

**Boyden:** Have you considered undergrounding the power lines at the front of the house as mentioned in 2010?

**Gutierrez:** That is a possibility, they will have to talk with the neighbors and see how much it would cost and would be willing to share costs.

**Public Comment:**

**Jennifer McIlvaine:** Owns the house directly to the north. Is interested in how the house is oriented towards the back of the lot. Would like to see an elevation of what she will see? **Gutierrez:** An elevation was shown. Basically, the wall is stucco and the guest suite will be hidden due to the greenery. The existing trees will remain.

**William Hayer (McIlvaine architect):** Finished floor elevation on the upper level? Gutierrez: 99.5 fsl. (3' lower than McIlvaine first floor). Parapet at that end is 111 fsl, which is 9' above McIlvaine first floor. **Hayer:** Is concerned that the roof tiles look a little white and reflective from the houses above. Could like this be toned down? **Gutierrez:** They can use different colors of sand to tone down the roof, which will be hot mopped with gravel on top.

**Gail Forbes:** Lists houses and types for the neighborhood in response to Naegle question about neighborhood character.

**Landscape plan shown:** 5 western redbud trees will be planted in the front which will reach a maximum of 10' high. Most existing trees will be kept.

**Schenck:** This house will read a lot bigger than shown on the elevations, when compared from the neighborhood ranch style houses. Would have liked to have seen a street scene to show how this project fits into the neighborhood.

**Gail Forbes:** Is concerned with the height of the house. The chimney is at 29', so the house must be 25', which is a big tall building. There are other 2-story houses in the neighborhood, so it would be hard to argue that this is not in keeping with the neighborhood. However, this is in a prominent location, visible from 3 directions, and will be a statement house. She hopes that it will be a good statement architecturally.

**Motion: Emerson; second: Naegle**

Findings can not be made for a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit. The house is so different from those in the neighborhood it is not compatible and destroys the architectural unity of the area.

**Discussion on motion:**

**Lucas:** This house does sit back 51' from the street at the closest point, which is the pool.

**Schenck:** This is a bulky house, but the colors chosen make it blend in so it will work in this neighborhood.

**Emerson:** Feels it is not about the colors, but that this house is so different from the adjacent properties, that it is not compatible with the neighborhood.

**Merten:** Can't support the motion. The white stucco material on the house is similar to the house above it, and there is another house nearby that has a light stucco material. From a materials standpoint it is similar to the neighbors. The difference is that the proposed house has a flat roof on it, but it is broken up into several pieces, so the scale of the elements is not different from the houses in the area. It does read as two stories from the street. This is a sloping lot and there is a large differential from the lower to upper part of the lot. The project is different from the neighborhood, but not so different as to be incompatible.

**Motion fails: 2-3-1**

Approve: Emerson, Naegle; oppose: Lucas, Merten, Schenck; abstain: Boyden (chair)

**Schenck:** Could the house be located lower into the lot? **Gutierrez:** They are below the coastal height limit. The present house chimney is at 23', and they are proposing 29.6'. Does not see any need to change the design.

**Motion: Merten; second: Schenck**

The findings can be made for a Site Development Permit and a Coastal Development Permit based on plans dated July 22, 2012 and presented today with square footage corrected to 11,696 including 4,744 sf phantom floor..

### **Discussion on the motion**

**Lucas:** The McIlvaine house that we just approved is next door to this and is a 2-story house, it's just not a modern style. It would be hard not to approve this project.

**Emerson:** Yes, but the McIlvaine house backs further into the hill and doesn't stick out as much.

**Boyden:** We also approved the 2-story Casa Belmonte project which is 2-doors north of McIlvaine.

**Emerson:** But all those on Ave de las Ondas back into the hill and are not on a well traveled street.

### **Motion carries: 3-2-1**

Approve: Lucas, Merten, Schenck; oppose: Emerson, Naegle; abstain: Boyden

### **C. Lambert Felice Residence –**

- PROJECT NUMBER: 288444
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 2382 Via Capri Court
- Project Manager: Paul Godwin; 619- 446-5190; pgodwin@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Scott Spencer; scottspencerarchitect@yahoo.com

Project Description: SDP and CDP for a 702 sf first-floor addition and a 580 sf garage addition to an existing 4,204 sf SFR on a 13,250 sf site. Coastal (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, 300 foot Brush Management Buffer Zones.

### **Previous PRC Action, September 25, 2012. See PRC minutes for full details.**

**Motion:** Naegle; **second:** Merten

Continue the item to a future meeting. Bring updated plans with the correct visibility triangles for both driveways and detail for the driveway gate on Via Capri shown. Overlay proposed Via Capri wall on elevations.

**Motion carries: 6-0-1; approve:** Conboy, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Naegle, Schenck; **abstain:** Boyden (chair)

### **Presented by Scott Spencer:**

The plans have been changed but not submitted to the city. The changes are minor, dealing mainly with the visibility triangles and the walls in front. The modified plans with the visibility triangles were shown. There will be nothing higher than 30" in the visibility zones. The visibility triangle areas impact the project in several ways: the walls along Via Capri have to be pushed back along driveway for visibility triangle requirements. The wall at the corner of the property at Via Capri and Via Capri Court has to be pushed back to provide visibility per City requirements. The gate for the existing garage access is pushed back 20' from property line and 10' from the street, so there is room for a car to pull into while the gate is opening. They have not decided on the actual gate design yet, as they have to work out the best design for the sloping lot and limited space. It will probably be a gate that opens in the middle and moves parallel to the wall, rather than a swinging-style gate.

With regards to the geotechnical and soils issues, they contacted the city planner Paul Godwin and he said that the city missed this issue and that a geotechnical report is required. Jim Quinn at the City reviewed their geo report and made comments on issues. They (Spencer) then contacted their experts at Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. for a response. This report, dated today will be submitted to the city after this meeting. The City identified two areas of concern as this is in a geological hazard area. Part of this area is fill, and the house footings will need to be inspected and deepened/reinforced if necessary. The city engineers will inspect and review the footings from a structural and geological standpoint and make changes if needed. These will be shown on the construction drawings and as a condition of their permit. The geological report also shows that there is an



existing fault on the east of the property away from house that doesn't impact their project. GEI states that in their opinion "no geotechnical or geologic conditions exist on the subject property that would preclude the approval of the project and construction of the proposed additions, provided the recommendations in our report are followed." Their soils engineer did say that the City may ask them to sign a liability waiver which is a standard practice these days. Report is included as part of public record.

**Emerson:** There are 3 houses on Via Rialto that have issues with stability and faulting.

**Lucas:** You have plans that need to be re-submitted to the city and a soils report that needs to be re-submitted to the city, is that correct? **Spencer:** Yes.

**Emerson:** Do we need to wait for these to be re-submitted? **Merten:** Doesn't think so. A geotechnical analysis is outside of our purview. **Spencer:** The view triangle annotations are minor as was the change in the gate. These were made at the request of this committee and the city engineers, so everyone is on the same page.

**Merten:** With the changes made to the visibility triangles and the visibility at the corner, the wall in front is now very prominent from the street. The sloping wall with cornice decor is at an angle that is different from the cornices on the roof. Have they considered breaking up the wall into smaller horizontal sections that will mimic the house cornices? **Spencer:** They can look at this. It may be possible to do, but there is a significant slope to the wall. A committee discussion arose at this point on various ways to make this work and blend in better with the neighborhood.

**Public comment:**

**Gail Forbes:** There will be a lot of headlight traffic flashing onto this structure at night. **Spencer:** That was the idea of having a 6' wall similar to other walls in the neighborhood. The idea was to increase security, privacy and cut down on noise and light.

**Motion: Naegle; second: Emerson**

The findings can be made for a Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for the project as presented with plans dated October 23, 2012 and a letter from Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. dated 10-23-2012.

**Motion carries: 5-0-1**

Approve: Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Naegle, Schenck; Oppose; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

**La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Board: Minutes of Meeting, October 25th, 2012**

**Attendance:** Todd Lesser LJSA, Michelle Fulks BRCC, Keith Kelman LJVMA, Tom Brady LJVMA, Patrick Ryan BRCC, Orrin Gabsch LJCPA, Earl Van Inwegen LJTC

**Absent:** Dan Courtney LJCPA, John Kassar LJSA, Rob Hildt LJTC

**Voting Agenda Items**

1. **La Jolla Christmas Parade and Holiday Festival** – Applicant is requesting approval for their annual holiday parade and festival –Sunday Dec. 2<sup>nd</sup>. – Street Closure Motion: Keith Kelman – Second Michelle Fulks Vote 7 approve, 0 against
2. **Valet 7979 Ivanhoe**–Amaya restaurant is requesting a valet parking permit – Denied tie vote. Motion to approve with conditions. 1 Year approval, Applicant come back to LJTT for renewal. Signage to say Open to Public. – Tom Brady, Second Earl Van Inwegen Vote: 3 approve - 3 deny. 1 abstention.
3. **Two 15 minute parking spots at 1026 Wall Street.** - Applicant not in attendance. No vote.

## **FY2014 Capital Improvement Program - La Jolla Community Plan Area Projects Submitted at October 4<sup>th</sup> LJCPA Hearing**

### **Parks & Recreation**

1. Coast Boulevard Sidewalk Improvements at Children's Pool  
*(Restore and enhancement of last remaining segment, endorsed by LJCPA in March 2012)*
2. Coast Walk Parking Feasibility Study  
*(Restoration of up to 6 parking spaces on Coast Walk. Endorsed by LJCPA, Oct 2011 and by LJTC, Dec 2011)*
3. Scripps Park Restoration  
*(Restoration of Scripps Park as detailed in the 2009 plan)*
4. South Coast Boulevard Park (2008 plan)  
*(Enhancement of park and walking path along Coast Boulevard from Climbing Wall to its southerly end. AKA "Jim Neri Plan". AKA Cuvier Park, Hospital Point & Wedding Bowl.)*

### **Transportation**

1. Torrey Pines Road Corridor – Phase 1 (CIP S00877, S00613)  
*(Remove barriers in the north sidewalk from the Throat to the Village (LJCPA, Jul 2011); hillside slope stabilization on south side between Roseland and Calle Juela)*
2. Torrey Pines Road Corridor – Phase 2  
*(Segment 4 improvements as approved by LJCPA, Jul 2011)*
3. Torrey Pines Road Corridor – Phase 3  
*(Segments 1, 2 & 3 pursuant to the City of San Diego's 2011 Torrey Pines Road Preliminary Project Plan)*
4. Sidewalks on at least one side of major roads  
*(CIP Project S00928 addresses gap E side of La Jolla Mesa Rd S of Deerhill Ct, construction slated for 2014)*  
*Possibilities:*  
*\* La Jolla Mesa Drive from La Jolla Scenic Drive South to La Jolla Rancho Rd, possibly continue to Muirlands Drive, one side only*  
*\* La Jolla Rancho Road from La Jolla Scenic South to La Jolla Mesa Drive*
5. Sidewalk at Rock Park (aka La Jolla Hermosa Park)  
*(Connect sidewalks on W side of Chelsea Avenue S of Cam de la Costa, not previously voted on by LJCPA)*
6. Traffic Circle, Chelsea Avenue at Midway Avenue  
*(Replace 4-way stop with traffic circle, not previously voted on by LJCPA or T&T or BRCC)*
7. Street Repairs *(Locations not specified)*
8. Pedestrian Bridge over Torrey Pines Road  
*(Exact location not yet identified but in the vicinity of Amalfi/Hillside. Not previously voted on by LJCPA or LJSA)*
9. Additional Street Lights on Fay Avenue  
*(Exact blocks not yet determined. Not previously voted on by LJCPA or LJVMA)*