



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

Thursday, 4 April 2013

D R A F T AGENDA – REGULAR MEETING

6:00p

1. Welcome and Call To Order: **Tony Crisafi**, President
2. Adopt the Agenda
3. **Elections**
 - A. Certify Election
 - B. Recognition of Outgoing Trustees – **Councilmember Sherri Lightner**
 - C. Swearing in of newly elected trustees – **Councilmember Sherri Lightner**
4. **Election of Officers**
 - A. President
 - B. Vice President
 - C. Secretary
 - D. Treasurer
5. **Meeting Minutes Review and Approval: 7 March 2013**
6. **Elected Officials Report** – Information Only
 - A. Council District 1 – Councilmember Sherri Lightner
Rep: **Erin Demorest**, 619.236.7762, edemorest@sanidiego.gov
7. **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/>
8. **Non-Agenda Items for Trustee Discussion**

Issues not on the agenda and *within LJCPA jurisdiction*, two (2) minutes or less.
9. Officer's Reports
 - A. **Secretary**
 - B. **Treasurer**

10. President's Report

- A.** Revised Oversized Vehicle Ordinance is coming to the Land Use and Housing Committee was on Wednesday, March 27
The proposed pilot program to restrict the parking of oversized vehicles on city streets would only encompass an area west of I-5, north of Downtown, south of Del Mar, and a portion of the City east of the I-5 across from Mission Bay. (This includes the entire La Jolla Community Planning Area.) See Neighborhood Parking Protection and Safety Ordinance for more information: http://docs.sandiego.gov/ccagenda_luh/l130327.pdf
- B.** Bernate Ticino CEQA appeal hearing – April 30th @ 2p, City Council Chambers
Applicant postponed April LJ CPA hearing (3/25/13)
- C.** Costebelle Residence – project was presented with roof modifications to a true 3:12 pitch. LJAB recommended approval of the amendment on 3/19/13 5-0-0. Hearing Officer approved the amendment on 3/20/13.
- D.** Volunteers for subcommittees – appointments will be ratified at May CPA meeting.
- E.** Costebelle Residence - Confirm April 4th, 2013 appeal of Hearing Officer Decision (April 4, 2013 appeal deadline) – Possible Action Item

11. 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, 4p

A. Huckins Residence

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit to construct a 3,818 sq ft, two-story, above basement, single family residence on a 7,000 sq ft vacant lot located at 1545 Virginia Way. 7-0-1

1545 Virginia Way - Sustainable Expedite Program (process 2) Coastal Development Permit to construct a 3,818 sq ft, two-story, above basement, single family residence on a 7,000 sq ft vacant lot.

B. Feinswog Residence

DPR Action: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a three-story, 5,524 sq. ft. single-family residence, with detached four car garage, with pool cabana and lot line adjustment, located at 1250 Rhoda Dr. 7-0-1

1250 Rhoda Dr.- La Jolla Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a three-story, 5,542 square foot single-family residence with detached four car garage with pool cabana and lot line adjustment

C. Morreale Residence

DPR Action: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit to construct a 700 square foot detached guest quarters, on a 0.20-acre site containing a single-family residence located at 1644 Crespo Drive. 7-0-1

1644 Crespo Dr. - A Coastal Development Permit to construct a 700 square-foot, detached guest quarters, on a 0.20-acre site containing a single family residence

D. T-Mobile – Hotel La Jolla SCR

PRC Action: This project meets the criteria for a Substantial Conformance Review. 4-0-1

7955 La Jolla Shores Drive - Replacement of all six panel antennas with new 4 G antennas for an existing wireless communication facility. No modifications are proposed to the existing equipment

located on Hotel La Jolla formerly Summer House Inn in the LJSPD-V. Previously approved under Permit No. 452123 on May 21, 2007 with an expiration of May 21, 2017.

12. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADVISORY COMMITTEES - Information only

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

B. COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE – Meets 4th Tues, 7p, 9192 Topaz Way

13. Revised Medical Marijuana Ordinance - Action Item

March 2011 - the City Council adopted a medical marijuana ordinance that limited dispensaries to industrial zones and didn't allow dispensaries in most areas in District 1

Medical marijuana activists gathered signatures to force a referendum on the issue. The City Council voted to rescind the ordinance rather than putting it on a citywide ballot.

The Mayor's office has drafted a revised medical marijuana ordinance which would allow for dispensaries in several areas of District 1. Mayor's ofc. is tentatively planning to bring it to the City Council for approval on Monday, April 22 at 2 p.m

CPA Action (DEC 2009): Motion to deny acceptance of the report: "Recommendations from the Medical Marijuana Task Force," based on the provision regarding distance requirements, does not allow sufficient distance between dispensaries, ("Distance Requirements to be placed on dispensing collectives and cooperatives") 9-2-1

14. La Jolla Half Marathon- Action Item

Kiwanis Club of La Jolla is requesting street closures for the annual La Jolla Half Marathon

T&T Action (MAR 2013): none – no quorum

15. The Center for World Music - Action Item

The Center for World Music is requesting approval for their event on May 11th at Ellen Browning Scripps Park.

T&T Action (MAR 2013): none – no quorum

**Time
Certain:
9:30p**

16. Adjourn to next Regular Monthly Meeting, May 2nd, 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: 1st Thursday of the Month
La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street

Thursday, 7 March 2013

DRAFT MINUTES – ANNUAL MEETING

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

Absent: Dan Allen, Orrin Gabsch.

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

2. Verify Quorum (Need 20% of total Membership required)
43 members present out of total 177 membership; quorum present

3. Adopt the Agenda

Approved Motion: Motion to adopt the Agenda, (Fitzgerald/Collins, 14-0-1).

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

Abstain: Crisafi.

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

Mary Soriano: LJ Town Council elections. Invites us to become LJTC Members, enabling us to vote for Board, on or before Tuesday, March 12.

Shona McArthur: Concerned about the oversized AT&T boxes. Photographs shown, Via del Norte. Need to control size and location.

5. Officer's Reports

A. Treasurer

Assistant treasurer, **Trustee Fitzgerald**, gave the Treasurer's report. February Beginning Balance: \$235.72 + Income \$240.02 – Expenses \$90.66= March Beginning Balance: \$385.08. Income came from collection at the monthly meeting, sales of meeting CDs and reimbursement for document production in a legal action; expenditures included agenda printing, and telephone.

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.

B. Secretary

Trustee Costello, substituting for absent Secretary Dan Allen, stated that if one wants his or her attendance recorded today, he or she can sign-in at the back of the room. There are two sign-in lists: one for LJCPA members and one for non-members. LJCPA is a membership organization open to La Jolla residents, property owners and local businesspersons at least 18 years of age. By providing proof of attendance you maintain membership and become 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, copies of which are available at the sign-in table, from the Secretary and on-line at our website: www.lajollacpa.org. Persons are entitled to have attendance recorded without signing-in, and such case must provide the Secretary before the end of the meeting a piece of paper with printed full name, signature and a statement asking attendance be recorded.

6. Proposed Bylaw Amendments – Action item

Whether to accept the committees 27 January draft bylaw revisions which concern Section VIII, on the subject of project and environmental document review and appeal and corrections required to update committee titles.

Vice President LaCava explained the proposed amendments. The revisions apply only Bylaws Article VI, Section 2, part B(3)a(iii), Article VII, Sections 4 through 7, and Article VIII, Sections 1, 5, 6 & 7. These sections are reproduced as follows. Changes from the previously adopted Bylaws are indicated by vertical lines in the left-hand border. Deletions are in ~~red-strikeout~~ type and additions are in blue double-underline type.

ARTICLE VI LJCPA Trustee Duties; Meetings and Committees

Section 2. B. Committees

(3) COMMUNITY JOINT COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

a. COMMUNITY JOINT COMMITTEE

(iii) PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE (PDO) COMMITTEE: The Trustees of the LJCPA shall appoint three Members of the LJCPA to serve on the PDO Committee. The purpose of the PDO Committee is to insure uniform and consistent enforcement of the La Jolla Planned District Ordinance (LJPDO), to assist the City of San Diego City in clarifying the LJPDO, to assist applicants in understanding and interpreting the LJPDO and the permit process, and to develop recommendations for changes to the ordinance. The PDO Committee reviews and makes written monthly recommendations regarding all applications for ~~Coastal Development Permits~~ discretionary permits as well as sign permits and facade changes within the La Jolla Planned District to the LJCPA, the La Jolla Town Council, and local manager/advisory board of the Business Improvement District. This committee forwards its recommendations to the Development Permit Review Committee when associated with a discretionary permit under consideration by the DPR Committee otherwise direct to the LJCPA to enable the respective organizations to incorporate these recommendations in its review and public comment discussion. The PDO Committee holds regularly scheduled public meetings. The PDO Committee will normally consist of nine members, three appointed by the LJCPA, three appointed by the La Jolla Town Council and three appointed by local manager/advisory board of the Business Improvement District.

ARTICLE VII LJCPA Officers

Section 4. Second Vice President

In the absence of the Vice President, the Second Vice President shall perform all the duties and responsibilities of the Vice President.

Section ~~4~~5. Secretary

The Secretary shall verify that an individual applying for membership is an Eligible Member of the Community. The Secretary shall be responsible for the LJCPA's correspondence, attendance records, minutes and actions [including identification of those Trustees that constitute a quorum, those Trustees who vote on an action item, and those Trustees who abstain or recuse and the reasons], and shall assure that Trustees, LJCPA members and members of the public have access to this information. The Secretary may take on these responsibilities or may identify individuals to assist in these duties.

Section ~~5~~6. Treasurer

The Treasurer shall be responsible for general supervision of the financial affairs of the LJCPA and shall make regular financial reports to the Board of Trustees and Members. The Treasurer shall also be responsible for filing all financial reports and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed.

Section ~~6~~7. Community Planners Committee Representative

The President shall be the LJCPA's representative to the Community Planners Committee (CPC). However, by vote of the Trustees, a Trustee other than the President may be selected as the official representative to CPC with the same voting rights and privileges as the President. Designation of a Trustee other than the President as the official representative, as well as for an alternate to CPC, shall be forwarded in writing to the staff representative of CPC prior to extension of voting rights and member attendance. The LJCPA representatives to CPC shall promptly disseminate to all Trustees pertinent information regarding CPC's official business.

ARTICLE VIII LJCPA Policies and Procedures, Community Participation

Section 1. Policies

The LJCPA Bylaws incorporate policies and procedures contained in City of San Diego ~~directed by Articles I through VII of Council Policy 600-24. These Bylaws also contain some policies and procedures recommended in Article VIII of Council Policy 600-24.~~ Additional policies and procedures are found in Council Policy 600-24 Administrative Guidelines and Election Handbook, listed as attachments to these Bylaws. Where there is a conflict between these Bylaws, Council Policy 600-24, the Administrative Guidelines and the Election Handbook, these Bylaws shall prevail.

Section 5. Circumstances in which the Appeal Procedures Apply

The LJCPA may appeal any contrary decision. The LJCPA Appeal Procedures apply when there has been a City of San Diego decision (Staff, Process 2; Hearing Officer, Process 3; Planning Commission, Process 4) that is contrary to a LJCPA recommendation and/or finding. A "contrary decision" is defined as a city decision which is contrary to the recommendation or findings of the LJCPA or when the city decision is on a project/proposal that has been modified after an LJCPA recommendation of approval. Examples of contrary decisions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) The LJCPA recommends that a project be denied and the City approves the project.
- (2) The LJCPA determines that findings cannot be made and the City disagrees.
- (3) An environmental document is certified by the City that the LJCPA believes should not have been certified.

Section 6. Procedures for Appeal of Adverse Decisions

- (1) The following provisions pertain to a potential appeal of any contrary decision.
- (2) When an applicant initially contacts the LJCPA regarding review of his/her project by the LJCPA, the President or the appropriate Review Committee Chairperson shall notify the applicant of the LJCPA's Policy to appeal a contrary decisions by the City. The notification should emphasize the LJCPA's ability to appeal the City's decision, including to the highest levels of City government in accordance with the provisions of the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC). The purpose of such notification is to persuade the applicant to consider the concerns of the LJCPA in an effort to fully comply with all applicable provisions of the SDMC, the La Jolla Community Plan, Land Use Plan and Local Coastal Program and all other applicable rules and regulations.

(3) Should the Trustees vote to recommend to DENY a requested permit(s), and/or the 'required findings cannot be made for the requested permit(s),' the President will offer the project applicant the option to revise and re-submit the project design drawings for further consideration by the LJCPA.

(4) The President shall request that a hearing or staff decision by the City on the requested permit(s) occur not more than 10 days nor less than 4 days before a regularly scheduled monthly meeting of the LJCPA, so that should the City decide to approve the requested permit(s), the LJCPA will have an opportunity to consider and vote on whether or not to appeal the City's decision within the City's 10 day appeal period. The President shall inform the applicant that when the LJCPA has recommended DENIAL of a requested permit(s), that any decision by the City to 'Approve' such permit(s) made more than 10 days, or less than 4 days before a regularly scheduled monthly meeting of the LJCPA requires the President to file an appeal.

(5) If the City makes a contrary decision on a project or proposal, the Trustees shall consider whether or not to appeal the contrary decision to the next higher body at the next LJCPA meeting. With an affirmative vote by a majority of the Trustees, the LJCPA President shall appeal that decision to the next higher decision making body.

If the appeal period ends before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the LJCPA, the President shall file a timely appeal. Once filed, the President shall immediately distribute a copy of the appeal to the Trustees. An appeal filed in such a manner is not required to be brought to the Trustees for confirmation unless requested by a Trustee or the Applicant.

Section 7. Procedures for Appeal of Environmental Determination

When the LJCPA has voted to take exception to an Environmental Determination made by the City, and with an affirmative vote of a majority of the Trustees, and after all other project appeal rights have been exhausted, the LJCPA President shall appeal the Environmental Determination by the City to the next higher governmental body.

If the City issues a determination of exemption the Trustees shall consider whether or not to appeal that determination.

If the appeal period for the determination of exemption ends before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the LJCPA, the President is authorized to file an appeal based on the President's judgment after review of the project files and any joint community board hearings. Once filed, the President shall immediately distribute a copy of the appeal to the Trustees. An appeal filed in such a manner is required to be brought to the Trustees for confirmation.

Comments were made by **Bob Whitney, Helen Boyden, Julie Hamilton, Jean Simmons, Trustee Burstein** and **Trustee Little. Mr. Whitney** provided written alternate revised Bylaws.

Approved Motion: To approve the revised Bylaws as presented, (Burstein/Whittemore, 36-5-2)

7. Adjourn to Regular Monthly Meeting, at 6:38.



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

Thursday, 7 March 2013

DRAFT MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING

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

Absent: Dan Allen, Orrin Gabsch.

1. Welcome and Call To Order: Tony Crisafi, President, at 6:38 PM

2. Adopt the Agenda

Approved Motion: Motion to adopt the Agenda, (Fitzgerald/Zimmerman, 15-0-1).

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

Abstain: Crisafi.

3. Meeting Minutes Review and Approval – 7 February

Approved Motion: Motion to approve the Minutes of 7 February, (Collins/Fitzgerald, 13-1-2).

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

Opposed: Little.

Abstain: Crisafi, LaCava.

4. Elected Officials Report - Information Only

A. Council District 1 - Councilmember Sherri Lightner

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

Ms. Demorest reported pedestrian crossings in Bird Rock will be repaired starting 18 March, with some night work, noisy part between 9-11 PM. SANDAG is working on the North Coast Transit proposal with I-5 widening, and bike trail. Oversized vehicle ordinance will be heard end of March. Work in progress on Torrey Pines Rd. will provide improved drainage.

B. 39th District, California State Senate - State Senator Marty Block

Rep: Allison Don, 619.645.3133, allison.don@sen.ca.gov

Ms. Don introduced herself; left flyers.

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

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

Ms. Delouri said the Chancellor's Office has determined that the Venter Institute will have additional access off Expedition Way. They worked with Sherri Lightner's Office and the Mayor. Venter will be occupied in Oct. 2013.

General Public Comment

Mary Soriano announced the La Jolla Town Council elections; invites us to become LJTC Members, enabling us to vote for Board, on or before Tuesday, March 12.

Shona McArthur expressed concern about oversized AT&T boxes. Photographs were shown of boxes on Via del Norte; need to control size and location.

6. Non-Agenda Items for Trustee Discussion

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

Trustee Little presented a handout and made a presentation about height regulations and the difference with existing and proposed grade. **President Crisafi** expressed concern about the interpretation. **Trustee Conboy** noted the restrictions on height set by Proposition D are not flexible.

Trustee Burstein announced this was his last Meeting as a Trustee and thanked everyone for their volunteer efforts in madding La Jolla special.

Trustee Manno asked that required right hand turn on Torrey Pines Rd be on the April Agenda.

7. Officer's Reports

Reports were made at the Annual Meeting held earlier. There were no additional reports.

8. President's Report – Action Items where indicated

A. Annual Trustee Election – Voting closed at 7:00pm; results as soon as ballots are counted.

B. Letters

a. A letter sent to UCSD re: Venter Institute.

b. A letter was sent to the City Human Relations Committee on the subject of the Hillel project as discussed at last month's meeting.

C. Deviation request re: 1020 Prospect

Will not be heard until further notice; the applicant advises the project is on hold.

D. President Crisafi announced next month will be officer elections; he stated he intends to be a candidate for re-election as President.

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. Xiong Residence

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit for an 866 SF addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.24 acre site at 1553 Copa De Oro Drive. 8-1-0

1553 Copa De Oro Dr. - Coastal Development Permit for a 866 SF addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.24 acre site

B. Huckins Residence

DPR ACTION: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit to construct a 3,818 sq ft, two-story, above basement, single family residence on a 7,000 sq ft vacant lot located at 1545 Virginia Way. 7-0-1

1545 Virginia Way - Sustainable Expedite Program (process 2) Coastal Development Permit to construct a 3,818 sq ft, two-story, above basement, single family residence on a 7,000 sq ft vacant lot.

C. Trogen Enterprises Demolition

PRC Action: The findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) to demolish the current structure down to the slab, leaving the Torrey Pine trees intact, as presented. 6-0-1

7949 Lowry Terrace--Demolition of a 3,912 sf existing single family residence and two car garage on a 14,217 sf lot. Future redevelopment not decided as yet.

Tim Golba, architect, asked that his client's project, Huckins Residence, be continued, to the Consent Agenda on a later date. This will allow time for further negotiations with the neighbors.

Approved Motion: Motion

To accept the recommendation of the Development Permit Review Committee: (A) Xiong Residence: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit for an 866 sf addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.24 acre site at 1553 Copa De Oro Drive, and forward the recommendation to the City,

To accept the recommendation of the LJ Shores Permit Review Committee: (C) Trogen Enterprises Demolition: The findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) to demolish the current structure down to the slab, leaving the Torrey Pine trees intact, as presented, and forward the recommendations to the City,

(LaCava/Brady, 15-0-1).

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

Abstain: Crisafi.

10. Reports from Other Advisory Committees - Information only

A. Coastal Access and Parking Board - Meets 1st Tues, 5pm, La Jolla Recreation Center.

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

11. Bernate Ticino Residence – Action Item

Confirm February 7, 2013 appeal of CEQA Exemption (February 4, 2013 appeal deadline). Appeal was filed on February 4, 2013, a non-agendized vote was taken at Trustees' meeting February 7, 2013. Trustees are asked to discuss and vote on the appeal filed.

Preident Crisafi: The City Planner advised that we should notice the Appeal question, and take a second vote. Item #12 below should be published to explain the Item #11. **Bob Whitney:** asked why the CPA appeal was similar to the LJ Historical Society appeal. **Trustee Costello:** replied because of the complicated CEQA issues he recommended to the President that we have the help of an Attorney specializing in CEQA. Comments by: **Mrs Whittney, Julie Hamilton, Rob Whittemore, Michael Morton.**

Approved Motion: Motion to confirm the appeal the of the Bernate Ticino Residence project's CEQA exemption, (Manno/ Merten, 11-0-3).

In favor: Bond, Brady, Collins, Conboy, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Thorsen, Zimmerman.
Abstain: Burstein, Crisafi, LaCava.

12. Bernate Ticino Residence – Action Item

1328 Virginia Way - Sustainable Expedite Program (Process 2) CDP to construction a 4,918 sq ft, two story, above basement, single family residence with detached garage and guest quarters, on a 6,995 sq ft vacant lot. Appeal of CEQA Exemption – Feb. 4th deadline

DPR Action #A (Jan. 2013): To require the Applicant to apply for a Coastal Development Permit to demolish the previous structure at 1328 Virginia Way, and to return to La Jolla Development Permit Review as part of the review process and present CEQA and other environmental documentation. 8-0-1

DPR Action #B (Jan. 2013): Findings can not be made for a Coastal Development Permit for construction at 1328 Virginia Way. Specifically, the proposed project is not in conformity with the specified implementation program (ie the Municipal Code requirement for Coastal Development Permit for the demolition of the previous building). 8-0-1
CPA Action (Jan 2013): Pulled from Consent Agenda by Trustee LaCava.
CPA Action (Feb 2013): Presentation postponed by applicant.

Presentation again postponed by applicant (2/27/13).

13. Gaxiola Residence – Action Item

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 (parking in driveway), swimming pool and retaining walls on a 29,120 sf lot. Square footage includes extensive non-habitable space.

PRC Action (Oct. 2012): 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.
CPA Action (Feb 2013): Pulled from Consent Agenda by Myrna Nagle.

Applicant: Gricel Cedillo; presentation and handout by architect, **Michael Morton**.

Approved Motion: To approve the project and to recommend SDP and CDP to demolish existing 1-story 3,178 sf residence and construct a new 2-story 11,696 sf residence at 2414 Calle del Oro as presented; landscaping as shown on sheet A9.1 dated 7 March 2013, (Fitzgerald/LaCava, 9-6-1).

In favor: Brady, Collins, Conboy, Fitzgerald, LaCava, Manno, Merten, Thorsen.

Opposed: Bond, Burstein, Costello, Courtney, Little, Lucas, Zimmerman.

Abstain: Crisafi.

Trustee Election Results

Election Chair **Tim Lucas** presented the vote count to **President Crisafi**, who then announced the results:

Elected to three year terms: Patrick Ahern, Helen Boyden, Gail Forbes, Bob Steck, Ray Weiss and Frances O’Neill Zimmerman. Elected to a two-year term to fill a vacancy: Janie Emerson, and elected to a one-year term to fill a vacancy: Myrna Nagle. The number of ballots cast was 71.

President Crisafi announced that results can be challenged until Thursday, March 14, 5:00 pm. If no challenge, the ballots will be destroyed.

President Crisafi thanked Election Chair **Trustee Tim Lucas** for, once again, running a flawless election, and thanked all of the Community Members who graciously contributed their time assisting **Trustee Lucas**.

Trustees expressed their gratitude.

14. Pham Residence – Action Item

7411 Olivetas Street - Variance to reduce the required street sideyard setback for a 855 sq ft addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.05 acre site.

DPR ACTION (JAN 2013): Findings can be made for a Variance to reduce the required street sideyard setback from 10ft to 4 ft for a 855 sq ft addition to an existing single family residence at 7411 Olivetas St. 4-2-1
CPA Action (Feb 2013): Pulled from Consent Agenda by Trustee Zimmerman

Presentation by architect **Mark Mitchell**. **Carole Barin** commented.

Approved Motion: Findings can be made for a Variance to reduce the required street sideyard setback from 10ft to 4 ft for a 855 sq ft addition to an existing single family residence at 7411 Olivetas St., (Thorsen/Conboy, 8-6-2).

In favor: Brady, Burstein, Conboy, Costello, Fitzgerald, LaCava, Manno, Thorsen.

Opposed: Bond, Collins, Courtney, Little, Merten, Zimmerman.

Abstain: Crisafi, Lucas.

15. Install 2 hour parking signs on Glenwick Place and Glenwick Lane – Action Item

T & T Action (Jan 2013): Motion to approve 6-0-0

CPA Action (Feb 2013): Pulled from Consent Agenda by Vanessa Garcia

Presentation by **Dempsey Copeland**. Handout provided; comments **Jun Onaka**.

Approved Motion: To approve 2 hour parking signs on Glenwick Place and Glenwick Lane, (LaCava/Burstein, 12-0-3).

In favor: Bond, Brady, Burstein, Collins, Conboy, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, LaCava, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Thorsen.

Abstain: Crisafi, Little, Zimmerman.

16. Move two 15 minutes zones from Herschel to Prospect Street – Action Item

Jolla Village Merchant Association would like to have two 15 minute zones installed at their new location.

T & T Action (Jan 2013): Motion to approve the move. If possible, convert existing spaces on Herschel to diagonal parking. Two closest spaces to Prospect stay 15 minute green zone. 6-0-0.

CPA Action (Feb 2013): Pulled from Consent Agenda by Dan Courtney.

Approved Motion: To approve moving two 15 minutes zones from Herschel to Prospect Street, (LaCava/Thorsen, 12-3-1).

In favor: Bond, Brady, Collins, Conboy, Costello, Fitzgerald, LaCava, Little, Lucas, Manno, Merten, Thorsen.

Opposed: Burstein, Courtney, Zimmerman.

Abstain: Crisafi.

17. UCSD Hillel Center for Jewish Life Draft EIR response – Action Item

Consideration of response drafted by the Ad Hoc Committee on UCSD Hillel Center DraftEIR and submit to City of San Diego by March 11th. Comments on the Draft EIR are due by March 11th submittal deadline Project proposals are described in the following link: [City of San Diego Bulletin of Public Notices, CEQA Notices and Documents](#).

Proposed Motion read aloud by **Trustee Costello**. Comments by **Julie Hamilton, Maria Rothchild, Bob Whitney, Trustees Zimmerman, Little, Lucas, Merten, Fitzgerald** commented.

Approved Motion: regarding the Hillel Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR):

That the Hillel Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) is deficient and contains major errors and omissions regarding: 1) the proposed Hillel project's immediate and cumulative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood; and 2) the project's substantial, precedent-setting non-compliance with the La Jolla Shores PDO, the Municipal Code, and the La Jolla Community Plan. The LJCPA adopts the findings and conclusions of the Ad Hoc Com. Minutes and three attached letters. These deficiencies are documented in the attachments to this motion and include, but are not limited to the DEIR:

- **Ignoring that a student center is not an allowed use in a residential neighborhood.**
- **Ignoring the La Jolla and City-wide precedent that would be set by allowing a student center in a residential neighborhood—e.g., UCSD's website currently recognizes 60 spiritual student organizations on campus.**
- **Failing to consider possible alternative sites close to UCSD where the zoning would permit a student center.**
- **Failing to consider the impact of the soon-to-be-open Venter Institute in assessing the project's traffic impact—in fact, the new Venter Institute is not even mentioned in the DEIR.**
- **Failing to point-out the lack of required on-site parking spaces for Hillel's stated use for the project (i.e., a place of religious assembly) as well as failing to substantively address the associated loss of on-street parking in a Parking Impact Overlay Zone.**

- **Failing to provide findings to support the requested vacation of a public right-of-way.**
- **Failure to adequately consider the visual/community-character impacts of the proposed student center project on the surrounding residential homes and neighborhood, including:**
 - a) setbacks,
 - b) bulk and scale,
 - c) intensity of use,
 - d) noise.

Attachments:

- **Minutes of the LJCPA Ad Hoc Committee, which reviewed the Hillel DEIR.**
- **Phil Merten letter to the Ad Hoc Committee, dated 2/27/13, regarding the Hillel DEIR**
- **Ross M. Starr, Ph.D. letter to City of San Diego Development Services Department, dated 1/30/13, regarding the Hillel Center for Jewish Life (submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee).**
- **Julie Hamilton letter to the Ad Hoc Committee, dated 2/27/13, regarding the Hillel DEIR,**

(Little/Merten, 10-3-1).

In favor: Bond, Brady, Collins, Costello, Courtney, Fitzgerald, Little, Lucas, Merten, Thorsen.
Opposed: Burstein, LaCava, Zimmerman.
Abstain: Crisafi.

18. Adjourn, at 9:39 PM.

Next Regular Monthly Meeting, April 4th, 2013, 6:00 pm.

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE REPORT

For
March 2013

March 12 2013 Present: Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Merten (Chairman Pro Tem), Welsh
March 19 2013 Present: Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Grunow, Hayes, Kane, Liera, Welsh

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT 3/12/13

Welsh: Asks if the project on Ivanhoe is being constructed as approved.

Architect Horton said no changes were made.

Kane: Asked about the construction at 1760 Soledad Rd. (Is it Process 1? Is it in the Shores area?)

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT 3/19/13

Kane: Followed up on the construction at 1760 Soledad Ave with Chris Larson. It is being done by a ministerial permit. Paige Koopman said she is the Architect, they are mainly just adding a master bedroom, property line is OK

3. SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 3/19/13: As Chairman Benton was unable to attend, motion to appoint Mr. Merten Chair Pro Tem.

(Costello/Kane 6-0-1)

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Merten

Motion Passes

4. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 3/12/13 & FINAL REVIEW 3/19/13

Project Name: **VISIN DUPLEX**

337 Playa Del Sur St

Permits:

CDP

Project #: PO# 280069

DPM:

Jeffrey Peterson, (619) 446-5237

Zone: RM-3-7

japeterson@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Sarah Horton, (619) 231-9905

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Sustainable Expedite Program Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing duplex and construct a 3,273 square foot duplex on a 0.04 acre site at 337 Playa Del Sur Street in the RM-3-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable Area 2), Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, Parking Impact Overlay Zone, Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, Transit Area Overlay Zone.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 3/12/13 (Sarah Horton, Sasha Veron)

Zoned for medium to high density, RM-3-7. Allowed FAR = 1.8, proposed FAR = 1.48. Duplex units a) 3 bed, 2 bath, b) 2 bed, 2 bath. Code allows “zero setback” for certain distance on side yards.

DISCUSSION 3/12/13:

Committee: With zero setback, what do neighbors see? Blank walls, windows? How are neighbors' windows affected? How is privacy affected?

Prof. Donna Blackmond (Neighbor, 2 buildings away): *Handed out photos.* Her building is owner occupied. They are concerned about light, air flow, and loss of views.

Joe Hayes (Neighbor): Concerned about loss of privacy.

Susan Hayes (Neighbor): Concerned about placement of the roof deck, loss of privacy.

Please provide for the FINAL REVIEW:

- a. Please provide a topographic layout of how the block progresses westward.
- b. Please provide copies of the HRB Staff report for distribution.
- c. Can more of the Cape Cod Cottage/Beach Stone Style of the old building be incorporated into your new building?
- d. Please provide a handout with the sustainable expedite specifics.
- e. Please provide a streetscape elevation showing how the building relates to the neighbors.
- f. Please provide a study of views and privacy issues into/out of neighbors' property (i.e. windows and decks).
- g. Where are the adjacent neighbors' windows with respect to the proposed building?
- h. Please provide the SD City Municipal Code reference of the RM Zone for DPR Members.
- i. Please expand the site plan to include neighbors' setbacks and windows.
- j. Please explain compliance with the LJ Community Plan page 90 e, building height, slope or setback.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 3/19/13**Provided for FINAL REVIEW:** *Applicant response in italics*

- a) Please provide a topographic lay out of how the block progresses westward. *Provided a scale profile drawing of the block. The topographic presentation showed a 15 ft. East-to-West slope with the roofs generally stepping Westward.*
- b) Please provide the HRB Staff report (email to Chairman for distribution). *Historical Resource Technical Report by Scott Moomjian was emailed to DPR Members.*
- c) Can more of the Cape Cod Cottage/Beach Stone Style of the old building be incorporated into your new building? *The client wants a contemporary style. Keeping river rock wall.*
- d) Please provide a handout with the sustainable expedite specifics. *A handout was provided with 14 items.*
- e) Please provide a streetscape elevation showing how the building relates to the neighbors. *Included with "a."*
- f) Please provide a study of views and privacy issues into/out of neighbors' property (i.e. windows and decks). *One neighbor's bathroom (or kitchen) window will be obstructed. The middle roof will be lowered; the decking rails will be transparent glass. Just about everyone has a roof deck; all these roof decks are in an urban setting.*
- g) Where are the adjacent neighbors' windows with respect to the proposed building? *Demonstrated. One bathroom window blocked by zero setback.*
- h) Please provide the SD City Muni Code reference of the RM Zone to Chairman Benton for DPR Members. *By email, SD Mini Code Ch 13, Art 1, Div 4, pg 56, 57. Diagrams 131-04H and 131-04I.*
- i) Please expand the site plan to include neighbors' setbacks and windows. *Provided an aerial presentation of structures footprints, also showing setbacks. Proposed building will be 30 ft. back from street; will have less footprint than the current single structure. Overall height is 29 ft. 9 in. (Building will be a couple of feet higher than the current chimney.)*

- j) Please explain compliance with the LJ Community Plan page 90 e. *(Topo error, should be pg. 90 c) Transition between old and new. They are using off-setting planes, roof lines; building will be set back 30ft from the street.*

Joseph Hayes Letter: reply by Horton.

- 1) Reduce building height? *Middle roof will be lowered; deck railing will be transparent glass. Overall effective lowering of 3 ft. 6 in.*
- 2) Use street level for finish grade level? *Would create a hazard for entry to garage from alley.*
- 3) Eliminate roof deck? *Most neighboring buildings have a roof deck.*
- 4) Effect on airflow? *Hayes Quarters are 120 ft. away; should not bother them.*

DISCUSSION:

Comments by: **Prof Blackmond, Paul Palpolikowski, Mark Marieno, Mathew Edwards.**

Heath Fox: (Executive Director of LJ Historical Society) We recommended to the City that a historic review be done of this structure; never done. This is a 1920s craftsman architectural style cottage; we need to preserve it, as few remain. Request item be continued to allow a study. A full Historical report is needed to consider for a fully informed recommendation.

Carol Olten: Opposes demolition of this craftsman cottage.

DPR Member questions and comments were regarding privacy of neighbors' windows, building height, views from upper levels. There was much discussion on the lack of an appropriate historical study and the lack of adequacy of the submitted report for this vernacular style cottage. Some concerns were lack of documentation of the original cottages; conclusions drawn without supporting evidence. There was no review of the report by the LJHS. On a human scale, this craftsman cottage has a quiet, settling feel where someone wants to live there and have a sense of history.

Continued at the Applicant's request.

Please Provide for FINAL REVIEW:

- a) **More documentation from the HRB Staff, including original report Jan. 2010.**
- b) **Provide the evidence that supports the Report's conclusion that the structures have lost integrity.**
- c) **Please re-send the Reports, attachments, and other documentation.**

5. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 3/12/13 & FINAL REVIEW 3/19/13

Project Name: **FEINSWOG RESIDENCE**

1250 Rhoda Dr

Permits:

CDP

Project #: PO# 308280

DPM:

Jeanette Temple, (619) 557-7908

Zone: RS 1-7

JTemple@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Paige Koopman, (858) 459-1300

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) La Jolla Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a three-story, 5,542 square foot single-family residence with detached four car garage with pool cabana and lot line adjustment located at 1250 Rhoda Drive. The site is in the RS-1-7, Coastal (non-appealable 2) and Brush Mgmt zones in the La Jolla Community Plan.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 3/12/13 (Paige Koopman)

Please provide for the FINAL REVIEW:

- a. Please provide a topographic map with details highlighted, thicker lines, colored landscaping.
- b. Provide elevations on one drawing, two cross-sections through the topo map (exact heights not required).
- c. Please provide SD City Municipal Code ref., or explain why the retaining walls and buildings are not too close as to be over height.
- d. Please provide photos looking up Rhoda Dr. and Cabrillo to help understand if the area has an urban or rural appearance.
- e. Provide assessor’s parcel map to compare the typical lot sizes in the neighborhood, across street too.
- f. Please indicate the footprint outline of the largest house that could be constructed on the smaller lot, could be 2 levels, what sq. ft.?
- g. Provide grading plan.
- h. Please provide site plan with the two homes next door.
- i. Please provide more details about raised-seam roofing material combination solar panels.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 3/19/13 (Paige Koopman)

Provided for the FINAL REVIEW: *Applicant response in italics*

- a. Please provide a topographic map with details hi-lighted, thicker lines, colored landscaping. *A clear drawing was provided.*
 - b. Provide elevations on one drawing, two cross-sections through the topo map (exact heights not required). *Provided.*
 - c. Please provide SD City Municipal Code ref. or explain why the retaining walls and buildings are not too close to be over height. *Changes made to correct; the retaining wall will be separated by 6 ft.*
 - d. Please provide photos looking up Rhoda Dr. and Cabrillo to help understand if the area has an urban or rural appearance. *A complete photo survey provided showing each house, parcel map, topo map.*
 - e. Provide assessor’s parcel map to compare the typical lot sizes in the neighborhood, across street too. *Provided with the above “d”.*
- | <u>Neighborhood Lot Sizes, sq. ft.</u> | <u>House Sizes, sq. ft.</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <i>Min.</i> | <i>4,499</i> |
| <i>Max</i> | <i>63,597</i> |
- f. Please indicate the footprint outline of the largest house that could be constructed on the smaller lot, could be 2 levels, what sq. ft.?
At max FAR, 0.59, it would be 2,951 sq. ft. (2,854 sq. ft. was shown as example.)

	<u>Existing, sq. ft.</u>	<u>Proposed, sq. ft.</u>
<i>“Larger Lot”</i>	<i>7,464.28</i>	<i>10,247.61</i>
<i>“Smaller Lot”</i>	<i>7,785.16</i>	<i>5,001.83</i>
<i>Larger House</i>	<i>1,617</i>	<i>5,542</i>
<i>Smaller house</i>	<i>487</i>	<i>487 (*may need to add a room so may be +/- 700 sq. ft.)</i>

**Since RS-1-7 Zone, the City may ask for a room to be added.*

The City did wonder if more parking was required for the smaller lot. Not required.

- g. Provide grading plan. *Provided.*
- h. Please provide site plan with the two homes next door. *Provided.*
- i. Please provide more details about raised seams roofing material combination solar panels. *Given a manufacturer’s flyer.*

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a three-story, 5,524 sq. ft. single-family

residence, with detached four car garage, with pool cabana and lot line adjustment, located at 1250 Rhoda Dr.

(Hayes/Collins 7-0-1)

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Grunow, Hayes, Kane, Liera, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton, as Chair

Motion Passes

6. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 3/12/13

Project Name: **HOPE VARIANCE**

8001 Ocean Street

Permits:

CDP and Variance

Project #: PO# 289049

DPM:

William Zounes, (619) 687-5942

Zone: LJPD-5

wzounes@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Ron Despojado, (619) 221-8285

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit & Variance to allow reduced front & side yard setbacks and garage encroachment into ROW; allow 2nd floor roof deck & basement garage additions to an existing free-standing condo unit in a four-unit development located on 0.07-acre site at 8001 Ocean St, in the LJPD-5 Zone of the La Jolla Planned Dist. Overlays: Coastal N-APP-2, Coastal Height, Parking Impact, Res Tandem Parking.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 3/12/13 (Ron Despojado)

DISCUSSION 3/12/13:

Lisa Breuninger: Presented a 28-page handout from the Ocean Lane HOA and presented their objections to the project.

Committee: Suggested the HOA could request historic designation as a mini-district.

Please provide for the FINAL REVIEW:

- a. Please provide copies of the four findings for a Variance in writing, for distribution to DPR Members.
- b. Please provide an exhibit with an aerial view showing the relationship of the adjacent buildings.
- c. Please provide the HRB Staff report for distribution to DPR Members.

7. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 3/12/13 & FINAL REVIEW 3/19/13

Project Name: **MORREALE RESIDENCE**

1644 Crespo

Permits:

CDP

Project #: PO# 284175

DPM:

Morris Dye, (619) 446-5201

Zone: RS-1-5

mdye@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Brooke Papier, (858) 449-5262, Conrado Gallardo (858) 442-2358

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) A Coastal Development Permit to construct a 700 square-foot, detached guest quarters, on a 0.20-acre site containing a single family residence located at 1644 Crespo Drive in the RS-1-5 Zone, within the La Jolla Community Plan Area, the Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), the Coastal Height Limit, the Residential Tandem Parking, and Transit Area overlays.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 3/12/13 (Conrado Gallardo)

The Project doesn't involve any work on the Historic residence. All work will be for an accessory building, off Kearsarge Rd. It will be a detached garage with guest quarters above, a bath, and no kitchen. No connection to the main house.

Please provide for the FINAL REVIEW:

- a. Please alter garage driveway to provide the required safety visibility triangle.
- b. Can the garage door be made transparent to match the main house?
- c. Please provide a street scene photograph and demonstrate how the fence works with the project. Also, how does the garage work with the project?
- d. Can you provide more articulation or architectural motif to the garage to avoid the "box on a box" look? Sloped roof, etc.?
- e. Please provide a street view showing the proposed garage with the existing house in the background. (Could be done on the same illustration as "c" above.)

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 3/19/13 (Conrado Gallardo)

Applicant Presentation: The Project doesn't involve any work on the Historic residence. All work will be for an accessory building, off Kearsarge Rd. It will be a detached garage with guest quarters above, bath, no kitchen. No connection to the main house.

Provided for the FINAL REVIEW: *Applicant response in italics*

- a. Please alter garage driveway to provide the required safety visibility triangle. ***Building pushed back into hillside to provide 10 ft. for visibility triangle.***
- b. Can the garage door be made transparent to match the main house? ***Will use the same door as the main house.***
- c. Please provide a street scene photograph and demonstrate how the fence works with the project. Also how does the garage work with the project? ***Shown drawings and photos***
- d. Can you provide more articulation or architectural motif to the garage to avoid the "box on a box" look? ***Changed the finish. Sloped roof? Can't slope roof since the max height for accessory structure is 15 ft.***
- e. Please provide a street view showing the proposed garage with the existing house in the background. (Could be done on the same illustration as "c.") ***Done.***

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit to construct a 700 square foot detached guest quarters, on a 0.20-acre site containing a single-family residence located at 1644 Crespo Drive.

(Collins/Hayes 7-0-1)

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Grunow, Hayes, Kane, Liera, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton, as Chair

Motion Passes

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee Minutes

Tuesday March 26, 2013

Committee members in attendance: Helen Boyden (chair), Laura DuCharme-Conboy (joined for item 3B), Dede Donovan, Janie Emerson, Tim Lucas (joined for item 3B), Myrna Naegle (left midway through item 3B), John Schenck. Absent: Phil Merten

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment – 2 minutes each for items not on the agenda

David Little – CPA Trustee: Handed out a diagram illustrating the difference between existing grade and finished grade and made presentation regarding the calculation of the 30' height limit using Prop D methodology and the city code methodology. He has issues with the way it is being calculated and presented many times. Prop D says to measure the 30 feet height from the finished grade. This is a problem because builder can raise the existing grade and measure from there. The city realized that there were problems with this and adopted a change to the Municipal Code in 2003 that dictates that the 30' limit is calculated from the existing grade or finished grade, whichever is lower. Many times projects will come in that meet the Prop D height limit but not the Municipal Code height limit, and they want to get an exemption or variance for this. This defeats the purpose of the Municipal Code amendment. These committees are the front line for monitoring these standards. Be aware that when a project comes in and only meets the Prop D height, that means that they are measuring from the finished grade.

Helen Boyden (chair): Thank you for your information. We do always consider the height of the buildings in our review.

2. Chair Comments

- A revised Gaxiola residence was given a full presentation and was recommended for approval at the March 7, LJCPA meeting. Michael Morton is now the architect of record for the project. The applicant plans to bring the Draft MND to the PRC for review.
- On March 19 the La Jolla Shores Advisory Board (LJSAB) approved the 7940 Costebelle project, 4-0-1, the roof having been changed again to a 3' in 12' pitch with no parapet. At the March 20 Hearing Officer Public Hearing with revised Report to the Hearing Officer, this project was approved as presented at the Advisory Board hearing.
- At the LJSAB March 19 meeting the Sudberry property was continued due to not having been heard by the LJS PRC/LJCPA.
- LJSAB 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 some issues are resolved with the City.
- Drove by the Zegarra project that the board previously reviewed. They have been working on removing the berm per city requirements. Does not know whether the existing wall issue has been resolved and permitted. [As of 3-27, 5 PM, large quantities, perhaps 40 cu. yds., had been excavated and were awaiting removal.]
- I am resigning as chair and as a member of this committee effective the end of this term, which is through May 2013.

3A. T-Mobile - Hotel La Jolla SCR

- Project No. 287313
- Type of Structure: Wireless Communication Facility
- Location: 7955 La Jolla Shores Drive
- Project Manager: Karen Lynch-Ashcraft; 619-446-5351 KLynchAsh@sandiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Lynnea Barrett for Rocki Lam; 858 -650 3130; lynnea.barrett@mitchellj.com

Project Description: Replacement of all six panel antennas with new 4G antennas for an existing wireless communication facility. No modifications are proposed to the existing equipment located at 7955 La Jolla Shores Drive on Hotel La Jolla formerly Summer House Inn in the LJSPD-V, Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) and Coastal Height Limit Zones. Previously approved under Permit No. 452123 on May 21, 2007 with an expiration of May 21, 2017.

Seeking: Substantial Conformance Review (SCR)

Rocki Lam of Mitchell J Architecture representing T-Mobile:

T-Mobile would like to upgrade their antennas and they currently have a permit with the city which expires in 2017. They are proposing to swap out the existing antennas with new antennas capable of bringing in 4G, permitting use of I-pads, smart phones, emergency equipment. There are 6 antennas currently in use. They would swap out 4 of the 6. The antenna dimensions are slightly different. The new ones are slightly shorter, a bit wider, and heavier than the current antennas. They will architecturally integrate them into the building through paint and texture matching. To the naked eye there should not be any significant difference. No change will be made to the existing equipment cabinets.

Boyden: This is a substantial conformance review and we need to make a decision today so it can go to the CPA right away.

Schenck: What is the layout of the antennas? **Lam:** There are 3 sectors, 2 antennas per sector. The sectors were pointed out on the diagram. There are also Nextel, Sprint, AT&T and GTE antennas on the building.

Public Comment: None

Motion: Emerson **Second:** Naegle.

This project meets the criteria for a Substantial Conformance Review.

Motion passes 4-0-1

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Naegle, Schenck; Oppose: None; Abstain: Boyden (chair)
(Conboy and Lucas not present for the item review)

Boyden: This will appear on the consent calendar of the CPA on April 4.

3B. Sudberry Residence

- Project No. 304002
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8039/8053 Calle Del Cielo
- Project Manager: Paul Godwin; 619-446-5190; pgodwin@sanidiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Haley Bareisa, Island Architects; 858-459-9291; hbareisa@islandarch.com

Project Description: Demolition of existing SFR located at 8053 Calle del Cielo plus a portion of existing SFR located at 8039 Calle del Cielo (total demo 8255 sf). Construct a single story SFR over walk-in basement and related site improvements over both lots (total lot size, 44,140 sf; GFA=18,836 sf). An amendment to CDP No. 388708 and SDP No. 388170 (PTS 1152239) affecting only the 8053 lot. Coastal Overlay and Coastal Height Limit Zones. [City] Applicant states that this is being processed as a new project.

Seeking: Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and Site Development Permit (SDP) for La Jolla Shores

Boyden: LJSAB continued item waiting for review by LJSRPC & CPA. She had attended the meeting.

Presented by: Tony Crisafi, Haley Bareisa, Ben Willis of Island Architects

Background information: The first form of the project was started in 2003. The owners acquired the north house (8053 Calle del Cielo). They designed a new 10,000 sq ft 2-story house with an underground parking level on the north pad. The plans went through the community review process and gained approval from the city, but the building permits were never pulled. The south house (8039 Calle del Cielo) came on the market and was purchased by these owners. They remodeled the south house and have been living in that. Both of these existing houses are single story.

The project being presented today is an entirely new one and they are seeking a new CDP and SDP. They are proposing to demolish the north house and build a house that joins with the south house. The pads are at different levels, with the south house being lower. The north pad will be lowered 3 feet and a new building will go from the north pad and over the existing remodeled section of the south house, creating a main level that extends through both pads and a lower existing

level at the south pad. There will be underground parking and a basement under the north house. The lots will be tied together, and this is currently in process.

The west facade is on the main level and is covered terraces and verandas. There is a pool and garden area, along with trees. The plantings that are currently in place will be augmented with some taller plants.

Total Gross Floor Area, which includes some of the covered terraces, is 18,836. First floor habitable space is 7,424 sf. The lower level living area is 6,109 sq ft and the garage is 3,393 sq ft. The FAR which was calculated using the GFA is 43%.

Diagrams were presented showing the existing two houses and the proposed structure, and also the previously approved project. The setback from the north house is 19'10" to main level building, but only 8' to the patio structure. The drawings compared the previously approved project for the north lot with this new one. By spreading the structure between the two lots and utilizing the existing lower level south house, the main level habitable space is actually less than the previously approved project and has more of a rambling single-story profile feel.

A 300' setback survey was presented. The city had concerns about some of the setbacks, which have been addressed by this survey with the inclusion of the street frontage data. This will be re-submitted to the city. The board did have some concerns about the accuracy of the frontage data based on a diagram of the properties in the survey, and these will need to be addressed.

They will use the existing shared curb cut between the neighbor to the north (8067 Calle del Cielo) and the north end of the property. The driveway is divided down the middle with a wall. There is an underground garage with a single garage door access on the north side of the house. The driveway will be lowered 3' at this point to enter into the garage. The driveway has been pulled back 8' from the property line (dividing wall) at this point. This area will have landscaping and will serve as a buffer area to help with privacy and noise issues of cars entering and exiting the garage. The driveway continues on to the rear of the house and opens into a large motor court, which is where the front door of the house is. There is room for at least 6 cars in this motor court. The underground garage has room for 6 cars, as well as storage space, a pool equipment room, a recreation room and a guest room. There are stairs and an elevator up to the main level.

There is a mandatory 20' front setback for this property that dates back to when this area was first developed. There is a pool in front that will be at this 20' line. It is a long narrow lap pool, with a jacuzzi. The pool equipment will be located in the underground garage so there will be no noise issues.

There are 4 bedrooms on the main level at the south side of the house. There is a living room, study, entry in the middle, and a family room, dining room, kitchen on the north side. There are covered verandas on the front. The roof structure has a pop-up in the middle over the living room.

They have met with some of the neighbors at properties above on Calle del Oro, and also with the neighbor to the north Sally McMurray, and several neighbors to the south. They have a record of all the neighbors that have been contacted.

Donovan: Are there limitations on the number of lots that can be combined? **Crisafi:** You can combine a number of lots together, but the limiting factor here is the sloping topography and the 30' prop D height limit. **Donovan:** What do the neighbors above on Calle del Oro say about looking down on this project. **Crisafi:** There is a slope, then a flat area, and then a steep slope at the rear (east) of the property. One of neighbors came to the meeting they had and reviewed the plans and had no issues. Another neighbor above called to discuss and had no issues. **Boyden:** What is the height differential between Calle del Oro and the house? **Bareisa:** The houses above are at about 252' and this north property is at 174', so quite a lot of height differential.

Elevations and drawings showing the proposed structure were presented. The proposed project has a maximum ridge line of 199.9'. The Prop D and the stricter 30' Municipal Code plumb line were shown on the drawings. These plumb line was calculated based on the lower level finished floor at its lowest point and extending that through out the structure. They feel that this is a more conservative calculation than doing the extrapolations, as some areas are covered and some are not. The maximum height is 29.8' to the chimney and 27.8' to the ridge line of the house.

Lucas: The cycle reviews presented to the committee were based on plans submitted to the city in December 2012 and there were 50 plus open issues. Is there a more recent version? **Bareisa:** These were submitted December 21 and the city completed the cycle February 1. These are the most recent. They have discussed many of these issues with the city planner. They will be responding to the issues and re-submitting them to the city.

Public Comment

Sally McMurray (neighbor on north side): Has concerns about the garage entrance on the north side. With six garage spaces there will be cars entering and exiting frequently, creating noise and pollution. Her living room is on the south side and she would like the entrance changed to the street side. They have an acre of property and she doesn't see why the garage entrance has to be located there. She also has concerns with the excavations and the lower pad height. Her property and the north house both share the same pad level. With all the proposed excavation, she is worried about geological issues. She is also worried about the construction process damaging her house.. She has underground gas lines and water. During the construction that they did there were heavy equipment and trucks going up the driveway and excavating for the new driveway wall and she could feel her house shaking. She had a water pipe break between the walls of her house right after construction. She thinks having the garage entrance located at the side will lower the property value of her house. **Crisafi:** They tried to balance the height differential of the two pads. They will be lowering the height of the north pad by 3'. With respect to the driveway, when this development was first opened the houses shared a driveway. When they did the recent remodel, they put in a block wall that was deeper than what was needed, and the digging process did cause some shaking... **McMurray:** The damage to her pipes occurred before the wall was excavated. It was during the construction process when they were doing grading with the heavy equipment... **Crisafi:** That's right; that did occur before the wall... **Boyden:** Can we move on to what you propose for this project? **Crisafi:** The current driveway is up against the property line and the block wall that was installed. The driveway has been this way since the development was open. They will be pulling the driveway 8' south creating a buffer area with large trees. The beginning of the driveway will be 3' lower in order to be able to transition into the garage. **McMurray:** All the earthmoving machinery used to lower the driveway will be creating shaking. Also, having the garage facing her house will not be good. **Crisafi:** The pattern for garages in the neighborhood is to face the side yard. **McMurray:** Hers doesn't. **Crisafi:** Both the north and south houses had side entrance garages originally. This orientation works with how the neighborhood was set up. They are trying to be considerate of Ms. McMurray. They met yesterday with Sally McMurray and representatives from UCSD including Anu Delouri, Cathy North from Facilities Management, and the soil engineer for this project. There were four things that were talked about. Some of these were of a good neighbor nature not directly related to this development, but one was regarding the buffer area. They will try to keep the buffer area intact and at the same level while grading the driveway alongside it down 3', and they will try to get the landscaping for this area in before any grading begins to help mitigate disturbance from the construction process. **McMurray:** Still concerned about the location for the garage entrance. **Emerson:** Need a clarification on the grading of the driveway. This was always an up slope? **Crisafi:** Yes. The driveway goes from street level, which is lower, to the rear of the property, which is higher than street level. They will be adjusting the level of the driveway down 3' so that it is a smoother transition from the street to the garage entrance. **Conboy:** Can you provide the elevations from the street to the garage and the rear? **Crisafi/Bareisa:** The current house is 162' at the street to 174' at the side of the house. They are proposing 162' to 179.5' at the rear, the garage entry is at 171'.

CA Marengo: I am a bit confused with how you calculated the coastal zone height limits. You are showing height levels that are never traditionally shown in the coastal zone by choosing to go to the lowest finished floor and run a line across regardless of what the outside levels are. **Bareisa:** We are looking at it from the standpoint that the lowest finished floor is our proposed lower level. **Marengo:** Why would you deviate from the methods on the city code? **Bareisa:** This was done after my meeting with Polonia Majas at the city. She said that it will be more straightforward if they present it this way. **Crisafi:** Because the existing grade is higher than the floor they are using this number. **Marengo:** You are not showing in your cross section how the structure changes. You will end up higher in some areas. You are not showing the changes in topography in your cross sections. It would be nice to see these changes in the cross sections calculated as specified in the code. This way may make your case better. **Crisafi:** It doesn't make our case better. This is how the city wants it depicted and it follows the coastal ordinance. **Marengo:** The standard way also helps to show the bulk and scale.

Boyden: Sally McMurray has left the property in her estate to UCSD, which is why they are involved here. UCSD representatives did attend the LJ Shores Advisory Board meeting.

Anu Delouri, UCSD: She is here today representing the University. Sally McMurray has deeded the property to UCSD. They have attended the meetings with the architects and at the LJSAB as Helen mentioned. Sally, as the neighbor, is very concerned about this two story house being built next door. It is a two level home and in many ways appears as a two story home. She is worried about the impact that demolition and construction will have on her 1960's home, based on past experiences. One of the prime concerns is having a 6 or 7 car garage entrance right next to her house and the noise created by that. In addition there are concerns about noise and dust and construction impacts including cracking and damage to her house. From the University's perspective, we would like an opportunity to review further the plans and drawings and look

for any impacts to the property. They did look at some of this yesterday at their meeting, but they would like to do further review before any final decisions are made. **Boyden:** There is the initial city review, which we can send you or the architects can. **Bareisa:** They have an updated letter regarding geological issues that they will be providing. They have already provided the soils report to UCSD. **Boyden:** Would you be able to review the materials in time for our next meeting? **Delouri:** I think so.

Matt Edwards, La Jolla Shores resident: Is not clear on the issues that Mr. Marengo raised regarding bulk and scale and elevations. **Bareisa:** What they presented was a conservative approach to meeting the height requirements. There are some exceptions in the city code that allow you to extrapolate existing grades through the house and use that line. We were taking a conservative and simplified approach, and Mr. Marengo was wondering why we were doing it that way instead of taking advantage of these exceptions. **Edwards:** The plumb line is to an existing grade or is there fill that is going to go in there? **Bareisa:** The plumb line is to the lower grade. **Crisafi:** (Showed the plumb line on the elevations.) If you were to calculate the plumb line for the higher pad using the existing grade, the plumb line would move up 3' higher than what is being shown. This would give us three more feet of building envelope. **Marengo:** The reason I brought this concern up is that the finished floor is not the extent of the overall height. You have structures that go into the basement and pool and everything that goes to the property line and steps up. These are all considered part of the structure that get measured and that relate. I don't think that you can just use one point on the finished floor. **Crisafi:** The building envelope is on the pad. A front setback line of 20' was established when this neighborhood was developed. So even though the 30' height limit may step down, the building envelope stops at the 20' setback line. **Conboy:** Are the pieces Mr. Marengo mentioned connected to the house? If they are, then they need to be counted in the calculation. **Bareisa:** The planters are all separated from the house by more than 6'. There is a 6' separation from the existing terrace, There is no concrete connection anywhere. **Edwards:** You are basing your elevations off of the 163' point and the chimney at 200' 9", which is close to a 40' difference. **Bareisa:** Yes, there is a 30' height limit plus 10' for a sloped lot.

Kim Whitney, La Jolla Shores resident: How tall is the McMurray house? **Crisafi:** I don't have that information, but can find out.

Board Discussion

Boyden: The city planner had a comment about stepping back the sides of the upper level. They also raised the issue of walls in the public right of way. **Bareisa:** They are seeking a permit for this with city engineering. Due to a construction mistake, the walls were built a few inches into the city right of way rather than on the property line.

Boyden: Gave a review of the information in the side setback survey which lists properties as well as the street frontage. **Conboy:** Has a question regarding two of the properties shown in the survey and the accompanying map. It appears that the street frontage for 8052 Calle del Cielo is the same size on the map as this projects combined lot, but the street frontage is only listed as 127 whereas the combined lot has 181 feet listed. **Crisafi:** We took those numbers from coastal permits and surveys. We can go back to the aerial surveys and check the numbers.

Boyden: The existing houses are over 45 years old, so there is still a historical review that needs to be made. We need to have those results before we can make a decision.

Schenck: Has issues with how open the cycles issues are. Very few have been checked off. Can we really make a decision on such and incomplete cycles? Discussion ensued regarding all the open issues and if a new set of cycles could be received in time for the next committee review. It will take the city at least several weeks to complete a second cycle after they have been re-submitted, so they would not be available in time for the next meeting. There was a question as to whether the committee should postpone further review until the next round of cycles. Many community planning boards do reviews very early in the process without full cycles. **CA Marengo** commented that it is better to have community input early in the process, so that changes can be made. After the city has cleared issues, there is no real reason for an applicant to make changes even if the review committee still has concerns.

Crisafi: For the committee's information, the CC&Rs for this neighborhood were renewed. Originally this neighborhood did not permit 2-story development, but this was changed and 2-story houses are now permitted. There is a map and a set of guidelines that restricts those second stories. So this neighborhood is transitioning to 2-story houses as redevelopment occurs. They are also willing to work with Sally McMurray and UCSD in mitigation efforts for this project.

Motion: Emerson **Second:** Lucas

Continue the item. Would like to have further information regarding:

- Second floor side yard step-back issue the city reviewer cited

- Massing study/streetscape. Include outline of existing north structure in addition to the proposed structure. Include McMurray house in this.
- Historical review results
- More description of the driveway and its slope, including elevations.
- Sections through house showing Prop D and plumb line. Confirm with city that the methodology is correct.
- Information on construction process, grading and excavation. Including how much fill will be moved.
- Address concerns and proposed mitigation about potential damage to the neighbors structures due to earth moving equipment.

Motion passes 4-0-1

Approve: Conboy, Emerson, Lucas Schenck

Abstain: Boyden (chair)

(Naegle left midway and Donovan left at end of the item review)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET

REQUESTED ACTIONS:

Provide staff with direction on how to proceed with drafting the ordinance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The issue of whether the medical marijuana dispensaries should be permitted to operate within the City began in earnest with the establishment of the Medical Marijuana Task Force (MMTF) in October 2009. The MMTF was established to advise the City Council on guidelines for patients and primary caregivers, the structure and operation of cooperatives, and police enforcement. On November 12, 2009, the MMTF issued its recommendations.

On March 28, 2011, the City Council adopted an ordinance establishing medical marijuana consumer cooperatives as a permitted use in the CR-2-1 commercial zone and the IL-1-3 and IS-1-1 industrial zones subject to restrictions. In general, there were two reactions to the ordinance. The first was that the ordinance was too restrictive in allowing medical marijuana dispensaries in such a limited number of zones and, second, that an ordinance allowing medical marijuana dispensaries should not have been approved. As a result of the first reaction – that the limited zones with an expansive number of buffer areas protecting “Sensitive Receptors” created a virtual ban on dispensaries anywhere -- a petition to place the matter on the ballot was circulated and received enough signatures to require the City Council to either place the item on the ballot or to repeal the ordinance. On September 27, 2011, the City Council voted to repeal the ordinance.

On January 28, 2013, the Mayor committed to the City Council that he would bring forward a new draft ordinance for the Council’s consideration within 30 days, and that the new draft would be based on the ordinance the Council passed previously.

This proposal to amend the Municipal Code to permit medical marijuana dispensaries is based on several principles:

- To allow patients in need with a proper prescription access for the compassionate use of medical marijuana throughout San Diego.
- To allow limited competition in permissible zones so that patients can find the strain they need to alleviate their symptoms and to improve the quality of their lives.
- To prevent dispensaries from encroaching on our residential neighborhoods.
- To promote legal and responsible business practices among dispensary operators
- To protect children from unprescribed use.
- To protect public safety.

The draft amendments to the Land Development Code reflect where this proposal differs from the amendments approved in March 2011. The major differences between the previously approved Medical Marijuana Ordinance and this discussion draft are as follows:

- The “medical marijuana consumer cooperative” has been renamed “medical marijuana dispensary” and the definition modified.
- The permit requirement has been changed from a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Process Four to a Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) Process Two.
- The number of zones where a medical marijuana dispensary may be permitted has been expanded to include all of the Community Commercial (CC) zones.

- The distance separation requirements from churches, libraries, and youth serving facilities have been deleted, and for purposes of §141.0614 (Medical Marijuana Dispensaries) “school” has been defined consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 11362.768(h).
- The regulations state that a medical marijuana dispensary may not be located on a premises that includes any residential use.
- The Planned District Ordinance (PDO) zones that may permit medical marijuana dispensaries are now specified in PDOs that have specialized commercial zoning.
- Section 151.0103 has been modified to reflect the current Municipal Code section which was amended subsequent to the March 2011 hearing.

Staff is looking to the City Council to provide direction on how to proceed with the drafting of the ordinance. Specifically, Staff is looking to the Council to provide direction to the City Attorney to draft an ordinance that will: (1) Require that permitted medical marijuana dispensaries only sell medical marijuana to patients who have registered their physician recommendations in the California Department of Public Health’s central registry administered in San Diego by the County Health Services; (2) impose a reasonable, annual permit fee of \$5000 and a two-percent (2%) excise tax on all medical marijuana dispensary sales; and (3) prohibit the siting and location of medical marijuana vending machines in the City of San Diego.

FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Any costs associated with implementation of the regulations in the future will be borne by project applicants.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL and/or COMMITTEE ACTION:

- On October 6, 2009, the San Diego City Council voted to establish a Medical Marijuana Task Force (MMTF).
- On January 5, 2010, the City Council voted to refer the recommendations of the MMTF to the Land Use and Housing Committee.
- On March 24, 2010, the Land Use and Housing Committee directed the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance based on the recommendations of the MMTF with changes.
- On April 28, 2010, the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee directed the City Attorney to review the MMTF Report and bring back legal recommendations.
- On May 26, 2010, the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee directed the City Attorney to develop an ordinance using the recommendations of the MMTF with changes.
- On September 13, 2010, the City Council voted 6-1 to initiate amendments to the Land Development Code and the City’s Local Coastal Program pertaining to medical marijuana cooperatives consistent with the recommendations from the Land Use and Housing Committee.
- On March 28, 2011 the City Council voted 5-1 to approve an Ordinance allowing medical Marijuana dispensaries in the IL-3-1 and IS-1-1 zones subject to restrictions.
- On September 27, 2011 the City Council voted 7-1 to repeal the Medical Marijuana Ordinance.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS:

This City Council hearing is the first step in a public participation and public outreach effort to develop a new medical marijuana ordinance. Staff will accept further direction on any additional public outreach the Council deems necessary or appropriate.

KEY STAKEHOLDERS & PROJECTED IMPACTS:

Key stakeholders include patients, advocates for access to medical marijuana dispensaries, residents, business owners, communities in which dispensaries may be permitted.

Kelly Broughton
Director, Development Services Department

Scott Chadwick
Interim Chief Operating Officer