

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE LA JOLLA
PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE
May 13, 2013**

1. **Public Comment** – Issues not on today’s agenda (2 minutes maximum.) **No public comment was given**

2. **Chair Report / Board Discussion**

a. Review and Approve April Minutes **No Minutes were presented** (I believe that we voted to approve the April Minutes since we had an April meeting. Please re-check your notes.)

b. Letter sent by CPA regarding the role of the PDO committee in the city review process. **The letter was not reviewed**

c. Issues regarding PDO compliance and means to promote enforcement. (Little)
After the meeting with Chris Larsen from the city, it was made clear the PDO would not have jurisdiction for Process 1 issues. The city has no requirement to refer projects to community groups, including the LJPDO Committee, that are subject to "ministerial" approval. It was estimated that 80% of the estimated 50% of eligible applicants the PDO Committee sees are for Process 1 issues. It was agreed that this would be acceptable if the city correctly applied the LJPDO. Lack of compliance on these issues may also reflect the applicants' lack of awareness of the PDO's requirements during Process 1 approval. Discussion of increasing compliance then focused on the PDO Committee working with the Merchants Association or simply becoming an "advocacy voice" trying to maintain the integrity of the community aesthetic as opposed to policing our fellow community members. We agreed to canvas Village streets, noting PDO violations. Ione would then send a letter informing businesses of their violations with the understanding that they might not be aware of their non-compliance. Ione will also attend the next Merchants Association meeting and write the various papers in hopes of raising community awareness about the LJPDO.

d. 30 height limit and how it should be measured under the Municipal Code.
Prop D from 1972 30'0" height limit is from the final grade up. Municipal code from the 1998 update has a 30'0" measurement from existing OR final grade depending upon whichever is lower. Ione explained the code in a drawing that is used by the city to explain the differing ways to evaluate the 30'0" height limitation.

e. Discuss issues to consider when hearing variances and deviations
There is a disparity between the LJPDO and the Land Development code regarding parking. The city is using the 14 division 5 article 2 code which applies the lowest parking requirement for mixed-use space, including applying it to restaurants and other businesses with higher intensity of use. Finally, we agreed that shared parking agreements are difficult to understand and enforce, especially when the city has no accurate record of those agreements already in place. We were reminded that these

agreements can only be made between the tenant and the owner of the additional parking spaces—not between the tenant and the parking management company.

--