

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee– Minutes

4:00 p.m. – Tuesday March 22, 2011

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment-

Phil Merten: Presented his views on PRC and LJCPA motions and that committee motions should always take into account the SDMC requirements.

2. Chair Comments –

A. To date we have no information on: 2414 Calle del Oro, Cto. Bello and City Rialto Drain and LJS electric Undergrouding district as to when they want to schedule.

-At LJCPA of March 3, Diarq/Westway passed on consent. Joe LaCava announced that 1912 Spindrift would be reheard at the LJCPA in April, due to unspecified irregularities

-Sewer and Water repair SDP in northern beach area of LJS will likely be heard at the April LJSPRC.

-AT&T wireless at Gilman will be reheard at the April PRC due to change in scope.

-Whitney appeal at the City Council is scheduled for May 3.

-No further word on Whale Watch Hearing.

B. PRC Terms of service are up for renewal during the month of May and for the Chair. PRC members appointed by the LJCPA should contact the new Chair of the CPA after one is elected in April and LJSA Chair for ratification by those boards at their May meetings.

3. Project Review –A-D

Committee members present: Chair: Boyden, Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Morton, Naegle, Schenck. Absent Ed Furtek. Morton needed to leave during Hooshmand discussion.

A. Casa Belmonte – Second Review

- PROJECT NUMBER: 226722
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence, two stories with basement
- LOCATION: 8435 Avenida de las Ondas
- PROJECT MANAGER: Glenn Gargas; 619-446-5142; ggargas@san Diego.gov
- OWNER'S REP: David Hawkins, AIA; 619-232-7700; david@H2Asandiego.com

Project Description: Demolition of existing 4972 s.f. single family residence plus 3-car garage. Construct new two story 5545 s.f. two-story single family residence with 1,737 s.f. basement garage. Coastal Overlay (non-appealable); Coastal Height Limit; Campus Parking Impact. [258 sq. ft. less than original plan]

Previous Action February 22.**Motion:** Lucas; Second Naegle

Due to the two previous projects taking longer than anticipated we are out of time. Continue the project for responses to committee concerns.

Motion carries 5-0-1

Approve: Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden

(Furtek and Morton not present for this item due to scheduling issues)

Please see LJSPRC Minutes from February 22 for complete committee comments.

David & Steve Hawkins presenting:

A site plan was presented with the outline of the existing house overlaid over the proposed houses. The proposed second floor outline and also changes to proposal from previous presentation were given. The setbacks on north side have been improved. On the south side there are 2.5 – 6 feet increases in setbacks. The wings of building have been set back on the second floor, and total square footage is now 250' less to 5545 sq ft. Average setback in front is 39.4'. Wood siding and trellis elements have been added to soften the look. Lighter toned stucco and stone will be used for the building materials. Maximum height from basement to highest point is 35'. Grade differential is 10'. The chimney was lowered 2.8'; the parapet reduced 1.0'. The side yards were increased, and the front of the house was pulled back by 6' to reduce the effect of the building height compared to the surrounding houses. The house is oriented at an angle and not parallel to the street.

Morton: Questions about the setbacks: *minimal setback is 7.6 (existing house is 6') and 8.6'. The second story is setback from the first story. Front yard setback 25' at minimum, neighborhood average is around 25'. Basement garage is 39.2' from the street.* Q: Do you have a straight on elevation from the street? *Response: yes, shown* How high are walls in side yard setback? *R: 2', existing walls in front will not be changed (3 – 5' tall).* Q: Parking? *R: 2 + 2 guest spots. In campus zone, but house has fewer bedrooms than 5.*

Merten: Elevation difference with neighboring pads? *Response: north is 10' lower, and south is 3 feet higher.[later estimate of latter increased]*

Naegle: Lower level of house, does it have view over the street? *R: Yes partial.* Q: The rest of the neighborhood has landscaping shielding the first floor. Having shrubbery in front can lessen the effect of the building height. Is there a way to raise the landscaping in front? *R: They will be in putting greenery between 3 – 5' in height at the front. (The current renderings do not reflect this-done this way to show details of front elevation)*

Boyden: What is the height of the plantings? *R: Maximum of 6'.*

Schenck: Roof heights of adjacent roofs? *R: South neighbor: ridge height estimate 11', which puts it at mid point of second floor of this proposed house. The front parapet is 124' above sea level, neighbor is around 118'. On North, the house is 10' lower and has a low roofline.*

Morton: Where do the roofs drain, show us the plan? *Response: Drains to the curb. No storm drain the in the area. Roof drainage presently is collected and sent to the curb.*

Public comment:

Dr. Menna provided a letter with concerns on setback to the south. He is worried about construction dust. This proposed three story structure is massive – does not think it is compatible with neighborhood. Are there drainage issues? *Response: A drainage plan has been prepared.*

Dr: Menna: Width of the two car garage? What is the setback on south property line? *R: Currently 16 feet, with this proposal the closest point will be 11.5'. With this design there are only closets and 2 small windows high up for light on that side to retain privacy for both houses.*

Q: Are there privacy issues looking at back yard pool? *R: only one small window in the bathroom will be 5' closer, the others are farther away. They can install a green roof or potted plants on roof to enhance privacy and shield the neighbors.*

Peggy Davis: How are they addressing the easement in the neighborhood? Will the pines remain? *R: Yes and yes. Q: Have they addressed the rear property easement of 55' in East. R: the easement does not affect their project, the building is further away than 55'.*

Q: Ave de las Ondas is over an old river bed. They need to really be wary of drainage issues.

Committee:

Morton: There is a concrete swale on the photo on the east side. *R: that is not part of this property.*

Merten: They have made some fine efforts with trying to blend the house into the neighborhood. The LJ Community Plan has provisions covering the residential areas. In general new development should “maintain and enhance the neighborhood” “preserve bulk and scale with respect to corresponding structures when viewed from the street” The rest of the homes in the neighborhood are single story, this is two stories. One of the findings for issuing a CDP is that this complies with all the requirements. One of the requirements is to follow the LJSPD Design Manual. That manual covers roof structures and shapes and how there should be some consistency in shape and color. The other houses have gabled or sloped roofs. This proposed structure is flat roofed. The roof materials should also be similar enough in materials and color to be compatible with the neighborhood. Is your roof form compatible? *Response: The wood and trellis elements enhance the compatibility of the design with the neighborhood. The roof is not visible from street. There are other houses in the neighborhood that have a flat roof.*

Lucas: Prop D roof height? *R: They are under the maximum height.* Q: Will solar panels fit? *R: Yes they will be flat on the roof and not angled up.* Q: Is there a viewing deck on roof? *Yes - below the parapet height and with railings and cable to not block the view.*

Merten: What type of glass is proposed for the west windows? *R: Tinted, non-reflective*

Motion: Schenck Second: Morton

Findings can be made for SDP and CDP. With plans dated 3/14/2011 and further changes to plans annotated at LJSPRC meeting to include landscape screening on basement garage roof to screen the neighbor to the south, the addition of opaque glass on master bath shower to enhance privacy and that the west facing glass at the front on both floors will be non-reflective.

Motion carries: 4-2-1; approve: Merten, Morrison, Morton, Schenck; oppose: Lucas, Naegle; abstain: Boyden

B. Aron Residence – Fourth Review

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

Project description: Demolish existing 3860 sq. ft. residence with 586 sq. ft. garage and construct a 2-story 7532 sq. ft. plus 966 sq. ft total garages, 6 bedroom SF residence on a 21,400 sq. ft lot. Coastal Height Limit, Airport Influence Area, Campus Parking Impact [832 sq. ft. less than NOA]

SEEKING: Site Development Permit (SDP)

Previous Action: November 2010 LJS Permit Review Committee

Motion: Morton Second: Merten

Continue item and return with: Parking spaces noted on site plan.

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

Motion carried: 6-0-1;

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

Please see November 2010 LJSPRC Minutes for Committee discussion and community input.

Previous Action: January 25, 2011

Motion: Merten; Second: Schenck

To continue project to future meeting.

Motion carries: 6-0-0

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

Please see January 25, 2011 Minutes for Committee discussion and community input

Motion: Morton Second: Furtek

Based on plans presented and annotated today Feb 22, this plan will be in conformance with the LJS PDO setbacks and the theme “unity with variety.” It is in conformance with other codes. The annotations to the plan include: landscape screening in the front, roof drainage be directed to street, and non-permeable surface runoff, that can be, should be directed to the street. Permeable paving was discussed for the rear and side areas.

Motion fails 2-5-1; approve: Furtek, Morton; oppose: Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Schenck; abstain: Boyden (chair)

Motion: Morton, Second: Merten

Return to the committee with plans that incorporate changes on landscape screening, hardscape drainage directed to street. Present a workable drainage plan that has been submitted to the City. Present a fully updated set of plans. The drainage plan should be an improvement on the status quo.

Motion carries 7-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Morton, Naegle, Schenck. Abstain: Boyden

Please see February 22, 2011 LJSPRC Minutes for complete community and committee comments.

Presented by Colin Hernstad

Thanked Vicky Powell for opening up her house for a meeting with the neighbors on the Sugarman Drive regarding the drainage. They have tried to improve the drainage with the latest plan. The new drainage plan has less water going eastward (the Sugarman Drive side) than existing house or first plans. The overall drainage to the front will be increased slightly.

They have tried to address concerns on visual impact. They have adding plantings and a stone pine tree to front of house which will help soften the view from the street. On the north and south property lines at front there will be tall plants. In the front courtyard will also be two trees, the stone pine and existing, badly pruned pepper tree. On the north side there will be tall hedges and clumping bamboo to soften the effect and address privacy for the neighbors.

The maximum height of this design is 27.3'.

Boyden: At 7532 sq. ft. the house will be the largest in the area within two blocks. The next largest is 5052 sq. ft. plus garage, the next is 4901 sq. ft plus garage. Nearly half are less than 2500 sq. ft. When normalizing to lot size (for lots greater than 20,000 sq. ft., this house has double the GFA to lot size ratio than the average of the other houses.

Schenck: What effect would raising the house 1 foot be to draining the water to the back? **R: Not sure, they are still working on that.**

Public comment:

Jennifer Phelps 8412 Sugarman: If there is any way to add additional drainage to the front that would be beneficial to the downslope properties.

Mr. Moffette, 8546 Sugarman: He is very appreciative of efforts so far to improve the drainage. If more could be done, that would be nice.

Ms. Casady 8412 Sugarman: The house is big, but raising the pad won't really affect the view from the street. Anything they can do to send more water to the front would be appreciated.

Q: How much of this proposed house will be visible from the Sugarman side? **R:** *The house is set back 97' at the rear, so there will not be much visible.*

Drainage is the biggest issue, the mass of the house is a lesser issue to residents on Sugarman Drive. **R:** *They are making efforts with plantings to soften the effect of the house from the front. The garages in the front soften the view.*

Committee:

Morton: Thinks that they have addressed the mass of the house by concentrating the second floor development at the center of the house. Not in favor of increasing the pad height, as that may make it seem bigger.

Boyden: Concerns with the next houses developed in the neighborhood - they will become even larger on the large lots, so there could be 10,000 ft houses constructed that are even closer to the street. Home adjacent to the north is a very low profile one story ranch house and the house pad appears to be several feet lower.

Schenck: raising the house could be a big improvement in the drainage at the rear.

Motion: Morton Second: Lucas

The plans presented March 22, 2011, with the hydrology reports dated 2/28/11 (page 5 dated March 2, 2011) as presented with Finish Floor Elevation (414.46) as shown on Sheet A-2 Site Plan, dated March 15, 2011 are compatible with the LJS PDO and meet the requirements for a SDP. [Page dates differ: A-1, Feb 2011; A-2, 3-15-11; A-5, Feb 2011; A-6, Feb 2011; A-8, Feb 2011; A-10, 3-15-11; L-1, 1-18-11 and pages A 3,4,7,9 and E-1 all dated Jan 10, 2011]

Motion carries: 4-3-0; Approve: Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle; Oppose: Schenck, Morrison, Boyden

C. Hooshmand Residence – Fourth Review

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A CDP and SDP for an addition and remodel to an existing residence. Namely, 2052 sq. ft. plus 52 sq. ft. garage additions to an existing 2015 sq. ft. plus 420 sq. ft garage SF residence on a 12,660 sq. ft. lot at 2480 Rue Denise, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone. Total GFA without underfloor: 4545 sq. ft. Total GFA including underfloor is: 6577 sq. ft. Revised from May 25 submission to City.

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

Motion: Schenck; Second Morton

To continue this item to a future meeting. The applicant should consider design issues raised by the Luetzow letter. We recommend meeting with neighbors and putting up story poles.

The applicant should bring next time:

- Neighborhood FAR and setback calculations for properties within 300 ft.
- Percentage of property on a 25% or greater slope and a percentage of coverage over that area.
- Elevations of the front of the house.

The motion is approved: 6-1-1. Approve: Lucas, Morrison, Merten, Morton, Schenck, Naegle; Oppose: Furtek; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

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

Motion: Furtek Second: Lucas – amendment by Merten accepted.

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

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

Discussion on the motion:

Morton: Appreciates the accommodations that have been made, but feels that the project is still not there.

Merten. Feels the northern expansion of the house extends too much, and the side setback should be similar to the setback on the adjoining property.

Motion carries: 7-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Morton, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Lucas, Schenck; Oppose: None

Abstain: Boyden (chair)

The current plans being presented by Architect Scott Spencer are dated 3/1/2001 and have been available to the public in the La Jolla/Riford Library.

Before the presentation the Chair Boyden read a letter from Carrie Luetzow. They have reached a written agreement and the plans have been revised. Based on the terms of agreement and the revised plans they are satisfied with the new design. Boyden to Luetzow: Does agreement go with the property? *Response: Yes, as long as he builds it.*

A letter from Joyce Cutler Shaw to Dr. Hooshmand was read.

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee

Regular Meeting – March 22, 2011

Minutes

Scott Spencer presenting:

Revisions that have been made to the plans: The corner of the deck on west was angled and the deck moved slightly to east to improve view for the Luetzows. There will be no construction in the side area of the lower terrace next to Luetzows as shown on the plans. The roof element on the northeast side is now a hip roof not gable, which improves the Shaw's view corridor. The privet hedge and tree must be trimmed and maintained at 3.5' to improve view corridor due to city mandate.

For comparison (though FARs do not apply in the LJ Shores) the max FAR allowed city wide for similar lot is 0.52, and they have used this as the limit in the present design. They are creating the potential for a 1,000 sq ft lower terrace although there is no access at this point. The plans show that a pantry can be removed and a stairway added in the future should they decide to develop the lower terrace. his potential terrace counts toward the GFA, but is below their target 0.52 FAR. Seventy percent of the lot is steeper than 25%, so there is essentially no back yard.

Boyden: Has compiled a spreadsheet of neighborhood setbacks and GFA based on information from the city. Shows that even without the underfloor, this is greater than any in the neighborhood. There was a discussion on total FAR and what was counted. Q: Is there a final Geology report? Have they satisfied the city concerns with the geology report? *Response: There is a report from July 2 that is newer. The city has not cleared this issue because the full set of plans for this project have not been submitted to the city.*

Merten: This is a nice one story style house that would sit nicely on a flat lot. This is a sloping lot. This house is so different from other houses in the neighborhood. The stilt structure is different from other houses in the neighborhood.

Schenck: Discussion of the possible future development of the terrace and phantom floor areas. Although there are no FAR requirements in the LJ Shores, the City looks at FARs to help resolve bulk and scale issues. What is the neighborhood average? *Response: They have articulated the rear elevation to address bulk and scale issues in the rear.*

Morton: Appreciates the hard work that has gone into the project. Doesn't think that the design meets the requirements in the LJSPDO based on the second floor issues.

Boyden: Looked at houses in neighborhood from the top Pottery Canyon in the 8100 block of La Jolla Scenic Drive. This house is visible from there.

Lucas: Where did the 0.52 FAR come from? *R: City wide for lots that size. One advantage with stilts is that they disturb the underlying hill less. Response: They looked at excavating below, but there are drainage issues. It would also block more of the views. The recommendation from city staff was to not do extensive excavation.*

Schenck: The FAR is greater than in the neighborhood both average and maximum? *R: that is true.*

Naegle: Has watched the plan evolve. Thinks it is good that they have worked with the neighbors. There are potential issues with the design such as earthquakes. By changing this to a two level design with an elevator they could achieve a more compact design and be more compatible with the neighborhood. He thinks that retaining part of the existing house has limited their choice of designs. If this was a new project from the start, this could be a much better design. All the bedrooms could have a spectacular view. The design could have architectural beauty. Once again, they have done a good job working to address neighbors concerns.

Public comment:

Mr. Shaw: The roof should be no higher that presently is. The roof should be sloping and not flat so that it will be less obtrusive when viewed from the neighbors above. The right hand side of house (East) should only extended 10'. The tree in the view corridor should be cut down and the brush trimmed. He thinks that all these items have been resolved by present design.

Motion: Merten Second: Naegle.

The Findings for a SDP cannot be made because the relationship of the proposed development to its site is so different from that of structures on adjacent parcels that the proposed development would disrupt the architectural unity of the area.(LJSPDO 1510.0301 (b) and LJSPD Design Manual p. 2). The Findings for a CDP cannot be made because the bulk and scale of the proposed structure when viewed from the rear (north) of the property is so different from that of older

development on adjacent properties that it does not comply with the community character provisions of the residential element of the LJCP.

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

D. Nooren Residence – First review

- PROJECT NUMBER: 226965
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential in Multi Family One (MF1) zone
- LOCATION: 8001 Calle de la Plata
- PLANNER: Jeffrey A. Peterson; 619-446-5237; JAPeterson@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Michael Rollins; Cell 619-993-6003; Michael@rollinscc.com

Project description: Demolish an existing single family residence and construct a 3,700 square foot, two-story single family residence including a 635 square foot subterranean garage on a 0.10 acre site. The proposed project will conform to the Council Policy 900-14 criteria by generating 50% or more of the projected total energy consumption on site through renewable energy resources (i.e. photovoltaic). Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable Area 2), Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, Coastal and Beach Impact Areas of the Parking Impact Overlay Zone, Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, Transit Area Overlay Zone.

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

Presented by: Michael Rollins

They are seeking a CDP and SDP. This is a flat lot.

Proposal to construct 3,350 sq. ft. house with a 650 sq ft subterranean garage. The FAR is 0.88. This is the MF1 (multi-family one) zone. With the size of the lot they could put 2 families or 9 dwelling units, but this is to be a single family residence.

The proposed actual green landscape is 20%, but this does not include other landscape elements. The lot coverage is 40%. (50% is allowed in the MF1 zone.) The house is to be gold certified for energy efficiency, rainwater use, water use. There is no air conditioning just large fan system to circulate air. They have not received any concerns of neighbors yet.

The design is a flat roof and contemporary style, which are found elsewhere in neighborhood.

The open courtyard eases the bulk and scale. The setbacks adjacent to other properties mirrors the 4' & 5' that they observe. Due to wall elements in front for open courtyard the setback is 5' although the building itself is pulled back. There are no designated public view corridors. Utility easements are maintained. There are 2 off street parking spaces in the lower garage. There are no guest parking spaces.

Height limits were shown on the elevations. The chimney does extend beyond 30' for lot slope, but complies with 30' coastal zone methodology. They are using steel guardrails and glazing. Test pits have not turned up any archaeological issues.

Boyden: Lot coverage is 40%? *Response: Yes. The actual greenscape (planting) is currently 20%, but there are other open areas and total design complies with the 30% greenscape requirement.*

Q: In the PDO there are very specific design guidelines for orientation and dimensions of the house: *SDMC Section 1510.0306 (b)*

(3) To provide for see-throughs to the ocean, buildings shall be located so that the major axis of the structure will generally be at right angle to the shore line. The secondary or minor axis of the structure shall not exceed 60 percent of the width of the parcel. However, no building facade may be a continuous plane over 50 feet in length.

This house does not meet those guidelines. *R: Did not know about those requirements. He will need to do further research.* The maximum lot coverage for this height project is 50% in the MF1 zone. *This is only 40%* [but plans do not document, city requested]

Merten: There is an issue with the visibility triangle requirements for a corner lot. View triangles are measured from property line, 25' both sides. There is a pillar in the way.

Boyden: Discussion on houses on other 3 corners and also the historical board review. The SD City Historical Resource Board deadlocked 4-4-0 on whether this cottage should have a historical designation, so it did not receive one.

Public Comment:

Sheila Palmer, owner of house on diagonally opposite corner: The charm of the neighborhood will be lost with this proposal. This is a nice design, but does not fit with the neighborhood. This house takes the light from the adjacent neighbor on the east. It is inappropriate for the site.

R: adjacent property setback is the same as they are proposing.

Myrna Naegle: We are destroying everything of value in the Shores. This original house is so precious. This little house stands out and welcomes you to the neighborhood. This proposed design does not fit and has too much bulk and scale. It is not compatible with the neighborhood.

John Armstrong: His father is the neighbor next door (north) on Calle de la Plata. This 8001 house was built in 1927 by Charles Larkins. The proposed project will take light from his house and doesn't fit the neighborhood.

Sheila Palmer: This house should be built in Palm Springs on a larger lot.

Committee:

Naegle: Concurs with the public comments from the neighbors. Those of us who have lived here a long time would have problems accepting this design which is so different. He recommends reading the design guidelines in the La Jolla Shores Design Manual. He thinks that this will diminish the neighborhood. This is fine architecture in the wrong place. The modern style is just not compatible in this location.

Morrison: Would feel a loss in the neighborhood by removing the Spanish style cottage with the red tile roof, especially given the open space across the street at the Beach Club property.

Merten: Need to look carefully at the community character issues in the LJCP. He would like to see a street elevation for west and south which shows the adjacent structures. The next door neighbors will be next to a tall wall looming over them.

Lucas: This house is so different in from with the adjacent neighbors. There will be many residents objecting to this style.

Motion: Merten Second: Schenck

Continue item to a future meeting. The Applicant is requested to return with:
Side elevations that show the proposed development in relationship to the adjacent neighbors (a massing study)
The structure should be located on the site so that the major axis of the structure will generally be at right angle to the shore line. The secondary or minor axis of the structure shall not exceed 60 percent of the width of the parcel, and no building facade should be a continuous plane over 50 feet in length. [SDMC1510.0306 (b) (3)]

Exterior walls of the existing structures on adjacent properties should be shown on site plan drawing.

Address second floor walls adjacent to neighbors – step back the second story or create off-setting planes to provide visual relief according to the Community Character Plan Recommendations of the Residential Element of the LJCP.

Motion carries: 5-0-1: approve: Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Schenck; oppose: none; abstain: Boyden