

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee – Minutes

4:00 p.m. – Tuesday June 28, 2011

Committee members present: Boyden, Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Schenck; absent: Naegle. Morton left after the vote on Kooklani I.

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment

Phil Merten – Learned from unnamed parties that an applicant had been told by a DSD Project Manager that he could avoid obtaining a discretionary permit by doing serial remodels; i.e. demolish one half the building, get a ministerial permit to rebuild and then do the other half. Boyden and Merten will follow up and ask Tony Crisafi to communicate with DSD about department policy.

2. Chair Comments

- To date we have no information on: Cto. Bello, Gaxiola, City Rialto Drain and LJS electric Undergrounding District as to when they want to schedule.
- Palazzo project appeal to City Council will likely be heard in the latter part of September.
- Whale Watch recirculated draft Negative Declaration expired June 23rd and extension applied for. [After the meeting it was learned that an extension to July 12 had been noticed.]
- Hooshmand should have cycles and be heard July 26. Follow-up needed.
- Trunkey passed LJCPA unanimously on consent, Wells passed on consent 10-2-2.
- 7th Update to Land Development Code. It was heard at the Land Use and Housing Committee, chaired by Sherri Lightner, on Wednesday June 22. LJCPA passed a version revised by the City after the LJSPRC met, but recommended that Child Care and Student Centers be prohibited. City staff made those changes which may be found at: http://docs.sandiego.gov/councilcomm_agendas_attach/2011/LUH_110622_2a.pdf on pages 140 to 148.
- Additionally LU&H made some additional changes, among them prohibiting Community Gardens in the LJSPDO Visitor Zone. [After the meeting it was learned that the record of the LU&H is available at the same website and that the City Council would hold a hearing on July 19th with a likely 2 week deferral for final action. See notice on City Clerk website.]
- A T-Mobile installation on the south side of LJ Village Drive in the PROW between North Torrey Pines and La Jolla Scenic Way has just been noticed.
- Aron residence was permitted on consent at the Hearing Officer on June 1. The chair outlined changes that occurred after it was heard by the LJSPRC.
- Whitney project ... Public Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report has been issued by the City. See http://docs.sandiego.gov/citybulletin_publicnotices/CEQA/PN1300%2523182513nop%252006%252024%25202011.pdf Comments will be accepted until about July 25th. Interested parties, including the LJCPA and the La Jolla Library will receive copies.
- A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration has been issued for 1900 and 1912 Spindrift. See http://docs.sandiego.gov/citybulletin_publicnotices/CEQA/PN1300%2523214654%2520%26%2520216073%2520mnd%252006%252014%25202011.pdf The PRC chair has the LJCPA copy and there should be one available at the La Jolla Public Library. Period for public input expires on July 14.

3. LJSPRC Housekeeping – Action items

a. Elect officers for June 2011 to June 2012, Chair, Co-chair, Secretary

Motion: Morton Second: Merten

Motion to re-elect current officers. [Boyden, Chair; Morton, Co-Chair, Lucas, Secretary]

Motion carries 6-0-1

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

b. Establish calendar for the remainder of 2011—Should there be a Holiday break, due to scheduled PRC meetings falling within the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays for November and December respectively? Boyden has concerns about having a quorum for the December meeting. A suggestion was made to combine the November 22 meeting and December 27 meetings into a single meeting in early December. If there are a reasonable number of projects to review this would work. There is still time to work out the calendar, but the committee should keep this suggestion in mind. No further action was taken.

c. Proposal to adopt as PRC procedures current LJCPA procedures affecting the PRC directly: No action taken.

d. Adopt other procedures for PRC operation, including committee members' roles: No action taken.

4A. Nooren Residence - Fourth review (second version)

- 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@saniego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Michael Rollins; Cell 619-993-6003; Michael@rollinscc.com

Project description: Demolish an existing single family residence and construct a 2725 ~~3,700~~ square foot, two-story single family residence over a 656 ~~635~~ square foot 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, Coastal and Beach Impact Areas of the Parking Impact Residential Tandem Parking, and Transit Area Overlay Zones. [City]

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

Previous action, March 22, 2011- Full minutes at lajollacpa.org

Motion: Merten Second: Schenck

Continue item to a future meeting.

Motion carries: 5-0-1

Previous Action, April 26, 2011, Full minutes at lajollacpa.org

Motion: Morton

To continue the project; died for lack of a second.

Then the applicant requested a continuance on this project.

Motion: Morton; Second: Merten

To continue the project

Motion carries: 5-0-1

Previous Action, May 24, 2011 Revised Project

Motion: Merten; second: Emerson

To continue review of the project until the full submittal package has been submitted to the city. This will include site sections.

Motion carries 5-0-1. Approve: Emerson, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Lucas; abstain: Boyden

Presented by Matt Peterson & Michael Rollins.

Mr. Rollins documented the resubmission to the City.

Changes to the concept design presented last meeting:

- Heights increased to 29.6' and 28.6" to highest roof ridge
- Removed outside fireplace, which steps building back and increases articulation.
- Roof plan changed slightly to allow more area for photo voltaic panels.
- Increase the landscaping from 30% to 34%
- Plants are drought resistant.
- East elevations stepped back wall and roof.
- Adjusted slope of driveway.
- Changed the visibility triangles on the plan.

Morton: Property wall heights? **Response:** *property walls not to exceed 6' on North and East.*

Public Comment:

Tricia Riha (El Paseo Grande): She did not receive notice. Asked questions about how the notices were sent out and is concerned that no other neighbors are present. **Response:** *As she lives within 300' she would have received City notice on how to get involved. This is the fourth hearing and neighbors were present at others. She will get notice of City hearing. She also gets the LJCPA e-blast*

Jim Brown, AIA, likes the original design better. (occurred later in the meeting)

Committee discussion:

Merten: Thinks general massing on site is now more compatible with other houses on the street. There are offsetting planes and articulation – improved from previous design. This project is similar to other properties that have sought CDPs recently. Thinks that this design complies with the LJS PDO and the recommendations in the community plan.

Motion: Merten Second: Schenck

Findings can be made for a CDP and a SDP based on the plans presented--dated 6/17/2011 and submitted to the City 6/28/2011.

Discussion on motion:

Donovan: What were the previous objections from the neighbors? *Response: Neighbor on north was concerned with height of building blocking light on their property. Also, concerns on the first design (modern style) fitting in with the neighborhood.*

Motion carries: 4-0-3

Approve: Lucas, Merten, Morton, Schenck; **Abstain:** Boyden (chair), Donovan, Emerson –Donovan not present for previous three hearings; Emerson not present for first two hearings--Prior to their nomination to the LJSPRC.

B. 8490 Whale Watch Recirculated Negative Declaration

- PROJECT NUMBER: 164545
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 8490 Whale Watch Way
- Project Manager: Will Zounes wzounes@san Diego.gov
- Environmental Reviewer: Philip Lizzi, plizzi@san Diego.gov; 619-446-5460
- Applicant: Michael Paluso; Public; 619-682-4083

New Project Description: Demolish an existing home and construct a new 12,716 sf single dwelling unit on a 0.46 acre site. This includes a 6241 sf first floor and 6.475 sf second floor.

Seeking: CDP and SDP but issue today is the Draft ND

LJCPA President Joe LaCava had commented on the previous Draft ND as did other members of the community. Based on input received the project description has been revised and the Draft ND recirculated for public review. Revisions include: modifications to the square footages for the basement, first floor, second, floor and total gross floor areas. The square footages have been updated. No new impacts have been identified and no new mitigation required.

The deadline for response to this Negative Declaration had been June 23rd [After the meeting it was learned that the deadline had been extended to July 12, 2011.]

The applicant's representative James Brown attended but did not make a presentation. However, he made comments and participated in the discussion.

Previous PRC action: April 2010 – see minutes of that meeting and March 2010 for full information

Motion: Furtek Second: Schenck

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.”

Approved: 3-1-1; Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Schenck; Oppose: Morton; Abstain: Boyden

Previous LJCPA Action, May 2010

To accept the recommendation of the PRC Committee, to deny the Project, (N) 8490 Whale Watch Way: Coastal Development Permit for demolition of existing residence and construct a 9,860 sf (GFA) residence (originally noticed as a 7559 sf residence) on a 0.46 lot. FAR=0.58. Shores Planned District, and forward the recommendation to the City. (Addington/Burstein 15/0/1)

In favor: Addington, Brady, Burstein, Costello, Courtney, Crisafi, DuCharme Conboy, Fitzgerald, Gabsch, Lucas, Merten, Rasmussen, Salmon, Whittemore, Weiss. Abstain: LaCava

Project Representative: Jim Brown

Design is still the same. They have recalculated the FAR, which added to the totals, due to area being covered by overhangs being incorporated into the calculations.

He objects to distribution using the project rendering that is on the project website. The online photo is inaccurate and was made using a fish-eye lens for dramatic effect. Architects like to make renderings dramatic in order to get published in magazines. He urges the committee to only use the drawings from the packet. (Boyden presented elevations from packet at this time) Brown commented on the evolution of the project: the first design was 3-story, the second was 2-story with increased setbacks, third design was even more stepped back and the building was dug into the hillside to reduce height. The structure is poured concrete with a textured finish.

Disclosure: Boyden and Merten had sent comments to city regarding the original Negative Declaration for the project, as did the LJCPA. Boyden read the LJCPA submission. Boyden has already submitted a comment for the recirculated draft ND.

Morton: There are other homes in LJ Shores that this home is similar to, such as in the Montoro development. This is a contemporary home with a bit of an edge to it. Morton does not feel that this is out of place.

Merten: Since the design hasn't changed, the comments made during the previous committee reviews of the project still stand. The contemporary projects in Montoro are in a planned residential development. The projects in that development are obligated to comply with and be compatible with that development. This project is in a different area and must be compatible with the houses in its neighborhood. Merten showed aerial photos of the area and compared footprints with other house in the area.

Merten quoted pertinent design guidelines from the LJS Design Manual: "Large buildings interposed into communities characterized by small scale structures without adequate transition *should be avoided*"; "Visually strong buildings which contrast severely with their surroundings *impair the character* of the area; " Structures *shall conform or complement* the general design and bulk of the buildings in surrounding and adjacent areas."; " new buildings should be *made sympathetic* to the scale, form and proportion of older development; new designs should *promote "harmony* in the visual relationships and transitions between new and older buildings." and "extreme contrasts in color, shape and organization of architectural elements *should be avoided*, so that new structures do not stand out in excess of their importance."

The courtyard is typically a feature of a single-story house whose patio area is on grade. The city exempts courtyards from FAR calculations because the Spanish style with courtyard is typical in San Diego. The city uses FARs as a way to quantify the bulk of a project. When you take a building and lift it up, it affects the perception of bulk and scale, hence areas underneath overhangs need to be calculated.

The FARs originally presented did not include those. He would like to know how the FARs were calculated and what was included. He has concerns with the exterior balconies: If 2 or more sides of those balconies are 40% open, then balconies are not included. Based on the plans he has reviewed, the balcony is enclosed on the south and north side by wing walls. They should be included in FAR.

There is a question of roof deck versus courtyard. A roof deck is an area is over an enclosed space below. He thinks that 2,000 feet of roof deck has been incorrectly classified as a courtyard. Adding up all areas together, the gross area is in excess of 12,000 feet, and FAR would be 75 to 80%. On this size lot the maximum FAR in any other part of the city is .45, this project is significantly higher in FAR. He recommends the committee adopt letter that he previously sent to the city for the first ND.

Brown response: *You can not negate (ignore) the contemporary houses in the Montoro development. He feels that this completely fits in with the neighborhood. The city disagrees with the way Merten is calculating the FAR. The wing walls are open 40% and should not be counted in FAR calculation. Besides, there are no FAR requirements in this zone.*

Merten: After checking the plans presented, he agrees that the wing walls are open and should not be included in the calculations. However, he still feels that the house is too big for the neighborhood and the FAR still bears this out.

Boyden: The adjacent house styles in the neighborhood are: California ranch, Mediterranean and contemporary 1-story.

Morton: Is the lower floor considered a basement? *Response: No*

In discussions with city of courtyard versus roof decks, would these features in this design be included in the gross floor area?

Merten – they must be included.

Morton: This house is a different architectural style. La Jolla has always had cutting edge buildings and homes. It is hard to balance new designs with existing designs. Would have liked to have had this analysis of FAR during previous project evaluation (these full plans were not available at the time of previous committee reviews).

Merten: The LJ Design Manual specifies roof types for the area: Flat roofs, mansard, gable, and hip roof. The LJS PDO specifies that building and structure set backs should be in general conformity. These setbacks are not consistent with the neighbors. 4 concerns:

1. General character of the building with the architectural unity of the area
2. Size of project – bulk and scale
3. Roof forms and long sides without articulations
4. Traffic safety due to retaining walls affecting the visibility triangles.

This is too big a house for a 0.5 acre lot. This design should be on a 3 acre sized lot.

Donovan: Visited the site today and looked at the neighborhood. It is out of scale with the neighborhood. She appreciates that fact that they reduced the size, but proposing huge projects and then reducing them slightly, still results in a house too large with the neighborhood.

Brown Response: *The existing house blocks more of the view of the house to the east than this project. The view down the street is increased. The house is closer to the property line, but the view has increased.*

Morton: Are the plans the committee has (dated 7/28/2010 provided by the city) the ones that are current? *Response: Doesn't know, will need to check at the office.*

Public comment:

Tony Crisafi: The city is very careful when making comparisons of the Montoro development with other neighborhoods. Montoro incorporates considerable open space within the development as a whole, so FARs calculated by the usual method are overly large and need to be proportioned. Has questions on FAR calculations for the roof deck and balcony underneath?

Merten explained how the calculations were made.

Motion: Merten; second: Emerson

The LJS PRC committee moves that the La Jolla CPA send a letter to the Development Services Department taking exception to the City's Negative Declaration for the project for the following reasons:

- **The project is not in character with neighborhood**
- **The bulk and scale are not compatible with surrounding development.**
- **The building setbacks are not in accordance with the LJS PDO**
- **The roof is not in accordance with the LJS PDO**
- **There are public safety issues with visibility triangles for the driveway.**
- **The design is not in accordance with recommendations in the LJCP regarding transitions between newer and older buildings.**

Motion carries: 5-1-1

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Schenck; **oppose:** Morton; **abstain:** Boyden (chair)

Morton stated he agreed with some but not all of the reasons.

C. Kooklani Residence Substantial Conformance Review

- PROJECT NUMBER: 126578
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Two Single Family Residences
- LOCATION: 7451 and 7447 Hillside Drive (Kooklani I and Kooklani II)
- Project Manager: Jeffrey A. Peterson; JAPeterson@sandiego.gov 619-446-5237
- Owner's Rep: Francisco Mendiola; Francisco@cdgius.com; 619-804-4463

Project Description: an application for a (Process 2) Substantial Conformance Review (SCR) to Coastal Development Permit (CDP) No. 9045 and La Jolla Shores Planned District Permit (LJSPDP) No. 9046 for the Kooklani I Residence; and CDP No.

9047 and LJSPDP No. 9048 for the Kooklani II Residence. This application included revised architectural design for the two previously approved single family residences. The project sites are located at 7451 Hillside Drive (Kooklani I) and 7447 Hillside Drive (Kooklani II) in the SF Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan Area, Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-appealable Area 2), Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, Parking Impact Overlay Zone for Coastal Impact Area, Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, and Council District 1.

Notes: This SCR was noticed in 2007 and delayed for a variety of reasons. The LJSPRC did not participate in the review process and an appeal was made to the Planning Commission after DSD made a decision to grant the SCR. It was heard on Thursday June 23rd. Planning Commission granted a continuance until July 21, 2011 to enable the Community Planning Group to review the current plans. It suggested that the prime topic of interest is whether the plans conform to Proposition "D" height limits.

Boyden: This is a Substantial Conformance Review for permits originally issued 2002. One set allowed the Munchkin homes to be re-located and the parcel subdivided into 2 lots. A CDP and SDP were issued for both lots. The CDP is vested due to grading being started. The houses could not be moved intact, and there were some legal issues due to this that delayed the project. In 2007 the design was changed and required a SCR. (The plans and records from the original CPA review are not available.)

There was a hearing at the planning commission on this project last week, and will be another in 2 weeks. A decision must be made.

Tony Crisafi – produced a letter for the planning commission and Chris Larson regarding the Prop D height limit. Larson said the project did conform. However, if the plans have changed since Larson's review then his letter does not pertain. He recommends a decision should be on each house individually as to whether they conform to Exhibit A.

Boyden: Some of the documentation from the city only refers to Kooklani I but not Kooklani II. This may be a typo.

Presented by Francisco Mendiola & Matt Peterson

Kooklani I = 7447 Hillside Drive, Kooklani II = 7451 Hillside Drive [This is what he said, but it differs from addresses in description above.]

Peterson: The question is whether the revisions are in substantial conformance. The heights are the same, but buildings have been shifted a bit on the site. For a Substantial Conformance Review the buildings should be similar in size and these are. The pool shape for each house is that main thing that has changed.

Mendiola: Presented Kooklani I drawings which showed the footprint of the original project and the proposed changes on overlays. Areas outside the original envelope are shown in green, those inside are shown in red. The changes appear to be very close to offsetting.

Mendiola pointed out that the dimensions on the various plan sets have changed several times, to better clarify the proposed project, but the project itself has not changed.

Public Comment: None. (Crisafi made comments earlier as noted)

Morton: Original plan garage setback? **Mendiola response:** 11' from property line. The setback for the proposed garage is at 18'.

Merten: Balcony is not cantilevered and goes down to grade. Do you have any elevations showing the pool from the front?

Response: No. The pool will have stone in the front and the front deck will be obscured by the façade.

Merten: There are issues with the prop D measurement. The pool is part of the structure and heights should be measured 5 feet out from the lowest point on the structure to the highest point on the building.

The elevations do not show what the pool will look like. **Response:** It will probably be supported by caissons... **Merten:** Even so, it has to be considered part of the house and deck structure and as such should be measured 5 feet out from the lowest structure. **Response:** We will have to adjust the design to meet the requirements.

Kooklani I:

Motion: Merten; second: Morton

- **The Kooklani I Project is not in substantial conformance with the Exhibit “A” drawings, because the location of the swimming pool is substantially different from previous plans and the supporting documents relating to the pool are inadequate.**
- **The project now exceeds the proposition D height limit.**

Motion carries 6-0-1

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

Morton leaves meeting at this point.

The Kooklani II project is reviewed. The plans show a similar design to the proposed Kooklani I project, and has the same issues with the pool and Prop D height measurements.

Lucas: Is the building style the same as the approved original project? **Crisafi response:** *The original design was in a modern style, but used flat roofs. The proposed project is modern but uses curved roofs.*

Lucas: Is the area on each floor similar between the original and proposed designs? **Response:** *yes, very similar.*

Kooklani II:

Motion: Emerson; second: Schenck

- **The Kooklani II Project is not in substantial conformance with the Exhibit “A” drawings, because the location of the swimming pool is substantially different from previous plans and the supporting documents relating to the pool are inadequate.**
- **The project now exceeds the proposition D height limit.**

Motion carries 5-0-1

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Morton, Schenck; abstain: Boyden (chair)

5. Consideration of amending the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance to incorporate the citywide residential floor area ratios of Chapter 13 of the San Diego Municipal Code, in addition to all the other criteria currently specified in the LJSPDO and the LJ Community Plan. This item was placed on the LJSPRC agenda as directed by Tony Crisafi, President of the LJCPA, at its June 2, 2011 meeting.

Tony Crisafi:

Presented a chart on City wide FARs for the single family residential zone (Table 131-04J).

There are problems with setbacks and sizes of developments in the Shores, and recently we have seen these affect projects in the Spindrift area. He proposed that the DSD adopt table 131-04J for residential zones. He is not necessarily proposing that the LJ Shores PDO or the Municipal Code be changed.

Committee members raise the point that the DSD is bound by the Municipal Code, so that this probably will not have the desired affect.

Boyden: Spoke of the need for a broader outreach. Is concerned that the city would treat neighborhood compatibility, bulk and scale, and other guidelines in the LJS PDO with even less importance than they do now. She expressed concerns about the effect on owners of properties on the 5,000 sf lots in the beach area who would now be constrained. She also had concerns regarding areas of larger lots, such as at La Jolla Scenic, where the residential zone table 131-04J would allow for 0.45 to 0.48 for a typical lot size, but the current neighborhood average is much less than 0.40—even in the .20s. She is concerned that this would encourage larger houses and change the current feel of the neighborhood.

A letter from committee member Morton was read, as he had to leave before the item was heard.

He said, “I oppose the motion to include FAR in the La Jolla Shores PDO. The PDO although is not specific in many areas, is a unique PDO in all Southern California. The freedom it avails the community and the property owners is unique in South California. I encourage the committee not to change the La Jolla Shores PDO.”

John Schenck: What is the history of the La Jolla Shores PDO lack of a defined FAR? (answered to a certain degree by Rob Whittemore presentation.)

Public input:

Rob Whittemore: He presented his views in a handout that summarized the history of the LJ Shores PDO. According to Mike Stepner, with the city at the time of the original LJS PDO in 1974, FARs were not specified because they were not thought to be useful in the Shores area due to many odd lot sizes and the various zoning designations at the time. Design guidelines were thought to be better tools. However, as development proceeded in the area, many issues/arguments arose about projects being compatible with the LJS PDO guidelines. In 1993, to eliminate some of the disputes, the Development Services Department created guidelines specifying a maximum of 0.60 FAR, and published and distributed these to the public. These were in use until the LJS PDO was revised and incorporated into the Municipal Code January 1, 2000. At that time the LJS PDO specifically incorporated Chapter 13 of the Municipal Code which included the provisions for city wide base zones.

Whittemore continued--The former city attorney weighed in on this in 2006 and came to the conclusion that base zones should apply, but DSD fought the decision and through unusual and (secretive to the public) circumstances the decision was never enforced.

At a recent meeting, the present city attorney agreed with the previous city attorney opinion about the base zones applying, but feels since they have not been applied to date; it would be arbitrary and capricious to apply them now. Currently two other Planned Districts incorporate provisions of Chapter 13 of the Municipal Code, similar to the way the LJS PDO incorporates them. Rob said that other legal consultants who have looked at the issue feel have the opposite opinion and feel that it is arbitrary and capricious not to apply them from this point forward.

Whittemore feels that the fastest and most effective approach to having the base zone FARs in Chapter 13 apply would be to take this issue before the City Council and have them confirm that citywide FARs should be applied to the La Jolla Shores Planned District.

A second approach would be to re-write the current LJS PDO, which is a large and time consuming task. Some efforts are being made on this currently, but will take years to achieve.

A third approach would be to expand the La Jolla PDO to cover the Shores area (and eliminate the LJS PDO). This would require re-zoning the Shores among other issues that would likely take years to resolve.

Committee discussion:

The committee discussed how to pursue the various proposals and whether to adopt the Table 131-04J as establishing the maximum FARs permitted in the LJS PD, for proposed development in the LJSPD in addition to the neighborhood compatibility and bulk and scale in the LJS PDO. Concerns were raised that there should be more public input taken on this proposal. A PDO re-write is an involved process and it would be presumptuous for this committee to speak for the entire La Jolla Shores area.

Merten: Raised concerns on what a motion made by the committee can consist of based on how this item was noticed.

Mr. Whitney in the audience raised the point that this item was only noticed for residential.

Lucas: Are we asking for a change to the MC or PDO? **Crisafi response:** He is proposing that these be guidelines used by DSD, not changes to the Municipal Code or LJS PDO.

Merten: As guidelines these wouldn't be enforceable... and would most likely be ignored by the DSD department.

Emerson: It is important to add these to the SF zones, but not sure the best way to do this.

Motion: Emerson; second: Merten

This committee recommends the CPA have a full hearing and discussion on the whether the underlying citywide FARs in all zones should be confirmed as applying in the La Jolla Shores Planned District.

Motion carries 5-0-1

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