



LA JOLLA SHORES PLANNED DISTRICT ADVISORY BOARD

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES FROM:

WEDNESDAY, November 16, 2022

Item 1: CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jane Potter called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Item 2: ROLL CALL

Members Present: Jane Potter – Chair, Suzanne Weissman, Andrea Moser, Herbert Lazerow, Kathleen Neil, and Philip Wise.

Staff Liaison: Marlon Pangilinan, Senior Planner, Planning Department. Staff provides guidelines/procedures for today's virtual meeting.

Item 3: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chair indicates that Action Item B: 2421 Whale Watch Way will become an information item as requested by the applicant who only requests input on the proposed as this time and the address should be corrected to 8421 Whale Watch Way. Motion to approve the agenda as amended by Board Member Neil, Seconded by Board Member Weissman. Agenda approved 7-0-0.

Item 4: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from November 16, 2023

Motion to approve minutes incorporating changes from the Board Members by Board Member Lazerow, seconded by Board Member Wise. Minutes approved 7-0-0.

Item 5: BOARD MEMBER AND STAFF LIAISON COMMENT

- Staff clarified with regard to the 8215 Prestwick Drive project being withdrawn that the threshold for projects to be reviewed by the Advisory Board is if they increase floor area by 10 percent and if staff refers a project as result of other review criteria under Bulletin 621. In the case with the 8215 Prestwick Drive project, it was premature at this time for the Advisory Board to review the project since it had not been reviewed by City Staff.

- Staff mentioned that the update to the LDC regarding FARs in single-family areas in the La Jolla Shores Planned District have not been certified by the California Coastal Commission. No details on hearing date available at this time.
- Board Member Lazerow offered to lead a discussion at the next meeting regarding the review process outlined in Information Bulletin 621 with regard to the Advisory Board wanting to review all projects when they do not meet all of the review criteria, not just the increase in floor area by 10 percent and recommend forwarding a letter to the City.
- Chair Potter mentioned concerns that were expressed about applicants not providing review materials (e.g. site plans, renderings, exhibits, etc.) ahead of the meeting and clarified that only the Applicant Project Information form was only required since prior to COVID. Staff also clarified that at a minimum the Applicant Project Information was required ahead of time to inform the agenda and that project details would be shared and presented to Advisory Board and the public at the same time during the meeting.

Item 6: NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Item 7: PROJECT REVIEW:

PTS 1053312 – Gibby Residence (ACTION ITEM) 8311 El Paseo Grande

Applicant: Tim Golba

Presentation: Applicant provided a presentation on the proposed project and discussed details related to:

- The existing site conditions and context of the neighborhood
- That there was an existing grade change resulting in the existing structure having 2-stories in the fronting the street and one-stories in the rear
- Existing Gross Floor Area (GFA) is 2,569 sf and will add 1,548 sf resulting in a total GFA of 4117 sf and an 0.78 Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
- Proposed addition is located within the footprint of the existing building with no encroachment into the existing setbacks
- No proposed roof deck

Applicant also provided clarifications with regard to project:

- Meeting the landscaping requirement
- Being conditioned for monitoring for paleontological resource monitoring despite the site being previously disturbed

- Subject to the existing regulations and not the recent changes that are yet to be in effect in the Coastal Zone.
- Project FAR and average FAR relative to residences in neighborhood

Public Comment: None

Board Comment:

- Concerns expressed regarding large windows being invasive with regard to privacy and the 2nd floor not being articulated well.
- Proposed bulk and scale were mentioned as an issue
- Other comments expressed that the project “nicely done,” that the proposed changes would be an improvement, and that many homes in the area are going through this similar process relative to bulk and scale

Board Motion: Motion to approve Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit by Chair Potter, seconded by Moser. Motion approved: 4-1-1. Board Member Lazerow abstained due to not being able to understand enough of the project to vote at this point.

PTS 0704251 – 2521 Calle Del Oro (ACTION ITEM)

Applicants: Jules Wilson and Chris Fletcher

Presentation: The Applicant provided a presentation on the proposed project and discussed details related to:

- The existing site conditions and context of the neighborhood
- The project including two pools and subterranean pool house
- Providing adjacent neighbors an opportunity to review the project (e.g. scope of work and renderings) along with providing story poles to show not impact to private views. Both next door neighbors have signed off.
- Increasing lot coverage from 49 percent to 53 percent
- Maintaining 30 percent landscaping on site.
- Existing FAR is 0.49 and will increase to 0.51 FAR.

Public Comment: None.

Board Comment:

- Concerns were expressed regarding the maximization of the buildable portion of the lot
- The applicant was complimented over their effort to inform the neighbors; however, concerns were also expressed about the amount of digging and

likely requiring caissons, that will take place on site with reference to paleontological, biological, and hydrology effects.

- Due to the sloping site, which was expressed as uncharacteristic in the area, the calculation of height was questioned
- Relative to the increase in floor area, it was commented that the size of the pool and pool house could be more than 10 percent
- Overall, it was expressed that the project had many positive aspects to be considered a minor, but the amount of digging involved would make the project more associated with a major project.

Motion: Motion to not recommend the project as a Minor Project by Board Member Lazerow, seconded by Board Member Wise. Motion approved 7-0-0. Board Member Lazerow also clarified that this motion does not recommend the project as a Major Project.

The Advisory Board also commented, in response to the applicant's request for input from the Board should the project come before them for consideration as Major Project, that more work needs to be done in response to the various issues that have been already brought by the Board such as those related to:

- Whether caissons will be required to stabilize the project
- Amount of soil cut from the site
- Size of buried structures
- Understanding the project's effect on hydrology given the sloping site

PTS 0704168 – 8421 Whale Watch Way (INFORMATION ITEM)

Applicant: Aaron Borja

Presentation: Applicant provided a presentation on the proposed project and discussed details related to:

- The existing site conditions and context of the neighborhood, showing that the existing residence smaller than the buildings in the surrounding properties
- Project minimize bulk and scale by trying to stepback the building from the Right of Way
- The project's FAR would be increasing from a 0.21 FAR to a 0.47 FAR and increasing the building's floor area from 3,800 sf to 8,195 sf
- The existing structure did not trigger the historic 45-year review
- Existing FARs, lot sizes, house sizes, and setbacks in the surrounding area
- Meeting with adjacent neighbors regarding the proposed project
- Doubling the amount of landscaping required on site
- Increasing lot coverage from 14 percent to 25 percent

Public Comment: None.

Board Comment: Comments in general were positive, in that the project was considered attractive, well-articulated, the proposed bulk and scale fit into the neighborhood. Other input and follow-up items included:

- Providing clarifying details on the retaining wall near the pool
- Ensuring correct calculation on building height relative to the sloping nature of the site
- Providing additional landscaping to add more appeal to the sloping area of the site
- The Board was appreciated that the applicant contacted adjacent neighbors
- Comments also noted special biological and moderate paleontological sensitivity of the area
- The Board also wanted the applicant to note that although the CCC has not approved the new FAR for the La Jolla Shores Planned District, that project's FAR limit would be 0.45 FAR.

Board Member Lazerow left the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

Item 8: ADJOURNMENT

The LJSDPDAB will be adjourned to its next meeting on Wednesday, January 18, 2023.

Meeting concluded at 12:28 p.m.