

La Jolla Planned District Ordinance Committee

MINUTES

Chairman: Chuck Berke Vice Chairman: Secretary: Sherri Lightner

MEETING – April 3, 2006

CHECK ATTENDANCE PLEASE

Present: Chuck Berke, Bob Collins, Sherri Lightner, Deborah Marengo, Hal White, and Trent Wagenseller.

Absent: Orrin Gabsch, Terry Underwood and Peter Wagener.

Other Attendees: Tiffany Sherer, Mike Costello, Odile Costello, Christino Gutheil, Danna Cotman, David Wilkinson, Joe Dameron, Joe La Cava, Dave Cutchin, Karen Moranville, Kevin L. Gordon, Michelle Fulks, Darcy Ashley, Paul Metcalf, Michael Morton, Mark Lyon, Mary Cutchin, Sally Miller, Anne Cleveland, Elena DuCharme, Anne Kapteina.

REGULAR MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER 4:10 p.m.

PROJECTS PRESENTED/DISCUSSED:

1. **MARY STAR OF THE SEA PARKING LOT, 7700 block of Herschel Avenue, PDO Zone 2, Owner's Representative: Joe Dameron.** Project proposes demolition of two single-story retail/office spaces and a two story, two-unit apartment building with four garages and construction of 21-space surface parking lot. Parking lot design is drive through with entrance from Herschel and exit into the alley. The spaces are diagonal. Lot is 50 x 140 (7000 sq. ft.) Parking is to be used by the Church and the Church-affiliated schools. None of the stalls will be leased. There will be a loss of about two on-street parking spaces for the driveway on Herschel.

MOTION: To approve with conditions that 1) the curb cut on Herschel, including flare, not exceed 15 ft of street frontage and 2) that the landscaping requirement of SDMC 103.1207 (g)) be met. ["Surface parking areas fronting on a street shall be screened with a landscaped buffer of not less than six feet in width between the public right-of-way (sidewalk) and the parking area]. (Collins/Wagenseller: 5-0-1) Recusal by Marengo – late arrival.

2. Request to hear PROW matter by Lightner, postponed by the Chair.

3. Committee to discuss proposed amendments to PDO.

Berke: Announced that the purpose of the meeting was to consider the two proposals as they relate to Bird Rock and the rest of the affected areas (all prior proposals have been resolved). His opinion was that there had been no testimony against the proposed amendments, and some testimony favoring them, as regards the areas other than Bird Rock - and, as regards Bird Rock, there has been good testimony on both sides. In addition, four people (Morton, Lyon LaCava, Metcalf) have positively moved in the direction of a solution as regards Bird Rock. He therefore was of the belief that we should vote to approve the proposals as regards all but Bird Rock and give no opinion as regards Bird Rock, because of the progress being made toward a solution. His opinion was to send them both to the CPA. Watched the Land Use & Housing meeting last week and is concerned by the DSD Work Program discussions at that meeting, as regards the standardization of the PDO's citywide.

Collins: Questioned the advisability of that. It is the PDO Committee, which should be evaluating and making recommendations. Doesn't believe all the information has been gathered or discussed. The community and the committee need to do more work and should not separate the Village from Bird Rock. Wants to move forward the other amendments and spend the necessary time on the latest two amendments.

Cleveland: Introduced herself as Secretary of the La Jolla Town Council and member of Parks & Beaches Committee. Commented that the Parks & Beaches Committee at their last meeting requested that the LJTC not approve the two latest amendments until the effect on or increased need for parks and beaches in our community has been evaluated.

Lightner: Commented that the effects of the height limit change on Zones 1, 2,3 and 5 have not been considered. The proponents want to increase the density of Zone 4 so that it is comparable to the existing in some of the other zones. The zones which are currently two-story and have the larger FAR's cannot achieve those FAR's. There are

other requirements, which limit the maximizing of the FAR's – landscaping, parking, service yards and setbacks. The effect of this indirect density increase (by increasing the story limits) needs to be considered as well as the obvious density increase in Zone 4. The LJTC has offered by letter to Scott Peters to finance a minimum of two charettes. The community needs to participate before this goes forward.

Marengo: Talked to someone downtown about the PDO and was given the impression that the PDO's would be eliminated Citywide.

LaCava: Turned in two reports to the committee. One was a summary of the current Bird Rock situation and the other proposed modifications to Section 103.1206 of the SDMC in response to the latest two amendments. Announced that Scott (Peters) has issued an RFP throughout the country to get a consultant for the BRCC to conduct a meeting or meetings related to Form-based zoning.

Mary Cutchin: Bought property in the mixed-use area of Zone 4 in 1992. Traded proximity to the Village and its conveniences for loss of privacy. Concern that privacy issues may trump good design. Does not want to see "wedding cake" designs.

Mark Lyon: Would like to see the Committee pass it on up to the CPA. Would like the committee to accept the concept with some of the conditions identified. To allow three stories and increase the base and maximum densities to match that which exists in the Commercial Core of the Village. Will give the commercial core a kick in the pants. Wants to see some help for the residential properties adjacent to the commercial core and even in the residential areas adjacent to these boundary residential properties. What are the suggested protections? Want to balance Incentives and protections.

1. Setbacks for privacy – Offsetting planes, wedding cake concept, buffering of commercial from the residential areas.
2. Limit to the third story mass
3. Underground parking required for lots greater than 8000 sq. ft.
4. Increase parking on some sites to provide parking for adjacent properties with insufficient parking.
5. Public benefits need to be identified.

Morton: Provided handout to the committee.

Wilkinson: Request for additional changes is a request for material changes. These are major changes, they are not the administrative types of changes, which were previously approved and forwarded to the City. The two areas, which will be affected by these latest proposed changes, are distinct from each other. Does not want hasty action. Need to take time.

DuCharme: Does not live in Bird Rock. The broader La Jolla Community does not know about this proposal. It has been around only a month and a half. If they knew about it they would be concerned. It means those buildings which are now one-story will be ripped down. Herschel will be completely changed. There has not been enough publicity. Need more publicity.

Miller: Public Views. There has been no mention of public views or view corridors. How are these proposed revisions going to affect ocean views.

Mike Costello: There seems to be confusion between what the City is doing (eliminating PDO's) and the direction of Scott's Office (with the RFP). Let's give the process a chance. We need more time before this moves up to the CPA.

Gordon: Give us the opportunity for more dialogue. Keep the matter in Committee.

Cotman: Is from the Village. Wants more information on what is going on. Wants more time to find out what is proposed. Lack of participation or comment by people from the Village is indication that they do not know about the proposal yet.

Lyon: Community Plan took a long time. Need to get this to staff for comments. There is an iterative process involved and we need to get it started.

Ashley:

Kapteina: The conditions for the proposed amendments need to part of the package sent to CPA. They must be attached like a burr so that they cannot be ripped off.

Gutheil: Need to keep in the committee. Agrees with the burr-like comment.

Fuller: Take more time.

Metcalfe: Want to point out the importance of the suggestion in the Bird Rock Status Report of forming an oversight committee. As noted in the Report, it could consist of the current La Jolla PDO committee with the addition of three representatives from Bird Rock.

Wagenseller: He believes he is not an expert and thinks that it should move forward to the CPA where he believes the matter can be handled better.

Cleveland: Statement refers back to the Marengo/LaCava comments regarding the City's handling of the PDO. Chuck had asked me to hold my comments until the public could speak. After the March 23rd Community Forum, Chanelle Barry reported that the City only had enough funds for one PDO review and that could account for some of the pressure to send all of the amendments, including the two new ones, through so quickly.

Lightner: Community Plan took a long time. It involved the community in a time consuming and inclusive process. Initial work was done prior to 1995. The Planning Commission held a public workshop on it in December 2000. The next hearing was in December 2001. The Planning Commission sent it back with 17 suggested amendments identified that the LJTC and CPA were to work with City Staff on resolving. The City Council voted on it in May 2002 and it was not finally certified until two iterations with the Coastal Commission were complete in February 2004. It was a lengthy process but the community was involved from the beginning. Want to know why we cannot review these changes in consultation with City Staff as we did with the previous amendments.

Berke: Based on what he had heard during the meeting, his opinion was to not recommend a position on either Bird Rock or the rest of LJ - but to send them to the CPA. His change of position on the rest of LJ was based mainly on learning that Scott Peters was to retain a consultant to review both areas.

FAILED MOTION: The Planned District Ordinance Committee passes this matter [two latest PDO amendment proposals] on to the Community Planning Association without a recommendation, because of the amount of work yet to be done by the consultants, which are to be hired with the assistance of the Councilmember's office, and by the individuals [Morton, Lyon, LaCava, Metcalfe] who have been working on this. (Berke/White: 3-3-0) Motion failed.

PASSED MOTION: Continue this process at the Committee level, as long as it remains productive. This includes the evaluation of the work to be done by the consultants, whom are to be hired by the Councilmember's office, and the community individuals who have been working on this. When there is a resolution or if the committee determines that the process is no longer productive, the matter will be passed on to the CPA. (Collins/Wagenseller: 4-2-0)

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m. Next meeting at 4:00 p.m. on April 17, 2006. Room 1 at the Rec Center.

Submitted by Sherri Lightner 4/4/06.