

MINUTES OF THE LA JOLLA PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE  
MARCH 9, 2009 (Unapproved)

Present: Chair Tiffany Sherer, John Berol, Crystal Hasson, Deborah Marengo, Orrin Gabsch, Glen Rasmussen. A quorum was established at 4 pm.

Harman Assets: Harman made a presentation for the Lion Building at 7650 Girard Ave. They propose an illuminated brushed aluminum box sign where the name of 3 tenants will be displayed, such that the illumination shows through the letters, only. In this fashion, Harman argues that the square footage of the sign should be defined only by the size of the letters 17.63 sf, as is their current signage, which is non-illuminated letters, only. Also, one of the tenants currently is named on the awning. That would be removed. An additional banner sign on the south side of the building (facing Bank of America) would be removed. The building has 48.2 frontage and under the PDO is therefore allowed 48.2 sf of signage. The box sign measures 50 sf, so Hartman was asked to return with proposed dimensions not exceeding 48.2 sf, as the Committee interprets the PDO as applying to the total size of the box sign.

An additional issue was discussed regarding allowable occupancy of this building under the PDO. In the past, the "Massage Envy" tenant on the 2d floor was questionably not an "office" as defined by the PDO as the only allowable occupancy category on the 2d floor. Then, the building was sold to a new landlord. The new landlord now proposes a sign for a tenant that is not allowed under the PDO. Additionally, now there is a 3d floor office tenant ("Shiloh") and a personal trainer on a 4<sup>th</sup> floor, formerly a roof deck, that may not be a legal occupancy, which is seeking signage under the proposed action ("Core Coach Center - Chris Robinson").

A procedural discussion was held about what the PDOC should do in cases where the PDO appears to be violated. The PDOC is not a policing agency, so such cases should be referred to City Code Compliance.

A procedural discussion was also held about what the PDOC should do when it votes on a project and, for example, a later City cycle review interprets an element of the building differently than the applicant presented to the PDOC, or when an applicant is not in compliance with the PDO but seeks an approval on another aspect of the project. In the former case, the PDOC can discuss the changed conditions with the LJCPA, which can then act in consideration of the changes. In the latter case, City Code Compliance is the proper policing authority for the other aspect.

A discussion was held wherein a final draft of the PDO Charter was unanimously adopted on motion by Marengo/Collins and to send the final draft to the CPA for further action.

Respectfully Submitted

Glen Rasmussen, Secretary