

# La Jolla Planned District Ordinance Committee

Chair: Ione R. Stiegler, FAIA

## DRAFT MINUTES – MONDAY, September 21, 2015 4:00 PM, La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street, Room 1

**Present:** Stiegler, Ovanessoff-Acting Secretary, Van Galder, Fitzgerald, Pitrofsky, Dershowitz, Parker, Burke, Zimmerman

**Visitors:** Karen Moranville, Mark & Becky Conger, Deborah & Ryan Pennell, Kaysie Porsonits, John McCulley, Andy Crocker, Doug Moranville, Sally Miller

1. **Public Comment** – Issues not on today’s agenda (2 minutes maximum.)  
None
2. **Chair Report / Board Discussion**
  - a. Review and Approve August Minutes  
Fitzgerald motion to approve. Seconded Dershowitz  
Vote 4-0-2 (only those who attended the last meeting were eligible to vote. Van Galder, Pitrofsky, Parker left early).
  - b. Issues regarding PDO compliance and means to promote enforcement.  
Tabled to next meeting
3. **Recommendations to DPR**
  - a. **Project Name:** Su Casa  
**Address:** 6378 La Jolla Blvd. and 350 Playa Del Sur (APN 351-382-16, 351-382-11)  
**Project Number:** 420956  
**PDO Zone:** 4  
**Applicant:** Claude-Anthony Marengo  
**Agent:** Claude-Anthony Marengo  
**City Project Manager:** Morris Dye  
**Date of App Notice:** July 1, 2015  
**Scope of Work:**  
The property is located at 6738 La Jolla Boulevard and 350 Playa Del Sur. The 0.51-acre site is in Zone 4 of the La Jolla Planned District and in the RM-3-7 zone, within the Coastal (Non-appealable) overlay zone and within the La Jolla Community Plan area and in Council District 1. A Process 5 Public Right-of-Way (ROW) Vacation, Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit to demolish a restaurant and apartment building, construct a 2-story 7,875 square-foot, mixed use building, a 3,820 square-foot, 2-story residential building and a 3,086 square-foot 3-story residential building with a 15,312 square-foot underground parking garage.  
  
**Minutes:**  
This item was pulled from the agenda by the applicant
  - b. **Project Name:** 801 Pearl Street  
**Address:** 801 Pearl Street, La Jolla, California 92037  
**Project Number:** 294307 Account # 24003213  
**PDO Zone:** 4, RM-1-1  
**Applicant:** Mark & Becky Conger  
801 Pearl Street  
La Jolla, California 92037  
**Agent:** Paul Benton  
**City Project Manager:** John S. Fisher, RLA.  
**Date of App Notice:** 9/26/2014 – (Review Cycle Comments enclosed) Resubmission June 2015

### NEXT MEETING – MONDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2015

Please check <http://www.lajollacpa.org> 72 hours prior to meeting, meeting may be cancelled if no projects are on the agenda.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT IONE R. STIEGLER, FAIA, CHAIR, 858-456-8555 OR  
[istiegler@isarchitecture.com](mailto:istiegler@isarchitecture.com)

*If a Sign Language Interpreter, aids for the visually impaired, or Assisted Listening Devices (ALDs) are required, please contact the City’s Disability Services Coordinator at 619-321-3208 at least (5) five work days prior to the meeting date to insure availability.*

# La Jolla Planned District Ordinance Committee

## DRAFT MINUTES – MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015 (Page 2 of 2)

### **Scope of Work:**

(Process 4) Coastal Development Permit and Tentative Map to remove an existing service station and construct a new mixed-use project with four retail units and 12 residential units with a subterranean garage: total development 23,340 sf. The property is located at 801 Pearl Street with a portion in Zone 4 of La Jolla Planned District and another portion in the RM-1-1 Zone, within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable 2), Coastal Height Limit, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Coastal), the Transit Area Overlay Zone, the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay.

### **Scope of Work and Minutes of discussion as listed at June 8 2015:**

Remove existing gasoline station and auto repair shop along with underground tanks etc. Site will be determined clean by County authorities.

Then owner wishes to construct multi-use retail/residential uses on 21,000 sf (140'x150') site. The north 14,000 sf of site (140'x100') adjacent to Pearl Street is LJPDO Zone 4. The southern 7000 sf (140'x50') of the site is zone RM-1-1.

Underground parking will be provided for the site with access from Eads Avenue. ~5,400 sf first floor retail space on Pearl Street will be serviced from Bishops Lane. This space will be divided into 5 retail condo units.

Three condo flats and 9 condo townhouses will be placed over the retail and around a courtyard accessed from both Eads Avenue and Bishops Lane. Separate elevators will service the retail and residential owners from the Parking Garage.

Since the last City review Dec 2014, and difficulties with the local DPR committee and neighborhood opposition, the owner has changed architects and then configuration of the project.

The program of 12 dwelling units and a total allowable buildable area of 23,428 sf (FAR 1.12) has not changed, but we have reviewed the City comments, met with neighbors, listened to their issues, reconfigured the project and eliminated the third floor from the work.

Therefore the new scheme proposes 2 story townhomes backing up to the adjacent neighbors, retail space reduced by ~20%, and reduced building heights.

Parking exceeds the 32 space minimum.

### **Minutes (June 8, 2015 Meeting):**

Project presented by Mr. James Alcorn, project architect. Mr. Alcorn informed the Committee that a previous version of this project had been presented to the PDO in the past and had been approved. However, during the applicant's subsequent presentation to the DPR Committee, they encountered difficulties with the project's neighbors and decided to significantly re-design the project. The new project was presented in detail. The required parking for the project is 32 spaces, while the new design would have 38 spaces. It was further explained the project is located on two separate lots with two separate sets of applicable zoning regulations (commercial and residential). It was further noted that only the parcel facing Pearl Street, the commercial parcel, would be subject to the PDO regulations. The new buildings have a maximum height of approximately 25 feet, while the older design had a maximum height of 30 feet. The project was reduced in the total number of floors from three to two. It was further noted that, per the City's request, the entrance to the underground parking structure would be from Eads Ave. because there was a traffic light on the corner of Eads and Pearl, which would help in controlling the traffic entering the project. It was further noted that all the delivery and trash areas would be located on Bishop Lane. Applicant had also reduced the commercial portion of the project by 20% from its last design as well as reducing the footprint of the project to 60% of the entire lot. There are two proposed elevators. One for the commercial and one for the residential. Jacaranda trees are required for this development, which will be provided on Eads Ave.; flowering Pear trees will also be provided. Stiegler noted that one of the cycle issues raised on the previous version of the project related to building 5 residential units in the RM1 zone when only 2 such units were allowed. Mr. Alcorn explained that, since the applicant is consolidating the two lots, 5 units would be permissible on that portion of the property. It was noted that FAR was not an issue. Stiegler also pointed out that, in the past cycle reviews for this project, bulk and scale was an issue with Long Range Planning department. Presenter noted that all issues with Long Range Planning has been resolved. Stiegler further noted that this Committee could only decide on the commercial portion of the property as it was the only portion that actually was subject to the LJPDO jurisdiction. There was detailed discussions regarding to patios, balconies, and windows overlooking neighbors. Stiegler noted her concern about the staircase that led to the parking structure from Eads Ave. It was noted that the staircase would be gated and well lit. Fitzgerald asked how the residential and commercial parking space would be differentiated to ensure that clients of the commercial areas would not park in the residential spaces. Other than being marked, there would be no other means to segregate the spaces.

# La Jolla Planned District Ordinance Committee

## DRAFT MINUTES – MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015 (Page 3 of 3)

After reviewing the parking requirements, it was decided that the present design does indeed meet the PDO requirements.

### **Public Comments (June 8, 2015 Meeting):**

Connie Branscomb voiced her concern about not having enough parking spaces for all the commercial clients as well as the occupants and their visitors/guests. She recommends the project to be reduced from 12 units to 8.

Ryan Panned (spelling?) was concerned whether a tow truck would be able to enter the garage structure to tow away illegally-parked or disabled vehicles. The presenter noted that the parking structure was designed per the City requirements and, as a result, there should be no issue here.

Doug Moranville expressed his concern as to how the trash would be collected from Bishops lane amidst all the parked cars. Mr. Alcorn responded by indicating that the majority of La Jolla is treated the same manner as this project would be.

Leslie Gaunt addressed the committee members with a detailed presentation of the opposition of the project by the Southerly neighbor(s). A detailed brochure was handed to everyone. Ms. Gaunt's presentation will be included as part of the PDO record. She noted that there were no dimensions provided by the applicant and, as a result, any decision on the project by the Committee would be premature. There was great concern about the bulk and scale of the project and how it relates to the PDO regulations. She further noted that the density did not comply with the PDO. The major concerns were detailed fully on pages 7, 11, 12 and 14 of her handout.

### **Scope of Work Quote from Architect's Letter, July 10, 2015 to City Permit Processing:**

"The project retains an overall density of 1.12 and the building footprint has been reduced to 64% from the previous 70% building coverage. The retail space has been reduced by 22% from 6830sf to 5340sf and the dwelling unit on RM-1-1 portion of the lot has been reduced from 3 stories to 2 stories (30ft to 24/2Sft height). The dwelling unit count at southerly RM-1-1 portion of the site is reduced by 37.5% from 8 to 5 and the southerly rear setback of the property which is located in the RM-1-1 zone has been increased from 10ft to 15ft. Street parking along Eads Avenue has been increased by 150% from 2 to 5 available. Underground project required parking is 32 although 38 spaces are provided (6 extra)."

**Action (August 10, 2015 Meeting):** This item was removed from the Agenda by Chairperson Stiegler and Vice-Chair Fitzgerald. The reason: The City's cycle issues letter was not available shortly before the meeting. As a result, there was insufficient time for the Committee members and members of the public to review this important material prior to discussion and Committee vote.

### **Minutes:**

Mr. Jim Alcorn and Mr. Paul Benton presented this project. Alcorn presented all the different F.A.R for the neighboring projects and buildings surrounding subject project. He further indicated that their project had an F.A.R of 1.12, well within the regulations. An extensive set of color renderings of the projects' various elevations were presented to the Committee. Alcorn explained that the applicant had addressed all of the most-recent cycle issues identified by the City and that the applicant would be returning to the City on 9/22/15 to submit their final answers and solutions to all of the cycle issues. The presentation indicated that the proposed project set-backs satisfied all of the regulatory requirements. It was noted that there was 39 parking spaces planned for the project while the City required 31. The location and capabilities of the dumpsters were presented to the Committee. In response to a Stiegler question, Benton explained that the recyclable dumpsters would be co-located with the regular dumpsters—each dumpster would be divided internally into recyclable and non-recyclable trash sections. Stiegler also questioned the location of the required back-flow preventer valves. Alcorn indicated the possible locations and assured Stiegler that they would not be located on Pearl St. Stiegler questioned the location of the garage stairs and their vicinity to the neighbors' driveways and homes. Alcorn indicated the proposed locations and, to address neighbor security concerns, he noted that the applicant would also be installing a six-foot wall around the stair wells with gated access and shielded-lighting to deter vagrants and minimize the impact on neighbors. Stiegler reminded the Committee that only a portion of the project property technically fell under the PDO jurisdiction. Mr. Alcorn indicated that, per the Municipal Code, when a project is located in two separate zones (residential and commercial, in this case), the site can be considered as a single entity in assessing the project's compliance with the PDO and other applicable regulations. In addition, Jim Alcorn and Paul Benton indicated that: 1) the project's window coverage was planned to be 20%, well below the maximum allowed 40%; the sizes and location of the various windows were presented to the Committee; 2) the project's landscaping area will be 25.6%, above the minimum requirement of 25%; 3) the project's height will not exceed the maximum allowable height of 30 ft. Finally, samples of the materials to be used were presented to the

# La Jolla Planned District Ordinance Committee

## DRAFT MINUTES – MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015 (Page 4 of 4)

Committee: the window frame colors would be a dark grey to black color; terra cotta tiles would be used for the window grills and balconies; tan and white smooth finish stucco would also be used throughout the building. A small, sample glass pane was also presented to demonstrate how a typical window would look.

The Chair then opened the floor for public comments and questions:

Sally Miller spoke. She had three questions from the applicants:

1- What are the widths of the sidewalks on Pearl and Eads streets?

Response: 8 feet minimum.

2- In prior presentations, Ms. Miller noted that the applicant had indicated that the approach/exit from the parking garage would be flat. In today's presentation, it is now being presented with a 5% incline grade. Why? Also, the length of the approach/exit of this area should be long enough so that when a car is stopped, it would not protrude onto the sidewalk/ public right of way.

Response: 5% is a minimal slope and would hardly be noticeable. This slope is required to provide adequate drainage as well as to avoid an unnecessarily steep slope in the center section of the ramp in and out of the parking garage. The length of top section of the ramp this space was adequate so that, if a car stopped in this area, it would not intrude into the sidewalk/ public right of way for the driver to have visibility (i.e., visibility triangles) to car and pedestrian traffic on Eads.

3- Ms. Miller was very concerned about bright lights and in particular neon lights. How was the applicant addressing the lighting?

Response: The stairwell lights would be hooded so as to limit the lighting downward towards the stairs. The applicant would also consider prohibiting neon lights in the entire project and including such a restriction in the development's CC&R's.

Doug Moranville asked the presenters why the stairwell was permitted to be built inside the setback. The response was that, as long as the stairs are below grade, they are permitted within the setback areas.

Karen Moranvill asked whether the applicant had approached SDG&E to inquire whether they would re-locate their equipment, thus allowing the stairwell to the garage be moved further away from the neighbor's property. Response: the applicant indicated that they would approach SDG&E but it was their opinion that SDG&E would not likely relocate their equipment because it is large and because this equipment services the entire immediate neighborhood as well as the proposed project.

A member of the public asked where the A/C equipment for the commercial and residential units would be located. Response: The presenters indicated that the commercial A/C equipment would be on the rooftops of the commercial units, in front towards Pearl Street, hidden behind parapet walls. The residential A/C units would be located in each of the residence's private yard areas.

A member of the public questioned the applicant as to whether they would be able to guarantee that a restaurant would not be located in the commercial portion of the project. Response: the applicant indicated that there would not be any guarantees; however, they indicated that the HOA would probably not be in favor of a restaurant because the residential units above the commercial areas would be negatively impacted.

Another member of the public commented that it was their belief that the applicant reduced the project's commercial area and deleted the proposal for a restaurant in order to reduce the project's traffic count and to avoid triggering a full Traffic Study. This person wanted to go on record and to alert the Committee that the current project, as presented, would create very high traffic congestion and would eventually create a dangerous situation around that area. Response: Applicant noted that the City is evaluating creating designated left turn lanes on both Pearl and Eads to reduce traffic congestion and to mitigate safety concerns.

Motion by Fitzgerald, seconded by Pitrofsky: The 14,000 square-foot portion of the project that is in the LJPD4, in conjunction with the remaining 7,000 square-foot portion that is not in the LJPD4, conforms to the PDO requirements.

Vote: 8-1-0 Passes.

**La Jolla Planned District Ordinance Committee**  
**DRAFT MINUTES – MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015 (Page 5 of 5)**

4. **Recommendations to CPA Committee**

- a. **Project Name:** Bird Rock Mixed Use  
**Address:** 5702 La Jolla Blvd., La Jolla, CA 92037, APN 357-366-12, 13, & 14  
**Project Number:**  
**PDO Zone:** 4  
**Applicant:** CR Birdrock, LLC  
**Agent:** Kirk Philo, ColRich  
**City Project Manager:** Morris Dye  
**Date of App Notice:** May 2015, Building Permit Submittal (CR Birdrock, LLC)  
**Scope of Work:** Building Permits, Paint Scheme

Minutes:

This item was pulled from the agenda by the applicant.

5. **Information Items**

- a. **Project Name:** Spa La Vie  
**Address:** 1125 Coast Blvd., La Jolla, California 92037  
**Project Number:** TBD  
**PDO Zone:** 5  
**Applicant:** La Valencia Hotel – Mark DiBella  
**Agent:** Andrew Crocker, T7 Architecture, Inc.  
**City Project Manager:** TBD  
**Date of App Notice:**  
**Scope of Work:**

Remodel existing 3 story building into a new day spa. Work includes remodeling the interior, adding a new elevator, adding a new exterior deck, privacy walls and entry court and modification of selected exterior openings. The exterior color and style of the building are to remain in keeping with the current aesthetic where possible.

**Minutes:**

Mark DiBella, managing director of the Valencia Hotel, introduced the project and the project's architects made the presentation. The SPA will be located in one of the hotels bungalows that is currently not in use. The roofline and general architecture of the project shall remain the same. The proposed SPA will be open to the public. All of the current windows would remain. An elevator would be added to comply with the ADA regulations. The new elevators shaft will not be higher than the height of the existing chimney. There will be a new roof, but all the rooflines will remain the same. Stiegler noted that, since the applicant was changing the use of the building, new parking requirements could take effect. The change of use will also affect the treatment and location of the trash areas. The applicant noted that there would be no hair or nail treatments in the new SPA. In response to Fitzgerald question regarding ADA accessibility, the applicant assured the Committee that all ADA requirements would be met. Discussion followed.

A member of the public wanted to go record in addressing the General manager of the Valencia Hotel. She noted that when they presented their previous proposal for the sidewalk café, they assured the Committee and the public that the sidewalk adjacent to the café would meet the PDO's 8-foot "clear path" requirement. However, after the placement of the potted plants as well as various "boards" that often are placed in the sidewalk in the public right of way, the open sidewalk has been reduced to less than 5 feet. Response: the applicant indicated they have maintained the 8-foot "clear path" in front of their sidewalk café.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35

Respectfully submitted,  
Peter Ovanessoff, acting secretary.