

**La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee – Minutes**  
4:00 p.m. - Tuesday, November 24, 2009  
La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street, La Jolla, CA

**Committee members present: Boyden, Furtek, Lucas, Morton, Schenk**

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment – **None**
2. Chair Comments: The Chair reported that the Marcus project would not be heard because the required information had not yet been received from the City. The previously approved Levis project had had a city hearing. The Whitney project approved by the PRC was rejected by the LJCPA. An AT&T cell installation at the Gilman Drive entrance to southbound I-5 had been scheduled for a decision without a hearing. Upcoming are two other cell installations: Verizon, overlooking La Jolla Parkway on the southbound side opposite the LJ Scenic North exit and T-Mobile at Cliffridge Park. Also to be on the agenda when information is complete are: Three story McClelland residence on La Jolla Shores Drive where some front yard landscape walls are already partly constructed, Ninkovic residence expansion to two-stories on Nottingham Place, Palazzo condominiums on Torrey Pines Road north of the throat, requesting an increase from the 30 units originally permitted in 2005, demolition already having occurred under that permit, to 52 units.
3. Project Review (see A to C below)
4. Discuss the failure of the city to act on the proposed PDO bylaws changes and actions of the city in over-referring Process One/Process three determinations to the LJSPDO Advisory Board. Write letter to CD1? - **Not discussed**
5. Report by Tim Lucas re: rewrite for LJSPDO - **Nothing new to report: hopes to have meeting in December.**

**A. CARDENAS RESIDENCE (this item heard last)**

- PROJECT NUMBER: #191344
  - TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
  - LOCATION: 8466 El Paseo Grande
  - PLANNER: Will Zounes Ph: 619-687-5942, wzounes@sandiego.gov
  - OWNERS REP: Claude Anthony Marengo Ph: 858-459-3769, CAMarengo@marengomortonarchitects.com
  - PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Extension of existing deck with support wall and surrounding guardrail/screen wall with storage space below; addition of retaining wall with masonry fence and cable guardrail above supporting new turf area; 6' fence at south property line; increase in height of existing site wall at the house entry and addition of planting areas and enhanced driveway paving. (Applicant)
  - SEEKING: Site Development Permit (SDP)—Process 3 Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands in the form of the project being located adjacent to a coastal beach (per City Assessment letter)
- 

Presenter: Claude Anthony Marengo

Side wall is increasing from 3 ft to 4.5 or 5 ft height + 2 ft rail.  
Failed retaining wall will be replaced. One tree was removed from front parking area because it blocked driveway access. City has been notified. The site will be replanted with smaller tree.

The actual deck construction method has changed from imported fill and concrete to beams and woods requiring no fill.

One neighbor, Rob Whittemore was present to view project. He commented that the height of the side fence extends higher than the C & Cs allow. The chair stated that the PRC does not consider C & Cs and Mr. Whittemore concurred.

**Motion: Schenk Second: Furtek**

**The project as presented with plans reviewed that had been submitted 10/31/2009 and printed 11/2/2009 meets the findings for a Site Development Permit for environmentally sensitive lands. This plan set was left with the chair.**

**Motion Approved: 4-0-0**

**Approved: Boyden, Furtek, Lucas, Schenck.**

**Recuse: Morton (not present for any of the presentation, discussion or vote)**

## **B. DESSERT/HANNEKIN RESIDENCE**

- PROJECT NUMBER: 192318
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
- LOCATION: 8646 Cliffridge Avenue
- PLANNER: Tim Daly Ph: 619-446-5346 Email: [tdaly@sandiego.gov](mailto:tdaly@sandiego.gov)
- OWNERS REP: Erika Love Ph: 619-857-7406 Email: [pacificpermits@aol.com](mailto:pacificpermits@aol.com)  
Katie Powers Ph: 619-286- 1633 Email: [Katie@charco.com](mailto:Katie@charco.com)
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 184 s.f. first floor addition and a 1626 s.f. second story addition to an existing 2886 s.f. SFR (Applicant)
- Lot Size: 15,288 s.f.
- Existing Sq/Ft: 2886 s.f. (residence 2402; garage 464)
- Addition Sq/Ft: 1<sup>st</sup> story 184 s.f., 2<sup>nd</sup> story 1626 s.f. Deck 97 s.f.
- Subterranean Sq/Ft (if applicable):N/A
- Total Sq/Ft (excluding subterranean if applicable): 1810 (w/Deck 1907)
- Percent of lot covered: 20%
- Floor area ratio: 30.70%
- Height: 26' 6"
- Front yard setback: 26'
- Side yard setback: 7', 15'
- Percent of green softscape: 68%
- Off street parking: Garage: 2; Driveway 2
- SEEKING: Site Development Permit (SDP)
- NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION: Single family residences LJSPDO area

---

Helen Boyden disclosed that she was a resident in the general area but not a neighbor directly affected by the project.

Dena Gillespie presenter:

This project is Process 3.

26.5 feet tallest elevation

52% of houses in neighborhood are 2-story

88% of houses have side setback 4 – 8 ft

12% of houses have side setback of 8 – 12 ft

This house 8.5 – 11.5 ft

The left side 2<sup>nd</sup> floor wall is 53 ft in length with no articulation or step backs.

The presenter stated that Robert Pendleton, the neighbor on the left side, is OK with project. His only request was that the second floor windows looking down into his house be frosted or opaque. Both parties have agreed to this.

Boyden: Stated that the City has raised the issue that this is in campus overlay parking zone. The 6 bedrooms shown in the current plans require 6 spaces offstreet. There are presently on 4 spaces on site: 2 in garage, 2 in driveway.

Response: Changes to the plans have been discussed with the City. One of the downstairs bedrooms is being converted to entertainment area with no walls or closets. The other bedroom/office will have one wall removed and is to be purely an office. The city has said that with these changes, the rooms will no longer be considered bedrooms. The house therefore has four bedrooms and will not require extra off-street parking spaces.

The owners will be signing a paper stating that there will be no bedrooms downstairs. They will also sign an agreement for the sewer easement on the side of the house which presently has trees and bushes covering the lines. The sewer dept may require the trees and bushes to be removed when maintenance is performed.

Public comments:

Gary Frank, 8655 Cliffridge Avenue. Likes the project, thinks that the design is nice and will enhance the neighborhood.

Ann Hannekin, owner: This is a house for their family use only. Two of their three children are presently sharing a bedroom as the house has only three. The new 4 upstairs bedrooms being added are for family use. The downstairs rooms are office or play areas. They have no intention of renting out rooms.

**Motion: Morton Second: Furtek**

**Continue to a subsequent meeting because:**

**The changes to the downstairs rooms are not reflected in the plans submitted to the city.**

**This item is to be continued to a future meeting. The committee will need to see:**

- **Revised floor plans as submitted to the city that show the changes to the downstairs rooms. [Applicant agreed to have them submitted by December 15 and bring to December PRC meeting.]**
- **Show offsetting planes/recesses/architectural projections on left to meet the 50 foot rule and the LJS PDO guidelines.**
- **Call out all parking spaces on lot.**
- **Average the setbacks for houses within 300 ft.**
- **Talk with other two adjacent neighbors behind the residence.**

**Motion approved: 4-0-1**

**Approve: Furtek, Orton, Schenk, Lucas**

**Abstain: Boyden (chair)**

### **C. Sprint Nextel/Clearwire Cliffridge Park (Applicant) AKA Sprint Cliffridge Park**

- PROJECT NUMBER: 194434
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Cell site
- LOCATION: Cliffridge Park -8311 Cliffridge Avenue
- PLANNER: Simon Tse PH 619-687-5984 e-mail: [stse@sandiego.gov](mailto:stse@sandiego.gov)
- OWNERS REP: Debra D. Gardner 619-726-8110
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Conditional Use Permit for a Clearwire wireless communication facility inside two existing foul poles concealed behind RF transparent materials with above ground equipment inside a chain-link fence with slats. [The project consists of new panel antennas and new directional antennas on two existing pole with new RF raydomes. The associated equipment will be installed inside the existing chain-link fence enclosure.] (City) Further from applicant: add 4'x4' equipment area to existing equipment facility.

Additional Notes: Planner Simon Tse states that: T-Mobile will be submitting to staff shortly for their expired permit at this site.

---

Helen disclosed that she lives in the approximate neighborhood, but has no direct interest or conflicts with this project.

Presenter: Debra Gardener

Current leases: This is a shared Sprint & T-Mobile site. The current Sprint CUP lease will expire 2011. The current T-Mobile CUP lease expires 2010. The leases will be extended with the approval of the new project. This is a 4G upgrade.

There are presently two antenna poles disguised as foul poles. The northern one next to the equipment is the only one currently in use. The other is a dummy pole for balance to make it blend in with the site. They are planning to add antennas and a microwave link, pointing to the 939 Coast building inside this dummy pole. They also need to add a 4' x 4' extension to the present equipment site. They would prefer to add this extension to the canyon side of the enclosure, but the city would prefer it away from the canyon side. This area is considered disturbed fill, so it does not trigger any issues with sensitive canyon lands.

Public comment:

Karen Boger: Asked questions about poles. Poles will not change their form factor. Could south pole be relocated? Response: No, it is there to balance the look on the field. It would look odd with only one "foul" pole. She has RF concerns due to the topography. Two of the other ball fields are at a height about even with the top of the antenna and children play on them? Response: The antennas are facing away from the fields there is a three degree spread. There should be no issues with RF/radiation.

Mary Coakley: Disappointed that community was not notified of the walk around. This was a city responsibility. She would prefer that the dummy pole not be used, but rather put a new antenna near the north one and the equipment site. This new antenna could be painted to match the surrounding trees and bushes – camouflaged so it won't stand out. She agrees with the presenter that undergrounding the equipment site doesn't work and would actually cause more disturbance to the surrounding canyon areas.

Board/Community discussion:

Could a third pole be added to the site near the equipment enclosure that meets the coverage/use requirements? If so this would save having to trench lines to the dummy pole and disturb the play fields. Helen: Facility could be made nicer. The current fence enclosure looks bad. She would like a more finished look to it.

**Motion: Lucas Second: Furtek**

**Motion to continue this item to a future meeting. Come back with information regarding:**

- **the disturbed area to the west of the equipment enclosure and options for the placement of the 4' x 4' expansion.**
- **Present an RF coverage map for the existing site and proposed changes.**
- **Present an overall map that shows the project site in relation to the surrounding ball fields. The topography should be shown.**
- **Present the feasibility of placing a third pole near the existing one and the equipment enclosure. Will this meet the performance requirements for the project? If so this could save trenching the fields and avoid concerns regarding RF energy at head heights. Consult with Community members and City about this feasibility.**