

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee Minutes

Tuesday March 27, 2012

Present: Boyden, Emerson, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Schenck, Lucas and Donovan arriving after first item underway.

1. Public Comment – None

2. Chair Comments

- By-laws revisions were approved by the LJCPA membership at the Annual Meeting on Thursday March 1. The next step was to submit to the City for review.
- The Salami and Sinclair Residences and the AT&T Via Capri projects all passed the LJCPA on consent on March 1.
- The Chao residence appeal to the Planning Commission by a neighbor was denied on March 1.
- Gaxiola has resubmitted-the PM has advised that he will communicate again when the current cycles have been finalized
- One new project has been received-an extension of time for Taccone residence on Rue de Roark, approved previously as the Pierce residence

3A. Zegarra Retaining Wall –2nd hearing

- Project No. 90267
- Type of Structure: Retaining Wall and Free Standing Wall
- Location: 2974 Cto. Bello (on North La Jolla Scenic Drive, 2nd home north of Cto. Bello)
- Project Manager: William Zounes: 619-687-5942; wzounes@sandiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Brian Longmore; 858-603-9478; Brian@permitsolutions.org

Project Description: Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands for the construction of an existing retaining wall adjacent to a canyon and a Neighborhood Development Permit for an existing free standing solid wall within the Public Right-of-Way along La Jolla Scenic Drive. The 0.44 acres site is located at 2974 Caminito Bello in the SF zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community [Current City Description]

Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP) for Environmentally Sensitive Lands –retaining wall
Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) –free standing wall

Prior Action: Permit Review Committee July 25, 2006

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands to construct a retaining wall on a 0.44 acre site. Construction of wall will be of a carved and colored shotcrete to simulate the existing bluff material in color, texture and relief.

Proposed elevation/top of retaining wall: 96.5 ft.

Proposed elevation/bottom of retaining wall: 89.5

Height of wall: 7.0 ft.± [N.B. This maximum height is incorrect; should be 15.0 ft according to plans from that time. Measurements cited were taken a different section of the wall]

Move to approve wall within the setback areas with conditions.

1. Provide setback information on site plan.

2. Conform wall to municipal code for wall heights.

3. Apply for variance if required.

Vote: Crisafi/Lyon Vote: 4-0-0 **Motion Passed**

Prior Action: LJCPA August 3, 2006

3. Zegarra Retaining wall: Approved by committee, 4-0-0, to preserve the open space at rear of project.

Motion: Andrews, Merten to approve the consent calendar. Item #3 only.

Amendment to Motion: Golba. If the Committee conditions trigger a Variance the applicant will return to the committee.

Amendment Accepted: Andrews, Merten.

Vote: 14-0-0.

Prior LJSPRC Action: February 28, 2012 –See minutes for more details

Motion: Merten; Second: Emerson

More information is needed. Continue item to a future meeting.

Information needed:

- Determine whether the area fronting LJ Scenic North is considered a front yard or a back yard?
- Confirm that city has no plans to widen the street or have other use for the right-of-way.
- Ask city for better definition of the Pottery Canyon view corridor boundaries.
- Findings required to grant a Neighborhood Development Permit?

Motion carries: 6-0-1; Approve: Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, M. Naegle, Schenck; Oppose: None; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

Today's discussion:

The Chair announced that the questions previously posed by the Committee were answered by DSD Project Manager Will Zounes e-mail-

1. The property is determined to have 2 front yards. Does not matter because configuration of the fences and walls are specified in LJSPDO to be in "conformance."
2. City has no plans to use this right of way at this time.
3. The City has determined that this property is in the "overlook over private property" area beginning at the south end of Pottery Canyon open space

The LJCPA previously approved the plans for the Retaining Wall and the matter under consideration is the NDP for the free standing wall in the Public Right of Way.

Presentation – Brian Longmore represents owner and wants us to support the owner in having no glass on the wall at the north corner because of privacy issues

Merten- Community Plan is specific about views over private property, and development "must preserve or enhance" those views. The La Jolla Community Plan says "can build within buildable envelope", Therefore, City requires what is outside that envelope not exceed 3 feet in height. This includes landscaping. Bushes can be 3' in height and trees need an 8' clear height below foliage for view.

Merten: This is a solid fence and is out of character with most of the neighborhood. One has to go all the way to the next block until you find a similar fence on the west side of the street. One has to consider the cumulative effect of walls like this and how it changes the environment of the area. If it is suspected that the precedent the wall sets would have an environmental impact, then a full EIR would be required. Merten thinks that there are environmental impacts. The subdivision half a mile to the north that the owner's representative cites as an example of a similar wall was a planned subdivision built before the LJS PDO was in effect, and hence is not a comparable example.

Boyden: The Visual Resources map indicates to me that the "View over private property, Scenic Overlook" extends more or less equally on either side of Caminito Bello. The relatively new (5-6 year estimate) two homes on the other side of Caminito Bello also in the view corridor do not have walls and offer scenic views.

Morton: Are the existing conifers being replaced? *Response: Two are being replaced with smaller street compatible trees. Other trees are being added, but are smaller varieties.*

Boyden: Has concerns with existing leylandii cypress trees that are not in good health and not being maintained. There are other trees on the property that are overgrown and blocking vistas.

Boyden: To clarify, the City as a result of Code Compliance action says the applicant needs a permit from Park & Rec for removal of berm. They are to remove gate along north wall, and restore the chaparral below the retaining wall. Also they were required to obtain building permits for construction of the retaining wall and the free standing wall and Obtain permits for swimming pool. This has been going on for 5 years.

Public Comment: none

Motion: Merten Second: Schenck

First, one Finding for a Neighborhood Development Permit (The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable *land use plan*.) **cannot** be made because the solid wall along La Jolla Scenic Drive does not comply with the *Visual Resources* section of the *Open Space Preservation and Natural Resources Protection Policies* of the *Natural Resources & Open Space System Element* of the *La Jolla Community Plan* pertaining to the preservation and enhancement of public views from Identified Public Vantage Points (LJCP pages. 46 and 47).

Second, the Finding for a Neighborhood Development Permit (The proposed development will comply with the applicable regulations of the *Land Development Code* including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code.) **cannot** be made because the solid wall along La Jolla Scenic Drive does not provide the public view corridors within both side yard setback areas as required by LDC Sect. 132.0403(b); and the overall height and length of the solid wall within the street ROW does not comply with the *Design Principle* section of the *General Design Regulations* of the LJSPDO [Sect. 1510.0301(b)] because the overall height and length of the solid wall within the ROW is so different in form and relationship from development on adjacent parcels that it will disrupt the architectural unity of the area

.

Motion carries: 4-2-2

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Merten, Schenck

Oppose: Lucas, Morton,

Abstain: Boyden (chair), M. Naegle.

Discussion on motion:

Morton: Can see merits in removing slide and adding glass to open at the view corridors, but does not agree with lowering the front wall the whole distance. Lowering the entire front wall will only provide a public view of a roof, not preserving the views in the LJ Community Plan. He also doesn't see the potential of a cumulative negative effect on the neighborhood if the wall is allowed in its present form.

Merten: Thinks that the top of fence at the south side of front wall should be lower for public views. The rest of the wall is inconsistent with the neighborhood.

Schenck: The wall should not have been built on the city right of way, forcing the sidewalk out to the curb.

3B. UCSD Hillel Center for Jewish Life -3rd hearing

- Project No. 212995
- Type of Structure: Phased Project for Religious Student Center and Offices
- Locations:
 - Phase 1 (and if Phase 2 not approved)-- 8976 Cliffridge Avenue
 - Phase II; Bounded by LJ Village Dr., LJ Scenic Way, LJ Scenic Drive, Cliffridge Avenue, Torrey Pines Road
- Project Manager: John S. Fisher; 619-446-5231; jsfisher@sandiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Robert Lapidus: rlapidus@sherlap.com

Project Description: Phased project for a 6,600 square foot Jewish student center on a vacant 0.76-acre site. Phase I would use an existing residence at 8976 Cliffridge Avenue as a temporary student center until the main center is built in Phase II. The property is located on the south side of La Jolla Village Drive, between Torrey Pines Road and La Jolla Scenic Way in the SF Zone of La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan area, Coastal Height Limit. [City] Campus Impact Parking Zone. Process Five.

- **Phase 1. Recommendation to deny made on January 23. See motion below.**
- **Phase 2: Recommendation to deny made on January 23. See motion below.**

Seeking:

- Site Development Permit (SDP) for Sustainable Building Development
- Street Vacation
- Right of Way Dedication
- Change of Occupancy Permit
- Deviations from Development Regulations- [Need for deviations has been modified]

Today's consideration will only be the Street Vacation. See last motion below.

Previous LJSPRC Action: November 22, 2011. See minutes for additional details and comments

Motion: Emerson; **Second:** Donovan

Continue item. Item to next be heard no sooner than the scheduled January PRC meeting. The applicant is advised to provide the following information:

- Visibility triangle shown on plans
- Neighborhood setback study
- Materials board
- The design and operation of the lighting for the parking lot and buildings.

Motion carries: 4-0-1: Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Schenck; Oppose: 0; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

Previous LJSPRC action: January 23, 2012. Please see minutes for additional details and comments.

Motion: Merten; **second:** Donovan

Findings for a Site Development Permit for Phase 2 cannot be made because the project does not conform to the design criteria set forth in the La Jolla Shores Design Manual and therefore does not comply with the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance:

1. The size and bulk of the project is two to three times that of other structures in the vicinity and therefore not in conformance with the La Jolla Shores Design Manual.
2. The project will be disruptive of the architectural unity of the area.
3. The proposed structure setbacks are not in general conformance with the setbacks of other structures in the vicinity.

Motion carries: 5-2-1: Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Merten, Lucas, M. Naegle; Oppose: Morton, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

Motion: Merten; **second:** Emerson

The findings for a Site Development Permit for the continued office use of the existing single family dwelling (Phase 1) at the present time and also if Phase 2 is not approved is inconsistent with the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance

Motion carries: 6-1-1: Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, M. Naegle, Schenck; Oppose: Morton; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

Motion: Emerson; **second:** Morton

To continue the street vacation issue to a future meeting.

Motion carries: 5-0-3: Approve: Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Emerson; Oppose: None; Abstain: Boyden (chair), Donovan, Schenck.

Today's Discussion:

Boyden: This item considers only the right-of-way vacation. The other issues for this project were considered at a previous Permit Review Committee meeting.

Presented by: Josh Richman

They are asking city to vacate the paper street, so that Hillel can build a student facility.

To approve a right-of-way vacation, all four findings must be made:

1. No present or prospective public use for the public right-of-way, either for the facility for which it was originally acquired or for any other public use of a like nature that can be anticipated.
2. Public will benefit from the action through improved use of the land made available by the vacation.
3. The vacation does not adversely affect any applicable land use plan.
4. The facility for which the public right-of-way was originally acquired may not be detrimentally affected by the vacation.
 - The land was originally acquired from the city with the street vacation in order to build this student center.
 - There will be a new public sidewalk along LJ Scenic Drive North.
 - LJ Scenic N will be narrowed by 2'. Result is 34' wide with parking still on both sides. This meets the city codes for a street.
 - The vacation of the street will improve the public use of the land.
 - Four parking spaces will be lost when the cul-de-sac is removed and replaced by a park.

Morton: Are there any Sandag studies showing any use for the cul-de-sac for transportation, mass transit, etc...? Any utilities going through the site? *Response: Not aware of any transportation uses planned for the cul-de-sac. There are utilities at this site, but not aware of anything planned for the proposed park area.* Q: Will the park be maintained by Hillel? *Yes.* Will park be available to the public 24 hours a day? *Yes*

Boyden: According to a proposed draft conditions for the permit a public access easement will be granted and the cul-de-sac will remain ungated for public access.

Boyden: Reads a letter from Ross Starr, economics professor at UCSD, who can't attend the meeting. He lives in the neighborhood on Cliffridge Avenue. Highlights from the letter which is being kept as part of the record.

- Does not feel that any of the required findings can be made, but will concentrate his objections on the second finding regarding public benefit for the project.
- There is no public benefit of the land use for the proposed project.
- Narrowing of the street eliminates 7 on-street parking spaces along LJ Scenic North.
- Right of way vacation eliminates 6 spaces in the cul-de-sac.
- Narrows street width from 36' to 34'.
- Lot and corner are an unusual Zshape and at each end of the block is a blind corner.
- There is currently not an inch of pavement avail for safety in this area.
- According to traffic records, there are an average of 2 collisions a month in the area. If vacation is granted more problems will result.
- City will have to red paint the curb and eliminate more parking in response to safety issues.
- Loss of parking spaces from 6 to 7 spaces up to 27 for the whole street and cul-de-sac.

Presentation in opposition from Julie Hamilton, representing Taxpayers for Responsible Land Use (TRLU).

The project needs to make all 4 findings for a right-of-way vacation. If any one can not be made, the vacation can't be approved:

- Finding 1, Public use: There is currently a public use: parking and vehicular traffic. The street is being used.
- Finding 2, Public benefit: The proposed public benefit is a park – with easement? Is that a public benefit? There is a real public impact in putting a student center in a residential neighborhood. The narrowing of the street is also a negative public impact. The student center for UCSD students is not a community use and the public will benefit very little from it.
- Finding 3, will not affect the current land use plan: The LJ Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan address preservation of neighborhood feel and the scarcity of parking. The proposed vacation will affect both.
- Finding 4, public facility for which public right-of-way was acquired not affected: This is a residential street that serves not only local residences but provides a bypass to others of adjacent congested roads. The narrowing the road will make turns at both ends more difficult and less safe. Parking will be lost.

Public Comment

Pat Granger, resident on Robinhood Lane 1 block from the corner: Project itself is not an allowable use under the LJSPDO. Removal of cul-de-sac and narrowing of the road raises safety issues. She nearly had an accident in this area, and it is already dangerous. The cul-de-sac is frequently used by drivers to turn around in while looking for parking spaces, as well as by pedestrians and skateboarders.

Carol Hernstad: resident on La Jolla Scenic Drive, a few blocks away. Thinks that this will beautify the neighborhood. Would rather lose parking and have a more beautiful area. Disputes the accident reports. Dusty land and road needs improvement.

Benjamin Cosman, resident on Nottingham Place. It will be a public benefit to our neighborhood to have this center and park here.

Susan Shmalo: People in area thinks this will be a beautification to the neighborhood. Does not see any benefit to the present right-of-way. There is no sidewalk along the property now. Her grandchildren frequently use the area and cross the street. Having a sidewalk will enhance safety.

Kimberly Rebiez, resident of LJS North, directly across from the proposed project: She sees lots of traffic in the area. People often turn onto LJ Scenic North by accident due to confusing signage, and they have to use the cul-de-sac for turning around. Students searching for parking also use the cul-de-sac as a turn around. Thinks it will be detrimental to remove the cul-de-sac and narrow the street.

Bob Whitney: What is the zoning? Response from Richman: *Single family, but religious uses are allowed according to the LJS PDO.*

Gene Carswell, candidate for Congressional District 52: Wants to know about the history of the project – a brief description was given by the board.

Yoni Drezner, realtor in the area: Feels that the cul-de-sac is not necessary. Without it, people will simply make the turn on to the next street rather than try to turn around.

End of public comment

Richman response to opposing presentations:

The findings can all be made. They have been made in the past by the City Council and can be made again. He asks us to consider the public use the present cul-de-sac is providing versus the proposed public benefits of a new park and sidewalks.

Morton: What is the width of Cliffridge Avenue? *Response Hamilton:* 36' curb to curb. LJ Scenic N proposed? 34' curb to curb. Posted speed limit? *Not posted – so 25 mph.* Is this a permanent building for religious purposes? *Response Richman:* Yes, student center.

Morton: The LJ Community Plan indicates the existing park space is not sufficient. He believes a park will be a higher use for area (see LJCP page 8). Part of the community goals is to enhance public uses such as with a park.

Donovan: If facility is not built there will be no park? *Richman:* Correct.

Lucas: Requests a clarification on vacation extent and sidewalk, which was made. He is concerned that this road is heavily traveled by residents in the area to avoid the congestion at LJ Village Drive and Torrey Pines Road. The narrowing of street and the resulting decrease in visibility at the corners will be a safety issue.

Motion Morton:

Findings can be made for the street vacation and the proposed project and park. The vacation will not affect the land use plan. The public right-of-way will not be adversely affected.

No second – motion dies.

Motion: Merten; second: M. Naegle

None of the four findings can be made for a right-of-way vacation.

1. Finding 1 can not be met. There is a present and prospective public use for right-of-way. While a park has significant value, it would come at the cost of losing a current cul-de-sac in the right-of-way which being used for both vehicular traffic and parking.
2. Finding 2, public benefit, can not be made. There is a loss of benefit in that parking will be lost and the street will be narrowed. Decreasing the width of the street is problematic and a safety issue.
3. Finding 3, not adversely affecting the land use plan, can not be made. The vacation is for the purpose of developing a facility, which is at odds with the surrounding low density residential use, and is contrary to the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance.

4. Finding 4, public right-of-way use as originally acquired, can not be met. vehicular traffic will be affected and the cul-de-sac providing both a place for turning around and parking will be lost.

Motion carries: 5-1-2

Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, M. Naegle

Oppose: Morton

Abstain: Boyden, Schenck

Discussion on the motion:

Morton: Feels the LJ CP has a higher call for public parks.

Donovan: Parks are important but not at the cost to parking and safety caused by putting student facility into single-family residential neighborhood.

Merten: If any one of the findings can not be made, the vacation can not be granted.

3C. Abelkop Residence:

- Project No. 258472
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 2481 Rue Denise
- Project Manager: Sandra Teasley; 619-446-5271; steasley@sandiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Colin Hernstad; 619-921-0114; colinhernstad@gmail.com

Project Description: a 2,298 square feet addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.29 acre site. Coastal Overlay (non-appealable) and Coastal Height Limit Zones

Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP)

Presented by Colin Hernstad

- The site is surrounded by 5 lots with a similar low presence on the cul-de-sac.
- Project is an addition to current floorplan, and they are keeping the height and views the same
- Retaining walls are existing: 3' high
- Retaining walls at rear have vegetation and an embankment.
- Shows photos of views from the lot.
- The main City issue is the size of the addition
- The proposed project keeps existing footprint of house. The addition will be at the rear side of the house next to the embankment, so it won't affect the views.
- Shows grading plan and drainage plan.
- Proposed lot coverage is 54.7%
- The site for the addition is presently hardscape.
- The 11'8" height of present ridgeline is being used as the maximum height for new addition
- New addition roof will be slightly lower pitch to meet 11'8" height
- Photo shown of street view with new structure overlaid.

- New structure has a parapet. But the overhang will be reduced from 6' to 3'
- Keep existing garage and enclose present patio area to create a second garage with tandem parking. Room for 4 cars.
- Front yard setback to garage is 17' 6"
- Presented letter from homeowner's association. They have given preliminary approval of proposed design.
- Letters from Van Horst & Shingledecker, neighbors, approving the project.
- Still working on Geotechnical report.
- There is a scenic overlook 3' wide identified on property.

Schenck: Is there a height limit for the property? *Response: No. Their design has a self-imposed height limit to be unobtrusive to the neighborhood.*

Boyden: Parking requirements and city issue with garage space? *Response: 2 spaces required. The tandem garage is 40' in length. They have removed the workbench area from the second garage and now have parking for 4 cars.*

Lucas: Number of bedrooms? *Response: 4 plus small office. Parking 4 spaces covered. Technically can't park in driveway due to it being 17' 6" instead of 18' required.*

Morton: Materials? *Response: the roof will be brown. Color palette was shown.* Is this a high fire area, is a brush management plan required? *R: Doesn't think so, city has not indicated anything in their reviews.*

Merten: Parapet color and style? *Response: Stucco finish, earth tones.* Merten: Thinks that with a SDP, they will need to bring the project into compliance. The driveway should be 18' from the curb. There is no sidewalk in this area. They need to provide visibility triangles. He has an issue with the visibility triangle at driveway, but bushes creating the issue are on neighbors' side. Setbacks have to be in general conformance.

Board discussion followed regarding the driveway and it appears from the plans that it is actually 18' from curb to the garage door, as it is set back from the side walls (which are 17' 6").

Public comment: none

Motion: Emerson; second: Schenck

Continue this item to future meeting. Applicant should provide:

- Measured dimensions of driveway from street to garage door.
- Visibility triangles shown on plan
- Scenic overlook on north west of property addressed
- Updated roof plan.
- Dimensions of property line to buildings on all 4 sides.

Approve: Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, M. Naegle, Schenck

Oppose:

Abstain: Boyden

Absent: Donovan- left before vote

3D. Browar Residence

- Project No. 269064
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 2725 Inverness Court
- Project Manager: Jeanette Temple; 619-557-7908; jtemple@sandiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Bill Hayer; 858-792-2800; bhayer@hayerarchitecture.com

Project Description: Demolish existing single family residence and construct new single family residence 6306 sf home with basement with associated site walls and swimming pool on a 58,840 sf lot in the Campus Impact Parking Zone.]

Seeking: Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and Site Development Permit (SDP) for La Jolla Shores Planned District and Environmentally Sensitive Lands

Boyden: Noted that project was in the Campus Parking Impact Zone.

Lucas: Notice missing today. (It was there last week, witnessed by committee members and Bob Whitney)

Presented by Bill Hayer:

They have met with 5 neighbors, including those on either side. Letters from these people have been sent to the City as well.

Project highlights:

- Driveway has been narrowed to 12' per city request for parking impact zone.
- This site is on a cul-de-sac and has a steep sloping canyon at the rear.
- Slopes mostly manufactured. Shown on drawing.
- Sensitive land and species will not be affected.
- They will be dedicating an easement on slope, beyond the brush management area to preserve as canyon lands.
- Proposed house is contained on the existing pad, with the addition of a basement office and other rooms at the north end of property.
- Existing house will be demolished. Existing house has a 6' setback from street at narrowest point.
- Setback survey of other cul-de-sacs in the area was presented. Their lot is the narrowest of those shown in other CDS shown for comparison. The slope is pinching from the other side, impacting the building area. This is why their setback is only 7' 7" along the cul-de-sac.
- There are lots of planes and textures to make this area more interesting.
- 16' highest parapet. Chimney 21'
- 3 bedroom + exercise room, upper level. Not sure if lower level office counts as a bedroom
- 3 parking spaces in garage + 1 in driveway,
- Capsheet roof material. Earth tone buildings.
- Pool – more of a water feature due to its small size, and a jacuzzi.
- Visibility triangles shown on drawings.
- No landscape plan shown – not required. Will do brush management plan.
- The iceplant along the slope will be removed, and slope replanted with native plants.

- No identified scenic overlooks in LJ CP
- Drainage over pad will be collected and sump pumped to street.
- Roof plan shown

Myrna Naegle: Setbacks are really small compared to other sites. I was concerned with the front set back of approximately 7 feet, as compared to the other homes in the same cul de sac which have front set backs of 15', 28', 21', 23' and 10'. She also praised the architectural design of the Browar project. *Response: this a cul-de-sac site along a canyon, so it is hard to compare fairly with properties along a normal street.*

Morton: Requested elevations, which were shown. The LJCP encourages to not grade in the canyon areas. Could development extend to the extent of the retaining wall shown on map? *Response: Yes, but the retaining wall would have to be moved out and be taller, the brush management would extend further into the canyon. Impacts in both cost and loss of canyon slope. Keeping the building closer to the street at this narrow part of the lot results in a better fit with the canyon slope.*

Public comment

Bob Whitney: Could you have done a 2-story house? *Response: there are some older CCR's that may be in effect, but otherwise yes.* Whitney: likes the single story design.

Merten: likes what you are doing here architecturally. This is a house designed for the sensitive slope area. However, according to the LJS PDO, setbacks should be in general conformance with the neighborhood. If we approve this, 8' setbacks would then be considered the norm and set a precedent. If this was replicated in neighborhood, the smaller setbacks would change the neighborhood feel. This narrow lot alongside a canyon, so there are special circumstances. I recommend that you ask for a variance.

Motion: Emerson; second: M. Naegle

Continue to next time. Provide:

Plans showing the revised driveway on submitted plans.

Determine total number of rooms considered a bedroom. Is lower office is considered a bedroom under city codes?

Provide street level perspectives and views showing showing house from cul de sac.

Approve: Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, M. Naegle, Schenck

Oppose:

Abstain: Boyden