

Minutes of the Ocean Beach Planning Board General Meeting

3/05/14

6:06: Meeting called to order. Present: Tom Gawronski, Barbara Shmidt, Scott Therkalsen, Pete Ruscitti, Bill Bushe, Raeanon Hartigan, John Ambert, Kevin Becker, Andrew Waltz, Gio Ingolia and Drew Wilson joined late.

Agenda Approval: Modification Chet Barfield has replace John Lye. **Pete moves to approve, Barbara seconds 9-0-0**

Minutes: Rae moves to approve the minutes from 2/5/14, Pete seconds. Vote 7-0-2

Relevant Representative Reports: John Lye has moved on to Mayor's office. Chet Barfield is currently the replacement, he explained the district 2 appointment process. New restrictions on food trucks – none will be allowed in the coastal overlay zone, including most of Ocean Beach. Marijuana ordinance will be revisited on 4/20. Yep, 4/20.

Non-agenda public comment: Barbara - spoke on behalf of Gretchen Newsom's candidacy to fill the vacant District 2 seat.

Nicole – ask to be on next agenda to ask for grant support; also spoke about the bike share sites.

Joseph “Moondoggy the crossing guard” – concerned about the painting of the yellow lines on the corners surrounding the school. Wants them repainted and completed/extended and the drop off zones extended. Chet will assist in the matter.

Fred Simon – running for 52nd district. Former doctor and health care consultant. Recognized that this was the best district in the United States of America!

Sidewalk Man – concerned about sidewalks on Voltaire between Abbot and Bacon. Chet promised assistance in this matter as well.

Action Item #1: 4766 Brighton Lots 7 & 8 CDP - Project #338809

Applicant presented the old design and then the new design that addressed some of the concerns from the project review committee meeting (*For some specifics see addendum at end*). Specifically for the east house the first story has been further setback about 2 feet and the top story has been further setback about 5 feet. Rae inquired about the new “green-roof” and applicant stated the planters would be practically immovable. Applicant stated that the homes are well below the height limit and below the allowed FAR, it's what I'm allowed to build. **Public Comment: Man 1** - is 3000 sq feet required to build a new home? **Tom**-no this is all legal.

Man 2 – really likes the design and tried to buy the other 2 that were built directly behind.

Seth – the homes are compliant but possibly incompliant with the precise plan in terms of bulk and scale. Thinks he has worked to improve the design and thinks it's a good project.

Woman who lives next door reading letters from other neighbors: **neighbor one letter** – owner of adjacent property objects because it is not in compliant with the precise plan. **Neighbor letter two** – the owner is maximizing profits at neighborhood expense, it is not in line with the

neighborhood. Not against new projects just wants ones compatible with neighborhood.

Woman reader – showed pictures of current view and described what the new project will do.

Kirsty – liked the uniqueness of Ocean Beach landscape. Supports the new homes. Reads letters for others present: **Letter one** – new homes will improve look of block and increase home values and tax revenue.

Man 1 second question: why not combine the lots and build a home out back keeping in character with the street all the other remodels on the street?

BOARD COMMENTS:

Kevin: what he is doing is legal, limited real estate means people want nicer houses and I like the project.

Scott – Appreciates applicant's efforts, recounts his concerns from the project review committee meeting and reads some recommendations from the community precise plan that are contrary to this project. States this is not in line with the goals of the precise plan and therefore he will not vote to approve it.

Gio – conflicted because it is big and bulky but you have made attempts to work with the community. My vote in favor would be a weak yes vote

Pete – the applicant has meet the code and according to the current 1975 precise plan the main concepts asked for is that it is in line with the small scale of the community; specifically asking for non "excessive" structures. Happy that the applicant has made some adjustments. This basically comes down to a judgment call about the language in the precise plan. Since the applicant has addressed our specific issues I would give my support, but it would not be overwhelming.

Rae – It's always difficult, considering the current draft plan, it says bulk and scale should be minimized with setbacks and the applicant has tried to address these things in accordance with the community plan. The fence is a concern, it is not community friendly. I will approve it since changes have been made respecting the board's comments.

Drew – Applicant has listened to the community. Just because we don't like the style is not justification to vote against this. The fence also seems futile with the rooftop terraces. If you want to fit into OB then open it up more.

Andrew – agrees with last comments. Also, suggests that you continue to take community input.

John – likes the styles, thinks it meets the bulk and scale criteria. On the side of property owners rights to build as they please. This project is code compliant and a value to the community.

Bill – agrees with John that the applicant has property rights and should be allowed to develop it as he pleases. We've got to move forward eventually

Tom – the changes made don't go nearly far enough. The bulk and scale are far beyond what is called for in the Precise Plan.

Pete moves to approve the project with the changes as presented here tonight. Gio seconds 7-4-0.

Action Item 2 – Council Policy 600-24

Pete reports that he's seen no substantial changes and this is not the time to work on the meeting attendance changes that are a concern to the OBPB. Tom asks the board to trust the

rest who have read the document that there really have been no substantial changes. This seems to be just a general “wordsmithing” update.

Motion to approve by Pete, Seconded by Gio: 10-0-1

Rae makes general election announcements

Candidates Forum: Pete – been here a few years but I moved to district 3 where I’m running now. I’ve got credentials, really too many to keep track of. My general view is that if it’s to code it’s good. You certainly should vote for me... oh and by the way I’m the only choice!

Valerie Paz – hoping to be appointed to district 7 after the election. Worked in commercial development for 30 years.

Seth Connoly – on the board prior; hoping to be appointed to district 4. Have voted for and against many difficult projects. Likes to see projects with community input. Does land use non-profit work.

Precise Plan Report: Gio - concerned about the lack of response from the city. Doesn’t have the dates now because they may not be 100% confirmed. Will respond to the board with the potential and confirmed dates as soon as they are released.

Relevant Board reports: **CPC** is thinking about the creation of design committees to be included within planning boards. Not sure why they took the position they did on the new marijuana ordinance. **Historical** – Wisteria party is 3/22. **OBTC** – great meeting with the bike programming last time. Nicole mentions the contact for bike racks: tlandre@sandiego.gov **MB park committee** – Gio is now on the committee! And mentions something about “Leisure Olympics” **Crime** – police trailer was approved by planning commission, now goes to coastal.

Motion to adjourn by Pete, seconded by Barbara. Meeting adjourned at 7:55.

ADDENDUM:

Specifics changes related to action item #1 communicated after the meeting

Below is a written summary of the changes made by the applicant for 4766 Brighton.

Also, the applicant and DSD staff have acknowledged that the upper fence needs to be 75% open.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Yale Jallos** <yjallos@hotmail.com>

Date: Thu, Mar 6, 2014 at 3:34 PM

Subject: Changes per Ob community meeting

To: "Dye, Morris" <mdye@sandiego.gov>, "ruscitti.obpb@sent.com" <ruscitti.obpb@sent.com>

These are the changes I made in response to community requests. Mainly only changes to LOT 8, the east lot were made.

Lot 8 now has a greater setback on the upper story, and by one foot on the lower story. (the upper used to project toward the street with a bay window, so the modified design represents a change in setback of about 8' total on the upper level : 2' bay window gone, 1 ft setback additional at level one, 4'-10" setback and terrace at the upper level)

- The house shrinks from 1600 SF to 1504 SF. FAR = 1504 house + 370 garage = 1874 less than 1875 max FAR

- One bedroom moves to the first floor

- There is now a 2 car garage instead of 1 car garage. garage is in same position, just wider. garage was 232 SF, now 370 SF.

- Roof planters above garage and terrace at second level of lot at rear alley to provide green at tree top level. see plans.

Fences on both lots to be solid up to 3'-0" height. Then from 3ft to 6ft they shall be 75% open - note added on site plan.

The change to LOT 7 is:

At the rear of the building, on the second level, the stair to the roof deck is shifted to the edge instead of a switchback. The walls and partial roof of this rear outdoor terrace are now mostly gone, with only a couple beams overhead and at corners to frame out this balcony.

Morris, please advise how I should submit these new sheets to planning..possibly an in person meeting to go over changes.

Yale