

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE REPORT
FOR
May 2012

5/8/2012 Present: Benton (Chairman), Collins, Costello, Liera, Merten, Thorsen

5/15/2012 Present: Benton (Chairman), Collins, Costello, Liera, Thorsen

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT 5/15/12

At the May 8 2012 DPR Meeting we voted to combine the Preliminary and Final and approve the EOT for Becerra on Coast Walk. That project will be heard by the Hearing Officer May 23 2012. They will circumvent the required Community Review by the parent organization, the LJCPA since the next LJCPA Meeting is June 7 2012. It was agreed that we should contact the CPA President asking him to request a continuance to allow the project to be heard at the CPA to allow the CPA to forward a recommendation. This will not delay the Project since the new owner is still deciding if changes will be made to the plans for the interior of the house.

recorder setting 37:01:34:42

2. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 5/8/12

Note: Preliminary Reviews can be voted a Final Review by a unanimous DPR Committee approval.

Project Name: **LEWIS RESIDENCE**

Project #:	1705 Valdes Drive	Permits:	Variance + CDP
	PO# 262793	DPM:	Glenn Gargas 619-446-5142
			ggargas@sandiego.gov
Zone:	RS-1-5	Applicant:	David B. Nevius 858-573-6900
			Liz Tuttle 858-573-6900

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Variance and Coastal Development Permit for an over-height wall in the front yard setback of an existing single family residence at 1705 Valdes Drive in the RS-1-5 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), and Coastal Height Limit.

Presenters: David Nevius, Engineer
 Robert Hawk, Geologist

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: The Applicant handed out a 15-page photo presentation of the site, erosion, surroundings and examples of neighbor's solutions to slope erosion. Valdes Drive created prior to 1928, slope is steep, roadway cut into the hillside. Road cut not made to current City standards. Currently, erosion issues which also create accessibility issues along street. Proposed solution to current erosion, a retaining wall 47 ft long, in places, 8 to 10 ½ ft high. Use "Soil Nails" and above retaining wall, use a stabilizing mechanism called "Tech-O- Mesh" on the hillside and will be landscaped, drain at bottom of wall. Two tone: wall blue on bottom, white on top. 3½ ft from ROW, helping vehicles park out of fire lane. Will improve parking. Goals to stop erosion and improve access along Valdes Drive.

DISCUSSION:

Applicant response in italics.

Mary Sariano: What is the height limit for retaining walls? **CA Marengo:** explained wall height and stepping of walls to a max height to 9 ft, ie can go up 3 ft step 3 ft repeat up to 9 ft.

Liera: have you looked into stepping the wall? *Yes, the location of utilities associated with the pool, and*

deck foundation preclude stepping.

recorder setting 36:00:19:23

Hawk: *we are trying to stay consistent with the existing wall alignment.*

Liera: Provisions for landscaping in walls? *Yes, we have a variety of plants.*

Hawk: *Slope is raveling, not grossly unstable. Raveling could continue until the slope reaches about 30 degrees. Under laying Geology is sandstone. Gross stability is addressed in the Geology report, house included.*

Benton: The foundation of the deck is stable? *Correct.* There is concern about widening of the street, will the City require additional geological studies? *That's in the Report and addressed by the City.*

Merten: I visited the site and surroundings. Can't find for a variance for the portion of the over-height retaining wall. Other mitigating measures, interlocking block walls, Gunite with planters would blend in better. Com. Plan refers to Com. Character, asks that you consider another type of "wall". Condition is not unique to this property.

Thorsen: Thinks the retaining wall looks OK, and could agree with variance request.

Collins: will parking be out of travel lane? *yes*

Liera: Would prefer a stepped wall, planting with system, Gunite. Something to mimic natural ground.

Benton: Findings for a variance, "can't be created by the owner", cutting the slope creates the condition. Previous owner felt the slope was stable. Is this going to T&T? **Hawk:** *So far this has only been to the SD City Traffic Eng.*

Marengo: He was DPR Chair when house to the North was given a variance for Gunite, check City records.

Lewis: Explained history of the neighborhood slopes and slope retention.

Soriano: What is the minimum wall you can use? *The closer to the road we build it, the lower it can be.*

Chair: Max height without variance is 6 ft.

Collins: Extending parking into the roadway is not a good situation

Please provide for FINAL REVIEW:

- a. Explain merits of Variance Application.
- b. Discuss the need to reposition the toe of the slope. > 3 ft,? 4-5 ft?
- c. Is there a need to support the structural deck, or not?
- d. Please provide an explanation of the alternatives to retaining wall, do they work or not.
- e. Please ask LJ T&T to review the issues with the roadway and parking, you may wish to go there first.

recorder setting 36:00:52:14

3. PRELIMINARY REVIEW + FINAL REVIEW 5/8/12

Project Name: **BECERRA RESIDENCE**

1590 Coast Walk	Permits:	Extension of Time
Project #: PO# 273740	DPM:	John Fisher 619-446-5231 jsfisher@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-7	Applicant:	Claude Anthony Marengo 858-417-1111

Scope of Work:

SAP No. 24002530 (Process 3) Extension of Time of an approved Coastal Development Permit 130085 and Site Development Permit 530877 which allowed a 1,832 SF addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.50 acre site at 1590 Coast Walk in the RS-1-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway.

Presenter: Claude Anthony Marengo

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: Asking for an Extension of Time, time limits have not expired. The Applicant states, there are no changes to the 2008 Project, or CDP and SDP, they are exactly the same.

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: to Combine Preliminary and Final Reviews.
(Thorsen/Collins 6-0-0)

In Favor: Benton, Collins, Costello, Liera, Merten, Thorsen
Oppose: 0
Abstain: 0
MOTION PASSES

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION: Findings can be made for an Extension of Time of the previously approved Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit of a 1,832 SF addition to an existing single-family residence on a 0.50-acre site at 1590 Coast Walk.

(Thorsen/Collins 5-0-1)

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Liera, Merten, Thorsen
Oppose: 0
Abstain: Benton (as Chair)
MOTION PASSES

recorder setting 36:01:03:02

4. COURTSEY REVIEW 5/8/12 + PRELIMINARY REVIEW 5/15/12

Project Name: **ROBBINS RESIDENCE**

475 Gravilla Street

Permits:

Variance & Neighborhood
Development Permit

Project #: PO#218477

DPM:

Morris Dye 619-446-5201
mdye@sandiego.gov

Zone: RM-1-1

Applicant:

James Robbins 858-431-6439
Dan Lin linnarch@gmail.com

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Variance for over height walls within the required setbacks, eliminate required on site parking and walls above 3' within the required visibility areas and Neighborhood Development Permit for a 5' wall in the public right of way at 475 Gravilla Street in the RM-1-1 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area.

Presenter: Dan Linn, AIA

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 5/8/12: Applicant provided a six page handout including : 1. Architectural site plan with elevations and driveway profile, 2. explanation of Variance Findings, 3. trig analysis of driveway and automobile incompatibility, 4. home owner letter.

House is 600 sq ft on a 2,000 sq ft corner lot. Driveway has a 22% slope, can't use because of cars wheel base. Wants to close driveway and eliminate the curb cut. Eliminate the garage. Eliminate on site parking. Needs permit for wall, will reduce fence height on wall to Code (open picket fence). Will make safety view tri-angle at the street corner.

DISCUSSION 5/8/12:

The issues of property, slopes, conditions of variance, parking, curb cut discussed.

Chair recommends DPR Members visit site.

recorder setting 36:01:17:27

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 5/15/12:

Applicant provided about two-dozen photos of nearby properties with abandoned driveways, no driveways, etc. The lot is referred to as a "constrained lot". Wants to close driveway and eliminate the curb cut. Eliminate on site parking. Needs permit for wall, will reduce fence height on wall to Code. Will make safety view tri-angle at the street corner. Applicant contends closing the driveway provides a space to make up for the loss of the driveway parking space, yielding no net loss. Any variance would go with the current house.

Any future development would require a CDP and must meet regulations. Variance would not transfer to new development.

DISCUSSION 5/15/12:

Applicant response in italics.

Benton: Certainly sympathize with situation. Don't want to setup a situation that someone else could take advantage of.

Thorsen: Can't make findings for variances. There are no special circumstances, problems are of owners doing.

Liera: Have a struggle not using parking provided. Doesn't like to legalize activities that need a special permit. Recalls working on the Mission Beach PDO, there were many properties like this one. Recalls where strict application of law deprives owner of use of property.

Costello: Can you provide quantification of the constrained lots with similar garage, driveway problems?

Collins: Troubled by granting a variance for un-permitted wall and fence. The wall and fill were done by the owner.

Robbins: The minimum length of a conforming driveway is 24 ft, he has only 16 ft.

APPLICANT REQUESTS CONTINUANCE.

Please provide for the FINAL REVIEW:

a. Please provide documentation about variance not being transferable to future development. What is the case with a simple Process 1 re-model, would the variance still apply? Can a variance be given to the house as is, only?

b. Survey the neighborhood, provide data on how many lots are similarly constrained, lack driveways, garages.
recorder setting 37:01:18:28

5. FINAL REVIEW 5/15/12 (Previously reviewed 3/13/12 & 3/20/12)

Project Name: **GIRGIS RESIDENCE**

811 Havenhurst Point
Project #: PO# 262975

Permits: CDP + SDP

DPM: Glenn Gargas 619-446-5142
ggargas@sandiego.gov

Zone: RS-1-4

Applicant: Don Vanderpool 619-557-0575

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands to demolish existing residence and construct a 7,384 SF single-family residence on a 0.40 acre site at 811 Havenhurst Place in the RS-1-4 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (nonappealable), Coastal Height Limit.

See March 2012 Committee Report.

Presenters:	John Dodge, AIA	Don Vanderpool
	Miles Cooper, AIA	Greg Hebert, AIA
	Mark House, AIA	Matt Peterson, Attorney

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

Peterson: Issues are 1) hillside walls to open space below, 2) sideyards adjacent neighbors. Has had meeting with Evelyn Heidelberg, Attorney, Tony Crisafi, AIA: both representing Mrs. Akers. Project has been submitted to the HOA which still has a few more weeks for review.

House: Hillside wall reduced in height (4 ft - 4.5 ft), follows hillside topography, rounded off at the corners of the property, clad in fossil mollusk laden stone. Wall is broken up and no longer a long linear wall. Actually two walls, about 4 ft and 5 ft with landscaping in between.

DISCUSSION:

Applicant response in italics.

Benton: There was an issue with the retaining wall in the courtyard. What was the resolution? *This could be a Code issue. If this is too high for a retaining wall, we will put a planter here.*

Thorsen: The issue is how this looks from the Park Land, this is larger than anything around there. The Bulk & Scale to the Park Land below is a Com Plan requirement.

Liera: The sideyards are so tight, can you soften with more landscaping or make wider?

Hebert: *5 to 6 ft shrubs will soften walls.*

Benton & Liera: The West sideyard is tight and could use some relief.

Peterson: *we can look at bringing back the sideyard, wider.*

Collins: When will you get an answer from the HOA about the CC&Rs? *A couple more weeks.*

Thorsen: We don't consider CC&Rs, but this house is >7,000 sq ft, larger than any other in the area. With this largest house there should be some transition to the older development. Applicable Land Use Plan says there should be. The front is OK, it is the highly visible back that isn't transitioned.

Cooper: *the pump house at the corner of the hillside property line will be removed.*

Neils Hyytinen, Attorney: representing Ryans, to the East. Their Architect, Mark Morris, asked that they move the corner back 10 ft, that is, 300 sq ft be removed from the East side (out of 7,400 sq ft). Ryans are disappointed this was not done. Also asked to provide a 3-D simulation to see the effect of Bulk & Scale on their property. This project could force the Ryans to push their new house farther out on the hillside when they remodel.

Benton: This is a good neighbor project, especially from the street. It is lower than existing houses. A transparent design. It is larger than any other house, concerned about the scale and size, but it is a pattern of development. Concerned about the treatment on the public space, open space, this is still not entirely satisfactory.

Costello: Reviewed the math analysis, this is to be the largest house in the area on an average sized lot giving an FAR twice the size of the others in the area. It is nice that you have done what we have asked others to do, that is place the second level down slope instead of a second story. Your new hillside wall design may be a good solution, can you create a drawing of a view from below? It would be nice to have a little more sideyard setback for this large house.

Collins: Concerned about the size of the house vs size of the lot. This is a smaller lot with a large house and FAR. Can't vote to approve the project as is.

recorder setting 37:00:36:19

Thorsen: Feels the same way. There is so much sq ft that goes to Com Character, there is so much B&S. There is so much sq ft it affects Com Character.

Benton: The issue of Com Character, bulk, height, mass, scale, and proportion. No one of these affects the view or privacy but the overall sense of the Com is it doesn't fit. When something is twice as big as everything else it affects Character.

Cooper: *From below, the hillside walls: upper wall is screened with landscaping, the lower wall is articulated up and down by the changing topography, and cuts in and out of the hillside.*

Liera: Large Bulk & Scale are not necessarily bad. Bigger does mean that more effort is required to make it fit into a neighborhood.

APPLICANT REQUESTS CONTINUANCE.

Please provide for the FINAL REVIEW:

- a. Please provide a simulation (photosimulation?) of the view from below of the new wall design. Include garden wall and existing vegetation.
- b. Please provide result of the HOA's CC&R review.
- c. Please have meeting with neighbors (Ryans or Attorney) about setbacks, etc.
- d. Check into more side yard relief on the West, see above (Aker).
- e. Please answer issue of Com Plan large-scale transitions. Consider down scale?

recorder setting 37:00:50:17