

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE REPORT
FOR
October 2012

October 9 Present: Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Liera, Merten, Welsh

October 16 Present: Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Welsh

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT BY THE COMMITTEE 10/09/12

Costello Announced that there will be an Independent La Jolla Form at the Riford Library Oct 17, 2012 at 5:30 PM. Casey Tanaka, the Mayor of Coronado, and Michael Ott, the Director of LAFCO, will speak.

2. FINAL REVIEW 10/09/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 9/18/12)

Project Name: **HERITAGE ON IVANHOE MW**

7716 Ivanhoe Ave (multiple addresses) Permits: CDP
Project #: PO# 289238 DPM: Jeff Peterson 619-446-5237
japeterson@sandiego.gov
Zone: RM-3-7 Applicant: Robert Bateman 858-565-8362

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Map Waiver and Amendment to CDP #793182 to create 14 residential condominium units (under construction) on a 0.72 acre site at 7716 Ivanhoe Avenue (multiple addresses) in the RM-3-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, and Transit Area.

Presenters: Robert Bateman
Sasha Varone

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

The Applicant would like to sell the 14 residential units as independent condo units. Initially there were three lots that were consolidated for the Heritage on Ivanhoe Project. A map waiver will allow them to be sold as 14 individual units.

Provided for FINAL REVIEW: *Applicant response in Italics*

1. Please provide the previously drawn Landscaping plan. *Provided landscaping plan, will keep the big Brazilian Pepper Tree, additional 24" box trees will be planted.*

2. Indicate the location of the historic Tudor style house. *House is located at the North East corner, will be for sale.*

3. Define the common areas and public areas in the Project. *Outlined private areas for each individual unit. Common areas such as the driveways, central courtyard with mailboxes and parkway on Ivanhoe were outlined.*

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:

(Collins/Costello 5-0-1)The findings can be made for a Map Waiver and Amendment to CDP #793182 to create 14 residential condominium units at 7716 Ivanhoe Avenue.

In Favor: Benton, Collins, Costello, Liera, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Merten

MOTION PASSES

3. FINAL REVIEW 10/09/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 4/17/12)

Project Name:	BENSON RESIDENCE	Permits:	CDP + SDP
	5970 Camino De La Costa		
Project #:	PO# 232790	DPM:	Sandra Teasley 619-446-5271 steasley@sandiego.gov
Zone:	RS-1-5	Applicant:	Mark T. House 619-557-0575 Scott Huntsman

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing two level 7,554 sq ft single family residence, and construct a two level 9,995 sq ft single family residence located at 5970 Camino De La Costa in the RS-1-5 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, and Transit Area.

Presenters: Mark House
Scott Huntsman
Myles Cooper C.E.
Trace Wilson

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

The Applicant is no longer planning additions to the existing house, instead there will be a completely new house. They are complying with all new setbacks, and other requirements. Applicant is not relying on existing conditions.

Sideyard setbacks, both sides, 7 ft 7 in. Sideyards are open, can see ocean. Utilities will be underground, poles removed. Gates are 75% open. FAR, allowed = .45, proposed = .352. Lot coverage 21.3%. 3 bedrooms plus office, 4 car garage plus motor court. Front yard setback = 20 ft. Rear yard over 100 ft (so, 40 ft bluff edge OK). One corner of the long axis of the swimming pool is in 40 ft bluff edge setback. The pool corner problem was solved by rotating the long axis of the pool 90 degrees on the plans, the design change was signed by Mark House and dated.

Roof plan, flat roof with low parapet walls, ¼ in/ft for drainage. Usually the inside of the parapet walls has flashing and black membrane and looks unfortunate, can you help that? ***Yes, we will work with the contractor also keep them low, 4 – 8 inches. Not much should be visible from the street.***

What documentation is there to codify the VC and its maintenance? ***There will be a VC easement document recorded, as well as a covenant of easement for the bluff. As well the side yard views. These are recorded against the land.***

Can you open up the bushes along the side yard setback in front, to make a wider VC? ***We want to keep the bushes to screen the neighbor's retaining wall.***

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:

(Merten/Liera 5-0-1) Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing two level 7,554 sq ft single family residence, and construct a two level 9,995 sq ft single family residence located at 5970 Camino De La Costa. The Motion is based on the revised drawings dated 9 Oct. 2012, signed by the applicant, Sheet A1.1.

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Liera, Merten, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton

MOTION PASSES

5. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 10/09/12 + FINAL REVIEW 10/16/12

Project Name: **BUTTERFIELD RESIDENCE**

5328 & 5334 Calumet Avenue	Permits:	CDP & SDP
Project #: PO# 243464	DPM:	John Fisher 619-446-5231 jsficher@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-7	Applicant:	Dave Longmore 858-603-9478 619-234-0361

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to Demolish 2 existing structures totaling 8,042 SF at 5328 Calumet Avenue and 5334 Calumet Avenue, execute a lot tie agreement, and construct a new 7,308 SF single story home (5,332 SF living area + 703 SF attached garage + 1,273 SF “phantom floor”) for a total FAR of .48, a spa, and a 2820 SF basement on a 15,201 SF site (Lot 15 is 7,272 SF and Lot 16 is 7,929 SF) The project is located in the RS-1-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, and Transit overlay zones.

Presenters: Matt Peterson
Kristi Hanson
Ingrid Espe

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 10/09/12:

Statistics sheet provided with 4 pages of drawings. Two lots are merged, and both houses will be removed (total = 8,042 sq ft), a one story single family home (7,308 sq ft) will be constructed. The FAR allowed = .49, proposed = .48. There is an 11 ft setback on one side, 12 ft the other. On S-W side there will be a big view corridor when combined with Bandera paper alley. The project includes three bedrooms and a full basement. There will be a safety rail partitioning the private property from the bluff edge and a 5 ft set back. They will provide a new fence at the Bandera paper alley. Project includes 4 parking spaces. The house will be 25 ft from bluff edge. The Coastal bluff is in City property.

Costello: asked Applicant to re-post notices on green paper in obvious locations, **answered “no”**.

Benton: Let’s review the rear yard setback issue. **Muni Code requires 15 ft (observing 22 ft), bluff edge setback is 25 ft.**

PUBLIC COMMENT 10/09/12: *Applicant response in Italics*

Rita: will there be a basement? ***Yes, a full basement***

Howard Reedy: what is the fate of the basement excavate? ***It is trucked off site for licensed disposal.***

Collins: What is the paper alley width? ***I believe it is 20 ft***

Jackie Lustiak: how many feet are you providing for a VC? ***12 ft plus the Bandera VC, a total of 32 ft.***

Peter Wintje: How much VC is there now between each of the houses and how much will there be with just one house? ***Maybe 4 ft each, but none in between the two houses. The only way to get more is with a new Coastal Permit.***

Steve Rossi: Objects to the change in density brought about by one house placed on two lots. Concerned about bluff erosion, acceleration of bluff erosion.

Costello: This change in density issue was noted in the City Cycle Issues Letters. This is clearly inconsistent with the density range of the LJ Community Plan.

Marie Mazzone: Mass is not consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. Concerned about loss of views, light and sky.

Provided for FINAL REVIEW 10/16/12:

1. Please prepare a summary of the existing setbacks and view issues and how they will change with the proposed project, two houses versus one.

Two houses - setback 4 ft on all sides = 24 ft, FAR= .57, 30 ft high;

One house - setback sum =23 ft, FAR= .49, 24 ft high (27 ft chimney)

2. Identify statements in your Geological Report about bluff erosion and rate of bluff retreat. How is 75 year life determined? Bring in your Geologist? **Les Reed, Geologist:** *Cabrillo Formation is more resistant. Up the coast a storm drain, 50 or 60 years old, serves as a bench mark for bluff recession, 24 inches per 50 years. 75 years seems a reasonable number to say the house site will last. There is an old WWII drain trench going thru where the basement will be, this will have a solution.*

3. Please provide some details / drawings of the basement. *There is a full basement, but not under the garage. There is a lot of mechanical space and storage space.*

4. Provide some details of treatment to the walls along the ocean. Make more natural looking? *Garden walls have been stepped back to conform to the house.*

5. Can you alter the single structure design to appear more like two houses on two lots? Landscaping at the entrance is a broad open area. *The street front of the house leading to the great hall is glass giving a blue sky view.*

6. Please respond to the SD City Cycle Issues Letters (page 4, II. Significant Project Issues) comment that a lot merger will create a density inconsistent with the La Jolla Community Plan. *Provided a report stating a lot of minimums are required, not maximum.*

7. Detail the effect on the neighbors across the street of switching setbacks. They purchased property with setbacks a certain way, how will this change their views? *There are not views to the ocean for the neighbors anyway. There will be much more view than now.*

8. Break up the view of the safety wall from the ocean. Something other than a straight line, relate better to the bluff and structure architecture. (Calif. Coastal Com is concerned about the appearance from the ocean.) *no response.*

9. Please provide some building sections, showing the roof type and details. *Layered roof to create areas of interest , parapet with flat roof, 24 ft high. The highest point of chimney is 27ft.*

j. Please provide the DPR Members with copies of the Geological Report. Send by PDF to Chairman Benton or provide paper copies. *Done by email.*

k. Have a simulation showing roof lines of the neighborhood. *Provided, but not of the neighborhood, or neighbors, just the first few feet of each house on both sides.*

PUBLIC COMMENT 10/16/12: Applicant in Italics

Jackie Lustiak: You are not giving us anything in return. There is no gain in the View Corridor. Can you move the house to the North? That will give a great view widening the view thru the paper alley.

Steve Rossi: Has observed the primordia of a sea cave being formed, the bluff face has become concave in the past 6 months.

Les Reed: *We get periodic bluff failures, these stabilize. This has been over steepened at the location of the old fault. There is a notch on the cliff face. They know the mechanism that formed this. They will look at this, does not affect the estimate of 75 years. The basement is going in bed rock material digging it shouldn't produce a problem, drains and a sump pump will handle water accumulation, if there is a cave formation this will help stabilize it.*

Marie Mazzone: Stated references from the La Jolla Community Plan in Bold:

Mrs. Mazzone comments in Italics

P. 39 Goals. Protect the environmentally sensitive resources of La Jolla's open areas including its coastal bluffs,.....

P. 50 Visual Resources. b. Public views to the ocean from the first public roadway adjacent to the ocean shall be preserved and **enhanced**, including visual access across private coastal properties at yards and setbacks. *How will Butterfield project enhance?*

P 50-51 Shoreline Areas and Coastal Bluffs

a. The City should preserve and protect the coastal bluffs, beaches and shoreline areas of La Jolla assuring that development occurs in a manner that protects these resources, encourages sensitive development,... **and maximizes physical and visual public access to and along the shoreline.**

P. 51 These regulations assure that development occurs in a manner that protects these resources, encourages sensitive development, and **maximizes** physical and **visual public access** to and along the shoreline.

P. 51 c. Development on coastal bluffs should be set back sufficiently from the bluff edge to avoid the need for shoreline or bluff erosion control (*as evidenced by 5322 Calumet's Coastal Commission emergency repair permit for bluff failure*).

P. 52 d. The City should ensure that new **development does not restrict or prevent lateral vertical or visual access (Fig 9 and App H) to the beach on property that lies between the shoreline and first public roadway, or ...designated public open space easements.**

P. 56 Visual Resources. c. Protect public views to and along the shoreline as well as to all designated open space areas and scenic resources from public vantage points as identified in Fig 9 and App H. Public views to the ocean along public streets are identified in Appendix G. Design and site proposed development that may affect an existing or potential public view to be protected, as identified in Figure 9 or in Appendix G, in such a manner as to preserve, **enhance** or restore the designated public view. *How will Butterfield project enhance?*

d. Implement the regulation of the building envelope to preserve public views through the height, setback, landscaping and fence transparency regulation of the LDC that limit the building profile and maximize view opportunities. *Board members comment at last meeting. Can you alter the single structure design to appear more like two houses on two lots?*

P. 57 **Where new development is proposed on property that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway, preserve, enhance or restore existing or potential view corridors... I suggest a generous compensatory setback.** *If you are asking for a lot tie and making a change in the character of a neighborhood, there should be a concession in the way of very generous setbacks in exchange for eliminating public view with a lot tie. I recommend the largest setback be placed on the south side where the paper alley already exists since it will really open up the space for public viewing.*

P. 59-60 Require removal of obsolete or unnecessary protective devices, when feasible, and in a safe manner, or otherwise allow such devices to deteriorate naturally over time without any improvements allowed, to restore the natural integrity and visual quality of the coastal bluff over the long-term. Do not allow erosion control measures on a site where development was approved with less than a 40 foot bluff edge setback, unless otherwise permitted in the Sensitive Coastal Bluff Regulations in the Land Development Code.

P. 84 3. Development Near Coastal Bluffs

a. The City should ensure that residential projects along the coastal bluff maintain yards and setbacks as established by the underlying zone and other applicable regulations in the Land Development Code in order to form view corridors and to prevent a walled-off appearance from the street to the ocean. (*Lot tie will give walled off appearance. A concession would be larger easement, and or an alteration of building mass.*)

P. 81 Residential areas Goals. Maintain the character of La Jolla's residential areas by ensuring that

redevelopment occurs in a manner that protects natural features, **preserves existing streetscape themes and allows a harmonious visual relationship to exist between the bulk and scale of new and older structures.**

Peter Wintje: Can you shift the house North?

Rita: Re shift house. There is hardly any space there now

Peterson: *from the Muni Code setbacks should be .08 of the lot width. For two houses 8 ft +4 ft + 4 ft +8 ft total 22 ft. setback. Butterfield will give 23 ft, so it is slightly more.*

Liera: what are the fences like? *Over 3 ft they will be glass.*

Costello: re Cycles Letters, City Planner pointed out the change in density conflicting with the LJ Com Plan. The Residential Densities Map, LJCP, pg 81, depicts the site as Low Density Residential (5-9 dwelling unit/ acre. That is 5 du/a = 8,712 sq ft/ du, 9 du/a = 4,840 sq ft/du. Pg 89 uses text to describe Low Density as 5-9 du/a, 5,000 -7,000 sq ft lots, and RS-1-7 zoning. SD Muni Code ch 13, art 1, div 4 lists RS-1-7 with min lot size of 5,000 sq ft, RS-1-3 with min lot size of 15,000 sq ft. The average lot size of the 29 homes in the immediate neighborhood is 7,552 sq ft. A lot tie would give Butterfield 15,200 sq ft, which is twice the size of the neighbors, inconsistent with RS-1-7, but consistent with RS-1-3. (BTW, the house size (7,308 sq ft) is almost 3x the average size of neighboring homes (2,504 sq ft). Graphic analysis was presented showing inconsistency in changing the lot size and the Community Character. Asked that DPR deny the project but if not, at least require increased side yard setback for view easement as compensation.

Liera: The size of the lot is the most important determinate in the Community Character. Discussed implications of density changes and agreed rules shouldn't be broken.

Collins: What is the width of the house? *114 ft*

Merten: My Motion to approve will be contingent upon the Applicant removing all the palm trees in the side yard view easements. Can you remove the trees in front of the view easements?

Hanson: *Yes. Plans revised dated, signed by Hanson.*

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 10/16/12:

(Merten/Hayes 4-3-0) Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to Demolish 2 existing structures at 5328 and 5334 Calumet Avenue, execute a lot tie agreement, and construct a new 7,308 SF single story home and a basement on a 15,201 SF site based on revised drawings dated 16 Oct 2012 signed by Kristi Hanson.

In Favor: Benton (to break tie), Collins, Hayes, Merten

Oppose: Costello, Liera, Welsh

Abstain: 0

MOTION PASSES

6. FINAL REVIEW 10/16/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 09/18/12)

Project Name: **FAIRWAY VIEWS SCR**

1456 Nautilus Street

Permits: SCR for CDP

Project #: PO# 291493

DPM: Jeanette Temple 619-446-5245
jtemple@sandiego.gov

Zone: RS-1-4

Applicant: Terry Montello 619-994-5557
Bob Belanger 619-261-1288

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Substantial Conformance Review for a proposed dwelling on an undeveloped site at 1456 Nautilus Street in the RS-1-4 zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Limit.

Presenters: Bob Belanger
Larry Cole, CE

Provided for FINAL REVIEW: *Applicant reply in italics*

1. Superimpose old and new drawings differentiate with color or shading. *Done, close to same footprint*
2. Have a cross-section showing driveway and access. *Done*
3. Provide a drainage study, and how it relates to East property including a concept drawing. *2003 Drainage Study, drainage from the East does not go into this lot, water from the North flows down the driveway before it can get to the house.*
4. Show the West elevation to Nautilus and a cross section from top of property to Nautilus. *Done*
5. Provide an analysis of traffic movement in and out of Nautilus. **Cole:** *demonstrated turns into and out of property, use of center lane.* **Grunow's** photo shown. **Liera:** traffic light will also stop traffic.
6. Provide view of roofline from Nautilus. *Done, structure is depressed into the terrain; only the roof is seen from Nautilus, ie, Spanish Colonial type tile with tower.*
7. Have an over-head view of roof, please color, and indicate texture, gravel, and tile. *Provided*
8. Provide project statistics in addition to FAR. *Previous Plan: 3 floors, 12,000 sq ft. Current Plan: 2 floors, 9,615 sq ft, 23% lot coverage, FAR = .223*
9. Provide information on Fairway closure or vacation. Is there a proscriptive easement for a walking path? *Paper street is not vacated, it still exists as an easement.*

DISCUSSION:

Hayes: retaining wall – sidewalk to house? *7 to 10 ft high, guardrail topped by wrought iron*

Liera: explain the retention basin

Benton: for a SCR, you need to show these projects are substantially the same, and also that we make a finding with regard to the LJ Com Plan. Let's focus on those issues. The style is substantially different. The old drawing was for a sleek modern simple design with horizontal elements going slope to slope. Now you have a Spanish Colonial architectural style with tile roof and tower. The question for Committee Members is: is this substantially the same, as well as the issue of the footprint.

Merten: What is the difference of the two building heights? *About 7.5 ft*

We are to determine that the project is in substantial conformance with the original project. We are to make a determination based on the rules and regs in effect at the time of the review. When we see projects that are so different in many ways, I wonder if this shouldn't be an amendment to the Coastal Permit. A SCR is problematic, it must comply with the LJ Com Plan, in Residential Development, it addresses architectural character. City Bulletin about SCR, Architecture Review of proposed changes to an architectural style of an approved project should weigh the significance that the discussion maker had placed on architectural style when the project was approved. When findings of neighborhood compatibility are required, even minor changes to architectural elements or materials could be significant. Increased height of a flat roof to a gabled roof could affect neighbors and could lead to controversy as to why the design change occurred after the public hearing. The over riding goal should be that the modified plan be better than the original one....

Benton: OK, clearly there are Spanish styles in the neighborhood, but the point is this is a very significant change in plans.

Merten: re 7 – 10 ft retaining walls. Retaining walls leading to driveways / garages can be > 6 ft. Would rather see the walls step up, be broken into two lower levels of terraced walls, landscape between.

The consensus of the DPR Members is that there are so many significant changes to the project that a SCR is not appropriate, however, a new CDP would likely be approved.

Belanger: *If a vote for the SCR fails the owner will build the previously approved plan.*

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:

(Liera/Merten 6-0-1) Findings cannot be made for a Substantial Conformance Review for the existing Coastal Development Permit because the Architectural concept is significantly different from the original design.

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Hayes, Liera, Merten, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton

MOTION PASSES

7. FINAL REVIEW (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 08/21/12)

Project Name: **CAMAISA RESIDENCE**

9450 La Jolla Farms Road

Permits: CDP

Project #: PO# 260171

DPM: Patrick Hooper 619-446-5001

Zone: RS-1-2

phooper@sandiego.gov

Applicant:

Sandra Escobedo 858-456-8555 x109

Scope of Work:

Joseph Reid 858-456-8555

(Process 3) An 1,835 SF addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.74 acre site located at 6450 La Jolla Farms Rd in the RS-1-2 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway and Parking Impact Overlay Zone.

Presenters: Joseph Reid
Sandra Escobedo
Ione Steiger

Provided for FINAL REVIEW:

1. Please meet with neighbor's representatives Architects. *Done*
2. What will you use for a tennis court fence? *No fence around the court. 3 ft wall existing wall remains.*
If no or limited fence, will you place that in a deed restriction? ???
3. What will the tennis court surface be? *Concrete, with a perimeter of permeable material to reduce hard cape*
4. Provide documentation that the City Staff will allow parking in the front yard, and tennis court for the required parking. *Provided a letter tentative from city planner Patrick Hooper that they will allow the tennis court to be used for parking requirement.* What is the Muni Code reference? ??? What about access to the tennis court? *We will cut a grasscrete driveway from the street. There will be a second driveway curb cut. Stiegler: the City is OK with using the tennis court. The parking requirement is because of mini dorms like around SDSU.* How many bedrooms? *Nine* How many people living there? *Seven*
Liera: Doesn't a tennis court need a high fence to keep the balls from going into the street? **Collins:** shouldn't we ask for a deed restriction on fence height / construction?
5. Provide updated CILs. *Not done.*
6. Provide parking layout plan. *On plans distributed*
7. Provide clearer drawings, use color to identify existing and new/proposed. As well as 1st and 2nd level color drawings. Shade or color. *Done, shaded areas would be new construction.*
8. Provide more treatment, motif, of the South facing structure. *Instead, will block several second level windows, will add plants.*
9. Please show a cross-section of proposed 2nd level structure and neighbors to the South.
10. Please provide a street scene showing proposed structures including the current property's structures to the North and South.
11. Please have a compliant landscape plan and with compliant hardscape.
front yard: 41% landscape / 59% hardscape

DISCUSSION:

Merten: *(45 degree angled plane does not apply here because of lot width.)* You see the nice setbacks all along the Farms Area. Would like to see the second story wall setback, provide some articulation here. The existing 2nd floor is too close to the neighbor (4 ft). The wall is the most unfortunate thing about this Project and now you are extending it making it less pleasant. LJCP asks height over one story be stepped back you aren't doing that (lot width). Can you push the proposed second floor in some?

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:

(Hayes/Collins 2-3-0) Findings can be made for Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish part of an existing structure at 6450 La Jolla Farms Rd and construct a 1,835 SF addition to the existing single-family residence.

In Favor: Collins, Hayes,

Oppose: Costello, Liera, Merten

Abstain: 0

MOTION FAILS

8. COURTESY PRESENTATION 10/16/12:

Project Name: **ROBERTS RESIDENCE**

9438 La Jolla Farms Road

Permits: CDP

Project #: PO# 294531

DPM: Jeff Peterson 619-446-5001

Zone: RS-1-2

japeterson@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Charity Lonberger 858-459-0805

Scope of Work:

A Coastal Development Permit for the remodel of an existing 3,377 SF one-story single-family residence on a 49,145 SF lot. The proposed project expands the house to a 8,058 SF single-family residence. The majority of the proposed home is one story with the exception of a 861 SF lower level, which creates a 2-story portion on the south western portion of the footprint. In addition to expanding the existing house there will be an addition of a 2-story detached studio/exercise room (accessory building) and a detached 1-story garage/recreation/pool house (may serve as guest quarters). Site improvements include a new driveway, pool, garden walls and landscaping.

Presenter: Charity Lonberger

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

Applicant gave a courtesy presentation as it relates to the Camaisa Project, her project is directly adjacent to the Camaisa property. Lonberger is assisting the Roberts's with their remodeling and coordinating with the Camaisa's. The project adds about 4,000 sq ft to the residence. An orchard will add some screening. RS-1-2 zone. Has a historic designation for the builder/owner. Lot coverage is 16%.

DISCUSSION:

Hayes: Can you describe some details of the walls around the two properties? *There will be perimeter walls. All the wall heights are not yet final; they could be 10 ft to 6-10 ft. Part in setback, talks in progress with City for solution.*

Collins: What are the setbacks? **15.4 ft, 11 ft**

Please provide For FINAL REVIEW:

1. Will the 10 ft high South wall have view corridor issues? Please articulate the wall.
2. Detail elevations
3. Detail materials used
4. Provide a Landscape plan (depending on features, you may not want orchard)
5. Consider articulating the long straight walls
6. Please provide an outline, street scene, of the houses on each side with the proposed house (photosimulation OK, but not requested).
7. Detail of flat roof, treatments of roof
8. Is there a View Corridor required or established?

9. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 10/16/12

Project Name: **GIRARD AVENUE MIXED USE**

7610 Girard Avenue

Permits: CDP

Project #: PO# 274439

DPM: John Fisher 619-446-5231

Zone: RS-1-2

jfisher@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Ashley Prikosovits 858-527-0818

Beth Reiter 858-232-4580

Scope of Work:

A Coastal Development Permit and Map Waiver application to waive the requirements of a Tentative Map to construct eight residential condominium units and one 5,125 square foot commercial condominium unit on a vacant 0.27 acre site at 7610 Girard Avenue in Zone 1 of La Jolla Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan in Council District 1

Presenters: Phil Quatrino
Ashley Prikosovits

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

They will be presenting their Project to LJ PDO.

Project includes 25 Spaces of subterranean parking from alley. They have established a parking agreement with Vons, to provide surplus parking. The 1st floor is commercial and the 2nd floor is residential. Project consists of eight 2-story residential units of 1400 to 2600 sq ft each and contains two elevators.

Collins: Is that Vons employee parking? *We will have to show compliance to the City.*

Liera: colors may not be compatible with the PDO (dark brown)

Collins: PDO requires earth tones.

There will not be fenestrations on the alley wall next to Vons. As there will be noise from deliveries at all hours.

Please provide For FINAL REVIEW:

1. Please bring samples of stucco, wood-like material
2. Please bring documents showing parking agreements.
3. Please bring a parking study, including how Vons parking is affected.