

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE REPORT
For
November 2012

November 13 Present: Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Merten, Welsh

November 21 Present: Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Merten, Welsh

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT 11/13/12

Costello: The draft Environmental Impact Report for Hillel is out and comments are requested. This project has very important implications for the residential zones.

Benton: Hillel will be heard next Tuesday, 20 Nov, 2012 at the LJSAB at 9 AM

Grunow: Mr. Grunow will recuse himself from voting on the Reserve Project because of family involvement in neighboring property.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT 11/20/12

Chairman Benton: the Pham Project has been removed from the Agenda by the Applicant.

3. SITE VISIT 11/13/12 + PRELIMINARY REVIEW 11/20/12 (PREVIOUS REVIEW 8/21/12)

Project Name: **THE RESERVE**

6850 Country Club Drive	Permits:	CDP, PDP, SDP
Project #: PO# 292065	DPM:	Glen Gargas 619-446-5142
Zone: RS-1-4		GGargas@sandiego.gov
	Applicant:	Greg Shannon 858-414-6777

Scope of Work:

Process four – CDP,PDP, SDP (ESL) and Vesting Tentative Map to subdivide a 25.14 Acre site into four lots (three SDU and one open space lot). The site is located at 6850 Country Club Drive and is within Zone RS-1-4, Coastal Overlay (non appealable), Coastal Height, Parking Impact, Brush Management, Very High Fire Hazard, and Earthquake Fault Buffer Zones.

Site Visit Present 11/13/12: Grunow, Kane, Liera, Welsh

Presenters:	Greg Shannon	Marty Poirier	Nick Lee
	James Alcorn	Brad Lents	Asha Blier
	Charity Lonberger	Amber Lake	

SITE VISIT APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/13/12:

At the Reserve site visit there were DPR members, the team consultants, and about 14 residents of the immediate area.

Attendees walked the site and first viewed the parcel that will remain with the fox run parcel, then the central large parcel, and lastly the upper parcel. Attendees stopped at the highest point of each parcel and heard a description of how the building will sit on the site to avoid view impacts on surrounding areas and resident's views. The un-permitted encroachment was identified.

Questions were raised about height, view impacts, runoff impacts, fencing impacts on wildlife corridors and hikers.

Presenters: Greg Shannon, Marty Poirier
James Alcorn, Brad Lents

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/20/12: Seeking a CDP for future homes, if future owners accept restrictions of CDP they will come back to Community only needing a SCR. Applicant is working with some neighbors to lower roof line on lot 2, and potentially rearrange locations. Project encompasses about 25 acres, divided in 4 lots. One lot will be open space with no development. Using an open space overlay, 25% of lot can be developed. Landscape Architects provided a simulation showing how topography, vistas, buildings can be situated. Trying to provide options of how structures can be massed within the maximum and minimum constraints of the volume. No fences are allowed in the Conservation Area. Fences will be at the option of home owners around their property. There can have fence along perimeter of Reserve (not a requirement to fence). The fence can be solid if not in view.

Liera: Considering how visible these houses are from above, the roof type is very important, flat low pitch, high pitch.

Kane: what will be the disposition of the 12.5 ft non-conforming retaining wall? *You could deny it and it will come down. It is over height, in setback, not enough footing. It is up to the City if it is to be removed. House is over 30 ft, with wall, a lot of mass.*

Unk: Will a house go on Lot 3? *Yes. Lot 3, 21 acres, can only dev 4 acres because of City Conservation Easement. It could be the largest estate in SD County. It can have one primary house up to 25,000 sq ft, a guest house of up to 5,000 sq ft, and three outbuildings of up to 1,000 sq ft each.*

Judith Vacquier: Concerned about fencing, loss of habitat, enjoys wildlife. Thinks it is important that animals be able to cross perimeter fence from wildlife corridors. *City now says it will be the option of home owners to fence or not (previously City said they must fence). This will be in the CILs.*

Shannon: *we could have openings at intervals (ie 100 ft) for wildlife.*

Unk: why have fences at all? **Shannon:** *We have had a problem of neighbors encroaching on land of others and built structures. We are in Court on several such issues.*

Molina: The house on Lot 3 will be 50 ft from my home. Concerned about the profile of the house, ie pitched roof, also about loss of protected areas by encroachment, likes the idea of openings in fence for wildlife.

John Coughlin: concerned that the simulation is accurate, not actually a reduction of the actual mass, as with the MESOM building at SIO-UCSD.

Colin Seid: most impacted. 1st choice is not to develop area – the impact is not acceptable. With 25 acres can't it go elsewhere? Asks us to take a role correcting violations of Code by illegal landscaping, the retaining wall. Asked to minimize impacts. Can house be moved back more, out of view?

Shannon: *We will continue to work with Colin. We can control the height of landscaping to protect the ocean views.*

Mrs Coughlin: Restrict the height of trees to the roof line?

Kane: What don't you like about the photo simulation? **Seid:** Loss of privacy from the living areas of the house. Asks to slide the house back (true for future house too, privacy), not concerned about materials, landscaping, etc.

Unk: the most important is to respect the ocean views.

Shannon: trying to bring the house more into the ridge, not up the ridge.

Liera: Fences can do three things, keep people out, delineate the property, fencing to obstruct views is another thing.

Please provide For FINAL REVIEW:

1. Present a different design for Lot 2.
2. Please continue working with neighbors on privacy, proximity, ocean views, roof lines and pitch, limiting tree height, fencing and other items.
3. Discuss SD City Cycles Issues Letters, soon to be completed. recording setting 16 01 35 59

4. FINAL REVIEW 11/13/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 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

Scope of Work: Beth Reiter 858-232-4580

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 11/13/12:

The Project was presented to LJ PDO on Monday where it was learned their LJ PDO Zone 1 is restricted to 2 stories. Not asking DPR for an approval at this time. DPR Members expressed concern for the very dark color of the wood stain. The PDO calls for avoiding dark colors, preferring earth tones, pastels, light colors. Applicant will return when their PDO 2 story limitation design dilemma is resolved.

5. FINAL REVIEW 11/13/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 08/21/12, 10/16/12)

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

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.

Presenter: Ione Stiegler

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/13/12:

Ione Stiegler stated that they thought all of the neighbor's and DPR's issues were addressed. As a result of the DPR denial vote, the applicant has withdrawn the Project.

6. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 11/13/12 + FINAL REVIEW 11/20/12

(Previously Reviewed 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

Scope of Work:

Applicant: Charity Lonberger 858-459-0805

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.

Presenters: Charity Lonberger
Jim Alcorn

APPLICANT PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION 11/13/12:

Property in question has a historic designation for a previous owner, Dr. Jacob Bronowski. The proposed drawings expand on his plan, by adding 1,400 sq ft to house totaling 4,800 sq ft for the house, adding a 1,700 sq ft pottery studio, guest house, cabana and lap pool. The building plans maintain a large courtyard around the pool area. The front street view is overgrown and will be corrected, there will be a wall with trees screening it. The San Diego City is asking for a "Visual Corridor" on each side yard. "SDMC 132.0403(b) requires a visual corridor of not less than the side yard setbacks or more than 10 feet in width, and running the full depth of the premises, be preserved as a deed restriction as a condition of CDP." As a result, trees can not be placed in the view corridor. The City is enforcing view corridor on behalf of the California Coastal Commission.

Provided For REVIEW 11/13/12:

1. Will the 10 ft high South wall have view corridor issues? *Not the wall per se. See Muni Code 132.0403(b) above, will comply.* Please articulate the wall. *Will articulate the wall.*
2. Detail elevations *We are still working on this*
3. Detail materials used *Presented a Materials Board*
4. Provide a landscape plan (depending on features, you may not want orchard) *Trees, maybe fruit trees, will be planted to appear as if the house, etc, was carved out of an orchard. Still working on some landscape details. Area by the ESL / slope is not designed yet.*
5. Consider articulating the long straight walls. *The walls will be articulated*
6. Please provide an outline, street scene, of the houses on each side with the proposed house. *A street scene drawing of the proposed project and the neighbors was provided showing building height, side yard setbacks, and massing.*
7. Detail of flat roof, treatments of roof. *Provided roof plan, new roof 3/8 in/ft slope, 1 1/2 in flashing with 6 in stucco parapet. Roof drainage will be pumped to the street. Crushed brick or gravel surface.*
8. Is there a View Corridor required or established? *Yes, required, see above #1 and Applicant Presentation.*

DISCUSSION 11/13/12:

Finish floor is 7 ft lower than the Camaisa house. FAR = .16, (next door FAR = .34).

Five bedrooms = seven parking spaces.

Albert Yedidsion: His house is across the street. He fully supports the Alcorn and Benton design. It preserves the integrity of the house and adds to its value. The Project will preserve the historical value of the house.

Liera: Likes the way the Project expands on what is existing, would like to see more of this in the Farms. What trees species will be used?

Merten: Is that a bluff “coastal”? **Alcorn:** *No, it is a “Coastal Canyon”.* What about drainage? *Paving tiles will be permeable, and roof runoff will go to the street.* What is the Landscaping by the canyon? **Lonberger:** *in Fire Zone 1, so far the landscape is concept plan only. Fire Zone 1 is 35 ft. Modified Brush Management Plan, this area is in Fire Zone 1, there are sprinklers in the house too.* Are you showing the Brush Management Zones on your plan now? *No.*

Kane: What is your hard-scape coverage? **Alcorn:** *hardscape = .226 to .228, about 25%*

Provided for FINAL REVIEW 11/20/12:

1. Please finalize details of Fire Zone, landscaping. *We had a meeting with the landscape plan reviewer and Fire Officer.*

Fire zone 1, mitigation measures, thicker walls, house windows will be double paned tempered glass, Fire zone 2, low ground cover and shrubs, ESL, Coastal Sage shrubs.

2. Please resolve the brush management plan, and interaction with ESL *Done with above.*

3. Please complete details of the paving character of the parking spaces, courtyard. *Interlocking permeable pavers, limestone non-permeable pavers. 12 % permeable pavers, 5% impermeable pavers. 17 % hardscape, 16% building.*

4. What species of trees and ground cover will you use? *Two options for trees, Sweet Bay and Camphor trees. Ground cover, wild strawberry.*

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:

(Kane / Costello 5-0-1) Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for the remodel of an existing 3,377 SF one-story single-family residence to a total of 8,058 SF, with some 2nd level, on a 49,145 SF lot at 9438 La Jolla Farms Road.

In Favor: Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Collins

MOTION PASSES

recorder setting 16 00 19 37

7. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 11/13/12

recorder setting 15/15 00 57 57

Project Name: **PHAM RESIDENCE**

7411 Olivetas Street

Permits: CDP

Project #: PO# 282249

DPM: Sandra Teasley

Zone: RS-1-7

steasley@sandiego.gov

Scope of Work:

Applicant: Hillary Lowe 858-274-5978

Variance to reduce the required street sideyard setback for a 855 sq ft addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.05 acre site at 7411 Olivetas Street in the RS-1-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Ht Limit, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. Council District 1.

Presenter: Mark Mitchell**APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/13/12:**

Applicant is requesting a variance for a 4 ft setback from the street where 10 ft is required. The lot is 25 ft by 100 ft. He is proposing a 2nd story addition and roof deck of 855 sq ft. Lot is substandard with a min. width of 50 ft. in this Zone. There is an existing carport plus a parking space. Allowed FAR = .70 (because lot is so small), proposed FAR = .69. There are three other properties in the area that have a non-conforming setback / variances.

DISCUSSION 11/13/12:

Merten: The City will require the four findings for a Variance in writing. One of the items is that you are asking for the minimum required to accomplish your goal. You have a fairly blank façade, and then you want to place another wall on top. This is an in your face sort of building mass. It is exacerbated by the roof extending out. You need to soften it, articulate the design.

Kane: Next time, can you color the drawings to differentiate features? Can you distinguish existing from proposed? Will this be a two story blank wall, would you articulate, cover with vines, or paint in different colors?

Mitchell: *There will be glass around the roof deck, ie a terrace.*

Liera: Historical, 45 yr review, has yet to be completed. Setbacks have been 10 ft for a long time, what community benefits will there be?

Kane: Maybe you should research the history of why the lot is so narrow.

CA Marengo: A problem you may have in making more building openings is that you are in the 0 to 5 ft range of the property line. There will be the fire rating issue on the order of 25% openings of the wall area.

Mitchell: *the street side is measured from the center line of the street for Fire. On the other side, we can minimize the window area on the neighbor's side.*

Please provide For FINAL REVIEW:

1. Please color your elevations / illustrations to differentiate structures, texture, etc.
2. Provide a landscaping plan.
3. Survey the neighborhood, 4 to 6 houses from your project. How many houses have narrow lots, non-conforming street setbacks, variances, 2-story homes, and calculate FAR
4. Provide a setback study.
5. What is the result of the historical review?
6. Provide an Olivetas St. elevation.
7. Articulate building: methods of articulation include: varying planes of surface, varying texture of surface, varying use of windows, and color. Alternatively, present a stellar modern design.
8. Provide a massing study of Marine St. and Olivetas St.
9. Please email your letter of findings for a variance to the DPR Chairman.

recorder setting 15/15 01 31 38

8. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 11/13/12 + FINAL REVIEW 11/20/12

Project Name: **LA JOLLA BEACH TOWNHOMES EOT [SHAW PROPERTIES]**
 6633 La Jolla Boulevard Permits: CDP
 Project #: PO# 295001 DPM: Paul Godwin
 Zone: RM-3-7 PGodwin@sandiego.gov
 Applicant: Claude-Anthony Morengo
 619-417-1111

Scope of Work:

Extension of Time for approved Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing building and construct 4 residential for rent units on a 5,760 sq ft site at 6633 La Jolla Boulevard in the RM-3-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Ht Limit, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area, Council District 1.

Presenter: Claude Anthony Marengo

APPLICANT PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION 11/13/12:

Applicant needs an EOT for a 2009 Permit, he is applying now so he will not lose the CDP. The EOT will be valid for 3 years. The project site contains yellow cottages on the East side of the street including subterranean garage with alley access. The project includes two bedroom rental units, with 9 parking spaces required. Floor Area allowed is 10,294.6 sq ft; proposed plan is 7,462.7 sq ft.

Provided for FINAL REVIEW 11/20/12:

1. Minutes from the 2009 LJ CPA and DPR meetings regarding the Shaw Project.
I went thru the Minutes, so did Mike Costello, the records have gaps. Our DPM doesn't have CPA records but shows no conflict. The project was pulled from CPA Consent 2009 by Darcy Ashley, but there are no records of any LJ community group hearings. The project was approved at City, there was no evidence that anyone opposed the project at the City.

From the Minutes of LJCPA, DPR, CDP.

I. Minutes of the La Jolla CPA, 2 April 2009

A. SHAW PROPERTIES

CDP ACTION (6/12/2007): Findings can be made, 6-0-1.

CPA ACTION (7/05/2007): Approved on consent, 10-0-1.

6633 La Jolla Blvd – CDP (Process 2) to demolish an existing building and construct 4 residential for rent units with underground parking on a 5,760 SF site. RM-3-7 zone.

Pulled by Ashley and sent to DPR/CDP Committee.

II. CPA Minutes for July 5, 2007

10. COMMITTEE REPORTS & CONSENT ITEMS:

A) Coastal Development Permit Review Committee:

(7) Shaw Properties, 6633 La Jolla Boulevard – Approved unanimously at the June 19, 2007 CDP meeting by a 6-0-1 vote. ON CONSENT. Mr. Morton recused.

APPROVED MOTION: To accept recommendation of the CDP Committee on Items (5), (7) and (8) and forward recommendations to the City. (Merten/Hayes: 10-0-0

III. COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE REPORT of the June 19 , 2007 Can Not Be Located, CA Marengo Chair

IV. COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE REPORT of the June 12 , 2007

PRELIMINARY REVIEWS:

Project Name: **SHAW PROPERTIES** Permits: CDP
 6633 La Jolla Blvd.

Project Number: JO 42-7662/ PTS 127201 DPM: Dan Stricker 619-446-5251

Zone: RM-3-7 Applicant: CA Marengo
 Scope of Work: CDP (Process 2) to demolish an existing building and construct 4 residential for rent units on a 5,760 s.f. site. Parking Impact. Residential Tandem Parking. Transit Area.
Applicant will return at a later date with additional information.

DISCUSSION 11/20/12:

Costello: why was the 2007 approved project returned to the CPA in 2009? *There was a delay for financial reasons.*

Costello: I telephoned Darcy Ashley and asked her why she pulled the project. She didn't remember. Called **Lesley Henegar**, she said all the comments have been cleared and the permit issued. Called **Paul Godwin**, the DPM, who was not able to find community voting records, said there were no outstanding issues and emailed the Mitigated Negative Declaration and a copy of the Permit, CDP.

Kane: What were the Bulk & Scale issues brought up by Lesley Henegar, City Long Range Planning. *She thought the North building should not be part of the criteria for evaluating B&S because it is greater than 30 ft and non-compliant. Over-ruled by DSD. L.R. Planning thought a window on the North façade of the building would look better than a blank wall. We all agreed on a stained glass window.*

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/20/12:

(Grunow / Kane 6-0-1) Findings can be made for an Extension of Time for a previously approved Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing building and construct 4 residential units on a 5,760 sq ft site at 6633 La Jolla Boulevard.

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton

MOTION PASSES

recorder setting 16 00 10 39

9. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 11/20/12

Project Name: **BERNATE TICINO RESIDENCE**

1328 Virginia Way	Permits:	CDP
Project #: PO# 293008	DPM:	Laura Black 619-236-6327
Zone: RS-1-7		LBlack@sandiego.gov
	Applicant:	Sarah Horton 619-231-9905

Scope of Work:

Sustainable expedite program process two Coastal Development Permit to construction a 4,918 sq ft, two story, above basement, single family residence with detached garage and guest quarters, on a 6,995 sq ft vacant lot located at 1328 Virginia Way in the RS-1-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Ht Limit, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. Council District 1. Notice Cards=1

Presenters: Sarah Horton
 Richardo Torres

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

The previous house was demolished. Need a CDP to build a single family 2-story house with guest house and basement. Project is sustainable expedite process. House is large but preserving as much yard as possible. The house is not stepping in the upper level, but have moved house away from the setbacks.

DISCUSSION:

Collins: Have you talked to the neighbors to the South? Two level guest structure?

Liera: How does this building fit the neighbors on each side? We need a section, for neighborhood context, to see how this fits in, with spacing, height ,etc, to the existing condition.

Collins: Is the garage two car? *Yes, two car with guest parking too.*

Welsh: Did the demolition have a Coastal Permit?

Leslie Davis, Preservationist: The demolished house was the Irving Gill Historic Craftsman Cottage known as "**Windemere**". The house was demolished under improper circumstances. Davis agreed to email links to newspaper articles to the Committee Chair. Project needs a full environmental review (CEQA), historic review too. There may be historic artifacts on the property. The project is eligible for California Register designation at the State level of significance, according to OHP Staff. La Jolla Historical Society was in process.

Liera: An expedited review has certain requirements, can you go over them? How much energy will this be producing, using, saving? *Efficient exterior wall insulation, solar panels 50% energy needs, dual pane low E windows, energy efficient appliances.*

Liera: You are asking for an expedited permit which would not be appropriate because of the demo process. **Collins:** When was the emergency demo?

Davis: 23 Dec 2011, with an "emergency" demo permit.

Welsh: The size of the previous house was 1360 sq ft.

Liera: We need to evaluate what is left on the site, maybe artifacts. Environmental documents will help evaluate loss and potential mitigation.

Collins: How long have you been working on this project? *Six months or something like that*

Costello: what are the side yard setbacks and profile height? *Both sides 4 ft 3 in, front 15 ft. profile is below 24 ft.*

Davis: would like to see environmental documents and no expedited permit.

Kane: The Windemere Cottage was demolished to avoid State Historical Review, and CEQA Review. Application timing is good example of "project splitting", in violation of CEQA requirements.

recording setting 16 02 02 06

Please provide For FINAL REVIEW:

1. Please provide a clear statement about the CEQA status of the previous project and its relation to this project and note if this came about as a result of project splitting. We would like to know from the Planner if indeed project splitting has occurred. There may be artifacts remaining on this site, please tell us how this will be addressed. Whether there is an Archeological study or as part of a CEQA study, there should be record of architectural drawings of the structure.

2. Are other Environmental Documents needed?

3. California State Preservation Office said this is a significant historic property and definitely could be designated; is authorization needed from California State Office of Historic Preservation to proceed with development?

4. Discuss project with neighbors on the south side of street.

5. Please provide a neighborhood context study, 1) a section (massing) showing neighboring houses on both sides with the proposed house, 2) a section going across the street, show relationship to building across the street.

6. Please provide GFA and FAR calculations and their break down.

7. Please provide a clear and detailed statement of how this project meets requirements for sustainable development.

8. Provide more articulation of the rear structures to help the appearance from the alley. The rear structure is rather plain compared to the main structure.

9. Please provide a materials sample board of the exterior.

recording setting 16 02 13 39