

**LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**

**November 11, 2014 Present:** Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Kane, Leira, Mapes, Ragsdale, Welsh, Will

**November 18, 2014 Present:** Benton (Chair), Costello, Kane, Mapes, Ragsdale, Welsh, Will

**1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Issues not on agenda and within LJ DPR jurisdiction. Two minutes maximum per person.*

**11/11/2014**

- a. Mike Costello described the new City DSD web site: it is a useful source of permit status, description of project types, and other information related to the planning and review process.
- b. Diane Kane has noted that the City is considering that it will post historic reports on the City web site, both in the final form as they are on their way to the Historic Resources Board, and other reports that may not ultimately be reviewed by that board. This is relevant to the work of the La Jolla Historical Society and other historic groups. She recommends the support of others to make these reports available on the City web site.

**11/18/2014**

- c. none

**2. SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/18/14**

As Chairman Benton must recuse for item 2 on the Agenda, he is recused and a Chair Pro Tem is to be elected. Michael Costello was nominated.

(Mapes / Kane 5-0-2)

In Favor: Leira, Mapes, Ragsdale, Welsh, Will

Oppose: None

Abstain: Benton, Costello

**Motion Passes**

**3. PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

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

Project Name:	Haudenschild Gate SCR	Permits:	SCR
	1860 La Jolla Rancho Road	DPM:	Jeannette Temple, (619) 657-7908
Project #:	387269		JTemple@sandiego.gov
Zone:	RS-1-1	Applicant:	Gene Cipparone
			(858) 587-9100

La Jolla: Substantial Conformance review for a new Gate Structure to modify proposed entry gate structure to CDP #1104287, previously approved CDP / Project No. 313059, at 1860 La Jolla Rancho Road, RS-1-1 Zone, Coastal non-appealable overlay zone, within La Jolla Community Plan area.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/11/14:** (Gene Cipparone)

*The project was previously presented to this committee and approval recommended, and ultimately a CDP was issued.*

*This project is to provide a new gate entrance to the property in substantially the same location. The original design was set back 26 feet from the front property line; the new gate is 40 from the front property line. The previously-approved design provided a gate 7 to 8 feet high; the new design will provide for a portal that is 18 feet high. The portal will have 14 foot clearance, which is the minimum required to allow a fire truck. The landscape planting includes a row of pine trees, which have already been planted and which are presently about 15 feet high.*

#### **DISCUSSION 11/11/14**

*Gail Forbes made a statement of support: the project is in scale and appropriate for this site.*

*A discussion ensued about the scale and dimensions of the proposal, and the relative distance to the existing residence and to the other improvements on the site. The proportion and scale of the portal is somewhat greater.*

**SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/11/14:** The Committee wishes to consider this Preliminary Presentation as sufficient to make a finding and recommendation for this project.

(Will / Costello 4-4-1)

In Favor: Costello, Kane, Mapes, Will

Oppose: Collins, Leira, Ragsdale, Welsh

Abstain: Benton, as Chair

**Motion Fails. This matter is continued to a later meeting.**

#### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/18/14:** (Gene Cipparone)

*The proposed changes to the CDP were discussed. The gate at the Portal is 38'-7" from the property line, where a setback of 25 feet is required. The finishes of the portal were reviewed: stone, with a gate that is centered in the portal, a wood frame with wood pattern infill.*

*Fire Department access will continue at the east side of the property. The portal is sized so that emergency vehicles will have access through the portal.*

#### **DISCUSSION 11/18/14**

*A discussion ensued about the nature of the portal and the character of the neighborhood. The applicant described several other examples that have similar portals, and dense planting. The vegetation in this design is compared to the masonry and stucco wall of the previous CDP, and the adjacent hedges and fences that are closer to La Jolla Rancho Road.*

**SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/18/14:** Findings CAN be made that the proposed modified gate and portal is in Substantial Conformance with the previously issued Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit / Project No. 313059, at 1860 La Jolla Rancho Road.

(Costello / Kane 5-4-1)

In Favor: Costello, Kane, Mapes, Ragsdale, Will

Oppose: Welsh

Abstain: Benton (Chair)

**Motion Passes**

#### **4. FINAL REVIEW (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 8/13/13, 8/20/13, 9/10/13)**

Project Name: **CONGER CDP & TM**

801 Pearl Street

Permits: CDP & TM

Project #: PO# 294307

DPM: Paul Godwin, (619) 446-5190

Zone: RM-1-1

Applicant: pgodwin@sandiego.gov  
Joe LaCava, (858) 488-0160

**Scope of Work:**

(Process 4) Coastal Development Permit and Tentative Map to remove an existing service station and construct a new mixed-use project with four retail units, one restaurant and 12 condo units with a subterranean garage. The property is located at 801 Pearl Street in Zone 4 of La Jolla Planned District and the RM-1-1 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable 2), Coastal Height Limit, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Coastal), the Transit Area Overlay Zone, the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay and Council District 1.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION 09/10/13:** (Joe LaCava and Alex Faulkner; Charles Houser, a Certified Engineering Geologist)

*New information was presented regarding the manner of removal and mitigation of potential petroleum hydrocarbons on the site, the planned excavation, and the methods of treating the soils that may be found to have petroleum hydrocarbons. A discussion ensued about the monitoring and reporting of the procedures and findings.*

*New information was presented in concept about the proposed changes to the design of the project: move 2 residential units to the north, remove all third-floor units at the south building; provide roof decks at several locations; continue to have the driveway and vehicle entrance at Eads Avenue; truck service area at the alley. The presenters made it clear that the design will be changing to reflect these proposed changes.*

**DISCUSSION 09/10/13**

*A discussion ensued about whether the project conforms to the La Jolla Community Plan: density, height, scale were discussed.*

**Please provide for FINAL REVIEW:**

- a) Show, in those areas where the pedestrian circulation crosses the vehicular traffic, that there will be adequate visibility and any conflicts will be mitigated.
- b) Show how this project will provide a transition from the higher to the lower density.
- c) Where possible integrate the commercial and residential designs to create an integrated building envelope.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/11/14:** (Joe LaCava and Alex Faulkner)

*The revised project was presented. The results of a traffic study indicates that the traffic loads to and from the property are similar to those presently experienced at the existing gas station. The configurations of the delivery space is intended to promote delivery to the rear of the commercial spaces. The design concept is modified so that the two rear buildings are separated. The unit entrance doors of the south buildings are oriented away from the property line. The blank wall fronting the alley is articulated so that some variety is presented to the westbound traffic on Pearl Street. Other studies provided include a noise study, which indicates that no mitigation is required. The FAR for the entire project is 1.12. Placement of air conditioning compressors is related to each unit: the locations are not yet defined.*

*The comments of the 9/10/13 meeting were reviewed, and the means of addressing each of these was discussed. The setbacks were reviewed at all levels of the building.*

*Doug Moranville showed photographs of the street indicating the traffic congestion and a recent traffic accident on Eads.*

*Connie Bransom described the project as much larger in scale compared to the established neighborhood, the availability of parking for the commercial uses: she estimates the parking demand will be for 50 spaces. Deborah*

*Pinel is concerned that the project does not address the results of the removal of the gas station tanks, truck movement during construction, and other results of intensification of use of the property.*

*Leslie Gaunt asked some questions: date of the traffic study: 8/28/13 Wednesday. She requested information on the proportion of FAR dedicated to commercial as opposed to the residential uses. The proposed project transfers the height and developability between the two parcels in a manner that maximizes overall development and results in the highest buildings in the southerly portion, adjacent to the residential properties on Eads. The traffic pattern is substantially unchanged from the previous project. The bulk of the project, especially at the south side is roughly as large as previously proposed. The landscaping is minimal. The consistency of the project with the La Jolla Community Plan is not established.*

*Per Svedlund is concerned about the scale of the proposed development. The proposed development will generate traffic.*

*A concern was raised about homeless access to the garage.*

### **DELIBERATION**

*A discussion ensued about the bulk and scale of the proposed development. The proportion and scale of the proposed development next to the adjacent property were discussed. The FAR is significant and yields the impression that this is more intensive than previously existing. Although there are other examples of this intensity of development on Pearl Street, the transition to Eads is critical. The central courtyard with the driveways should have more attention to detail and the landscaping. The design should demonstrate consistency with the community plan and how these transitions are made. Beautification and the impression of the project from the alley should be provided. The selection of trees was discussed.*

### **Please provide for FINAL REVIEW:**

- a. More detail and relief at the blank walls.
- b. Provide the geotechnical report that demonstrates remediation of the fuel leaks.
- c. Provide the noise study.
- d. Provide color renderings at all floor levels at Eads and above.
- e. Enhanced treatment on the interior courtyard and driveway.
- f. Consider reducing the number of units or the overall density.
- g. Demonstrate the turning maneuvers for a truck entering the delivery area from the alley.

**This project is continued to a future meeting.**

## **5. COURTESY PRESENTATION**

Project Name:	<b>MUSEUM OF CONTEMPORARY ART SAN DIEGO</b>	Permits:	CDP & SDP
	700 Prospect Street	DPM:	not assigned
Project #:	not assigned		
Zone:	PDO Subarea 6A	Applicant:	Paul Benton, (858) 459-0805

### **Scope of Work:**

The Museum has been considering an expansion of its existing facility, to include added and improved Gallery and Exhibit spaces, conversion of the parking lot fronting Prospect Street to a pedestrian plaza, and a new enclosed Parking Garage. This Courtesy Presentation is intended to inform the reviewers of the progress of the design of this project and to invite comment, perspectives, and insights from the La Jolla community. Courtesy presentation only: no vote will be taken.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/18/14:** (Paul Benton, Alcorn & Benton Architects)

*The proposed project was presented in its current conceptual form. The site context was reviewed, including the references in the La Jolla Community Plan for the view access across the site, the PDO setting, and the frontages and views of the site from the three sides fronting streets. The existing portions of the project to be largely untouched are from the north end to Axline Court. A new entrance to the galleries will be provided by remodeling the existing Book Store and presenting a new glass entrance roughly in-line with Silverado. An alternative entrance will be incorporated at Coast Boulevard.. The large Moreton Bay Fig to the south of Sherwood Auditorium will be retained, as will most of the garden on the slope to the north and west of the buildings.*

*The Museum will increase the exhibition spaces by adding roughly 3 times what presently exists for a new total exhibition space of 46,000 sf, and the overall complex will grow from 53,475 sf to approximately 108,000 sf. A significant portion of this is in underground basements, to reduce the calculated FAR. The new gallery spaces will extend along the southerly side of the property, with much higher volumes for the display of a wider range of work. The spaces will have daylight from skylights. A parking garage for 49 cars will be provided in the basement, and the entrance to the parking garage will be combined with an enclosure for the loading dock. The gallery exhibition spaces will process from Prospect Street to Coast Boulevard, with some ramps down to maintain the height below the 30-foot limit. The exhibition spaces will lead to a balcony overlooking the ocean at the southwest corner. Sherwood Auditorium will be repurposed to the highest exhibit space, with skylights as well: no change is planned for the exterior of Sherwood Auditorium. Materials presently considered are cast-in-place concrete, with glass and stone infill panels.*

*The frontage on Prospect Street is widely varying, with 3 courtyards or plazas. The parking lot at the north end is converted to a pedestrian plaza, and the existing loading docks and trash storage are repurposed to an exhibit space. The existing courtyard between the café and the Axline Court is retained. A new courtyard framing the new gallery spaces and incorporating the fig is created.*

*This is a conceptual presentation: the Applicant is seeking responses and thoughts of the members of the community. A design concept may be submitted for a CDP and SDP in the future.*

**DISCUSSION 11/18/14**

*A discussion ensued about the direction of the concept as developed. The various exhibitions and programs of the Museum were discussed, and the trend away from the formal seating of Sherwood Auditorium. The auditorium of the new facility for the Music Society will be an opportunity for continued presentations such as those that have appeared at the Sherwood Auditorium.*

*Several people in the audience expressed concern that Sherwood Auditorium would not continue in its current form.*

*The location and route of school buses was discussed. The ability to provide an entrance fronting Coast Boulevard is a significant improvement. The new pedestrian plaza at the north end, maintaining the view corridor, and the new courtyard at the fig, are all significant contributions to the community fabric.*

The Applicant will notify the Committee when the design is developed further and then placed on a future Agenda.

**6. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION – DISCUSSION OF POLICY**

**RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS IN THE BIRD ROCK AREA – “MANSIONIZATION”**

Presenters: James Ragsdale, Member of the DPR Committee

Sharon Wampler and Dana Williams, residents of Bird Rock

At their November 4<sup>th</sup> BRCC Community meeting there were a number of issues discussed relating to the construction of residential additions in the Bird Rock Area. Several residents discussed their concerns with several recent build/and flip projects in the area. Several issues were identified are:

1. Some of these projects implement the 50% exemption rule in ways that may not have been anticipated when it was adopted.
2. It appears to be more desirable than ever that the plans of such projects should be reviewed by neighbors in the direct vicinity.
3. Some of these projects implement the same style of architectural plans and materials in the same neighborhood (the new house on Linda Rosa has the same style, stucco and trim color as the completed project on Beaumont Ave. This is contrary to the preference for variation and innovation in the designs in the La Jolla Community Plan.
4. The City of Los Angeles adopted a “Mansionization” ordinance in 2008. This appears to address the size of the structure, with an emphasis that these should be in keeping with the size of the lot and respectful of neighbors. <http://www.latimes.com/local/la-me-0924-lopez-mansion-20140924-column.html>
5. This committee might consider recommending modifications to the Coastal Development Permit Categorical Exclusions that are currently being reviewed by the City and the Coastal Commission. These regulations could require reductions in the allowable square-footage for two story-additions or remodeling and reduction in height limits. This seems to be a more effective way to reduce bulk and scale than the existing requirement to preserve 50% or greater of existing exterior walls.

We recognize that the implementation of the above recommendations will require review by the City Planning Staff and the City Attorney. The purpose here is to have a discussion of the issues by the Development Permit Review Committee (DPRC), and then, also by the La Jolla Community Planning Association (LJCPA). Hopefully this can expedite the process of any necessary ordinance changes.

This matter will be discussed, direction for further review may be made, and a resolution or recommendation may or may not be put to a vote.

**PRESENTATION and DISCUSSION - November 18, 2014** (James Ragsdale, Member of the Committee, Dana Williams, Dr. Sharon Wampler)

*James Ragsdale introduced the subject, and noted that an individual was present at the meeting who has developed some of the projects that are the subject of presentation.*

*The Land Development Code is currently under review, and one of the standards under review is the 50% provision for the exemptions.*

*Dana Williams and Sharon Wampler discussed the community and the character of Bird Rock. It appears that there has been a rapid growth and transition in the Bird Rock area, which has brought some changes to the community. This is an issue that is also being addressed in the City of Los Angeles.*

*Mike Costello presented a note written by Phil Merten describing a project that was granted an exemption, which maximized the development of the property, with calculations of the project that indicate the scale and size of the project. He has reviewed some of the designs as presented in the drawings, and believes that some of the projects that are receiving Categorical Exemptions would not be approved if a CDP were required. The scale of such projects that result are frequently 2 to 4 times larger than the existing residence.*

*Diane Kane described “design by math” that results in some projects that appear to be at a great variance from the scale and character of the community. The pressure on development has led to the development of the large scale projects.*

*Joe LaCava discussed the need for a commitment by the community to a different approach to the zoning and planning requirements. There have been examples in the past in which the community has requested changes to the code, but these have met with resistance within the La Jolla community. The update of the Land Development*

*Code is limited, although a review of that is appropriate. There may be opportunity to reactivate the Categorical Exclusion, which encourages smaller-scaled development. A broad-based support is necessary to achieve a change to the rules. He recommends that an approach to the changes to the zoning and planning approach that requires broader review.*