

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee– Minutes

4:00 p.m. – Tuesday August 24, 2010

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment

2. Chair Comments:

--Project D: Hooshmand Residence, has been removed from agenda at the applicant's request.

--Upcoming projects include demo and rebuild at 1915 Spindrift; evaluating paleontological issues in establishing a district undergrounding utilities in area bounded by ocean, Avenida de la Playa, first row of properties on east side of LJ Shores drive and extending slightly into SIO property.

--The Cardenas deck project appeal was heard by the Planning Commission (later confirmed that decision was to approve without conditions imposed by the Hearing Officer); Marcus project on Sugarman was approved by the Hearing Officer with no opposition; Whitney project is slated for a September 9 Planning Commission appeal hearing (confirmed by receipt of mailed notice). --

There is not a quorum for the regularly scheduled September meeting. The next meeting scheduled is for October 26.

3. Project Review –A, B, C, E

Committee members: Present: Boyden (chair), Furtek (left before E), Lucas, Merten, Morton (arrived after discussion of A started), Naegle Absent: Morrison, Schenck.

A. Cave St/2503 Ardath Road -- Historic Houses Relocation

- PROJECT NUMBER: 1042
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential and guest house
- LOCATION: 2503 Ardath Road, moved from Cave Street
- PLANNER: Glenn Gargas: Ph: 619-446-5142; ggargas@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Marie Burke Lia, Esq618-235-9766; mblaw@earthlink.net
-

Project Description: Demolition of existing building on Ardath Road. Relocation of two (2) existing historically designated residences from Cave Street to Ardath Road. New foundations for both; new plumbing; new mechanical. New electrical, new structurals; and new three (3)-garage. Addition of 209 sq. ft. to guest house and 376 sq. ft to main house. For a total of 2865 sq. ft for both relocated houses and 734 sq.ft. for the garage. See below for addition of covered porch.

Project seeking: Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit (Cave)

Previous Action: July 27

Motion: Morton; Second: Naegle: Come back to committee and present: 300' setback study, and show how this project will conform. Especially with side setbacks. Distance of 3 car garage to side yard setback. Address doing a hammerhead type turn around driveway design for safety to accomplish a forward exit.

Motion carries: 5-0-1; Approve: Lucas, Morrison, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

See July 27 minutes for additional discussion

Presented by: Marie Burke Lia

Correction to Structure square footage:

- Main Residence 1576 sf
- Guest House 704 sf
- sub total: 2280 sf
- Covered Porches 62 sf (not previously included)
- Addition to Main 376 sf
- Addition to Guest 209 sf
- New Garage 736 sf
- total: 3663 sf, (now includes porches),including garage

- Total lot: 16,460.65 sf, lot coverage 17%

Landscape plans: These aren't available yet as the project has not completed a full cycle review with the city. The Long Range Planning staff asked for a preliminary project review by the planning groups before proceeding.

There is room to adjust setbacks slightly by re-arranging the buildings, depending on committee recommendations.

Setback studies: Applicant provided a commercially prepared multi-page graphic display of all properties within 300' overlaid with setback for each property. This project fronts Ardath Road, on .38 acres. There are no typical lot types within the 300 foot radius. Across Ardath/LJ Parkway there are condos and higher density homes. On the same side as this project, many properties within 300' don't front on Ardath Road. Tables were presented showing 22 properties within 300', but many of these were not directly comparable to this project site (larger parcel, condominiums, vacant lot, no street frontage...). Six properties fronting Ardath road and varying in lot size from .33 - .5 acre were selected for the comparison.

	Front	Left (east)	Right (west)	Average side
Average:	33.2	5.0	14.9	9.9
Range:	21.6-41.9	0-12.8	0-18.3	
Current house:	27.3	12.8	18.3	
Proposed:	22	5.0	7.4	

The PRC previously recommended a "hammerhead" type of turn-around for the driveway. This matter was reviewed by the LDR Transportation Reviewer who said that as this is a 2-lane residential street with a curb to curb width of 30', the Street Design Manual does not restrict backing out of the driveway. Currently the Dowdings on the west do not have a turnaround, and they back out onto the street (Beth Dowding confirmed that she has no problems doing this). There is enough space on the property to incorporate a turnaround if the committee still recommended it.

The final issue discussed was the relationship of the guest house on the west property line to the Dowding's property. Due to the slope of the lot toward the adjacent property, at 55' from the front property line, a low 23' retaining wall will be installed that extends to the rear (south) of the property. A low earthen berm will run from the retaining wall to the front of the property with the goal of directing run-off to the street and not onto the neighboring property. The distances between the proposed guest house and the Dowding house are 20' at the front and 12.5' at the rear of the guest house. There is a woodshed on the property line on the Dowding side that helps with privacy. There are windows on the west side of the guest house, but landscaping and fencing could be installed to improve the privacy.

Community Input

Arlene Powers, neighbor on east: Concerned about side of garage next to their driveway – seeing a large side of the garage while driving in would not be appealing. She also suggested making this a 2-car garage instead. *Response. This might not allow a hammerhead driveway, Three garage spaces may be desirable because of guest house*

Beth Dowding, neighbor on west: Privacy issues with the windows of guest house looking into their patio. Would like the setback increased.

Both neighbors like the project in general and think that it will be nice to have historic homes in the neighborhood. They think that the scale of the project fits well with the property size.

Board Discussion

The board discussion focused on the driveway turn-around, privacy issues on the west property line, landscaping, and the siting of the buildings in general. It was thought that the "hammerhead" type turn-around would be of value. The garage on the east side did not seem much of an issue with the board as the setback was 10' and the Power's driveway was on the other side and not their house. With a good landscape plan, the project could help mitigate some of the privacy issues. A plan showing this proposed project and the two neighboring properties would really help, and should be presented at the next review.

Much of the board discussions centered on how to do a preliminary review. The PRC is designed to review actual projects and either approve or disapprove based on how they fit the Municipal Code, the LJ Community Plan and the LJ Shores PDO. It was felt that we could not make any recommendations per se, only present a motion which lists reasons to approve/deny.

Lucas: This project has not been through the cycle review and the plans are not final; the project can't really be approved at this time.

Motion Merten:

That the relocation of the historic structures to this site be denied, because the movement to the site is not compatible with the LJ Community Plan.

No Second: Motion fails.

Motion: Morton; Second: Lucas

Although not ideal under the current La Jolla Community Plan, we support relocation of the historic homes to this site.

Approve: 2 + 1 chair voting due to tie. Morton, Lucas, Boyden

Oppose: 2 Merten, Naegle

Abstain: 1 Furtek

Motion carries: 3-2-1

Motion: Merten; Second: Morton

Approve the plans as presented.

Approve: Merten, Morton, Naegle

Oppose: Lucas, Boyden, Furtek

Abstain:

Motion fails 3-3-0

Motion: Morton; Second: Furtek

Deny the project as presented. Recommend increasing both side yard setbacks to 10'. Recommend substituting hammerhead driveway.

Motion carries: 4-1-0

Approve: Furtek, Merten, Morton, Naegle

Oppose: Lucas

Abstain: Boyden (chair)

B. Gaxiola Residence

- PROJECT NUMBER: 207195
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 2414 Calle Del Oro
- PLANNER: Morris Dye: mdye@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Victor Gutierrez: J.C. Alcantar; 619-971-6301;contracting_america@yahoo.com

Project Description: Demolish existing 1-story residence and construct a new 2-story residence with 5 bedrooms, 7 bathrooms and 3 car garage. Coastal Overlay (non-appealable); Coastal Height Limit.

Project seeking: Side Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit for Process 3 with potential for Process 5 to remove 30' road easement on eastern boundary of property.

Boyden, Chair: Cycle reviews show concerns: 30' easement, structure height, setbacks, GFA calculations, how many bedrooms and parking impact, guest quarters.

Presenter: Luis Gutierrez

Presented the project and responded to technical questions from the board concerning the curb cut width and the grade from one side of the house to the other. There was a bit of confusion as the cross sections were labeled differently than reference lines on the drawings.

A materials board was presented. Preliminary grading plan presented. Landscape plan presented.

There was no 300' setback survey.

Public Comment

Carol Gilster: 8415 Avenida de las Ondas – adjacent to property

Will the elevation of the new house be the same as the present and will the basement be excavated? *Response: the roofline will be 10' higher, but house is shifted to the back of the lot.* She commented that there is a drainage ditch behind the property which is important to keep as there is a real drainage problem in the neighborhood. She requested that poles be put up *which the owner's representative agreed to.*

Fred & Beverly Boynton, Calle del Oro, property directly below to west: They are very concerned with drainage issues. If upslope properties don't drain correctly or sprinklers are left on, etc, then their basement floods. The drainage ditch has a collection basin that drains to Calle del Oro, which is important to keep. On the north side of the property there is presently a channel that drains (the "swale"). They had questions about possible privacy issues with pool and house? *Response: the setbacks from the house are increased.* They reiterated that their basement and the house to the west of them has been flooded due to drainage issues.

Graydon Wetzler, adjacent homeowner on corner at 8416 Westway: Would also like story poles. He is very concerned with drainage.

Peggy Davis: What is proposed with the power poles in front? *Response: These will be undergrounded the whole distance and paid for by the owner.* She had questions regarding the retaining walls which were answered.

Joyce Fox: Her property shares the swale with the Boyntons. They have been flooded out too.

Responses: *Applicant: The owner recently purchased the property; he does not have a historical knowledge of these issues. They really appreciate the input from the neighbors. Chair: The City is evaluating drainage and will require a drainage plan.*

Motion: Morton Second: Lucas

To continue item to a future meeting

The committee would like to see **the following items presented:**

- **A drainage plan showing the swale and the drainage pattern proposed**
- Bring a **site plan** drawing that shows the outlines of building on adjacent properties
- Show additional on site **parking spaces and guest parking spaces on the site plan**
- Bring the 300' **neighborhood** setback survey that is required by the City
- Re-label the cross sections **of the building** to match with plan

- Show a grading plan with the existing and proposed **site** contours and drainage **pattern**
- Provide a **site grading** plan that would adequately address offsite drainage from upslope properties and to the downslope neighbors below
- **Show drainage devices to channel and control the flow and route it to the curb or storm drain system**
- Show the existing house outline overlaid with the current proposed project. **on the site plan**
- **Request that the applicant provide a title report with a schedule B attachment - which will show all easements on the property**

Motion carries: 5-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle

Oppose:

Abstain: Boyden (chair)

C. Diarq-Westway Substantial Conformance Review

- PROJECT NUMBER:
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 8436 Westway Drive
- PLANNER: Tim Daly; 619-446-5356; tdaly@sandiego.gov

- OWNERS REP: Edward Sutton, 858-459-9291; ed.sutton@islandarch.com

Project Description: Demolition of existing 2-story 3,297 sf house. Construction of new 2-story 6,796 single-family residence, including hardscape, retaining walls, terraces, cantilevered pool and spa and relocation of driveway. Site has active coastal permit for new 2-story 8,503 sf Single Family Residence issued in August 2007.

Seeking: Decision that the new project is in substantial conformance with the previously issued permits.

Boyden, Chair: Stated that the purpose of the hearing is to decide whether the present project is in substantial conformance with the previously permitted project, not to conduct a de novo hearing. She listed the city concerns with substantial conformance of the proposed project including: CEQA issues, grading changes, wall height changes, footprint changes, side yard setback and configuration changes.

OWNERS REP: Edward Sutton

He presented the comparison of the site plans, showing comparisons with the building siting and retaining walls, showing the addition of a new retaining wall. He discussed the differences in the grading plan. He stated that the original site plan, approved by the city, had a discrepancy in the grading plan between what the plans show and what the grading data shows. He said that if you take that into consideration, the new grading plan removes a similar amount of material. He presented diagrams showing the comparison of the old and new footprints, comparative lot coverage and side yard setbacks. During the presentation committee members asked questions about compliance and differences. Board members reviewed by discussion or inspection of materials the items presented by the applicant and City review cycle. The presenter was asked to demonstrate substantial compliance by two committee members. Eventually the presentation was halted by the making of a motion.

Board Discussion details.

Morton: This is not a small change or minor change. Normally, substantial conformance reviews are for small changes on a project, i.e. the moving of a bedroom, or a different building theme. In this project the building envelope is substantially different. This doesn't appear to be in substantial conformance with the previous permit.

Merten: Would also like details on how this conforms, doesn't feel it does.

Lucas: The retaining wall is new and extensive and the building outline is significantly different.

Naegle: Recommends starting with a blank slate and going through the process again, rather than trying to be in substantial conformance. That way they will end up with a design that is really effective. *Response: the client is pleased with the plan.*

Motion: Furtek; Second, Naegle

The project is not in substantial conformance with the previously approved project.

Motion carries: 5-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle

Oppose:

Abstain: Boyden (chair)

D. Hooshmand Residence - Not heard at request of owner's representative

E. Verizon Wireless "Ardath"

- PROJECT NUMBER: 205594
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Wireless Communication Facility –pole mounted antennas
- LOCATION: 7990 Via Capri
- PLANNER: Karen Lynch-Ashcraft; K LynchAsh@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Plancom Inc.; Shelly Kilbourn; shellykilbourn@cox.net

Project Description: Replacing (3) existing antennas mounted to steel pipes with (3) updated antennas and the installation of (1) additional antenna for a total of (4). The project also includes installation of (1) new equipment cabinet on a 3'x5'

concrete pad within Verizon's equipment area. Additionally, the existing Telco cabinet will be replaced with an updated Telco cabinet.

Seeking: Conditional Use Permit/Coastal Development Permit; Process 4.

OWNERS REP: Plancom Inc.; Shelly Kilbourn

Original permit was approved in 1994 with no permit expirations. New project will be permitted for 10 years. Expanded on project description above.

Board Discussion

Boyden: Stated she was a Verizon customer (as did another committee member). She had not noticed the site before this item had a Notice of Application, Is this upgrade to improve coverage? *Response: this will increase coverage slightly to the northeast, but this is mainly to add 4G services to the area.*

Morton: This looks like a good project as long as the antennas and equipment can be painted to blend in with the hillside.

Motion: Merten; Second: Morton

Approve project as shown on the plans presented. (They have been annotated to show the equipment cabinet and antennas painted green or camouflaged to blend in with the hillside.)

Motion carries: 4-0-1

Approve: Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle

Oppose:

Abstain: Boyden (chair)

(Furtek left before presentation)